OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

4
324.81
9

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

60 VICTORIA, 1896

VOL. XLIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE NINETEENTH DAY OF AUGUST TO THE FIFTH DAY OF OCTOBER INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1896

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

HONOURABLE WILFRID LAURIER

AT THE OPENING OF THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

1896

(CABINET FORMED 13TH JULY, 1896)

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Hon. WILFRID LAURIER.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. Sir R. J. CARTWRIGHT, K.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. SCOTT.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. L. H. DAVIES.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. ANDREW G. BLAIR.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. F. W. BORDEN.
Postmaster General	Hon. W. MULOCK.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. SIDNEY FISHER.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE.
Without Portfolio	Hon. R. R. DOBELL.
Without Portfolio	Hon. C. A. GEOFFRION.

[*Not in the Cabinet*]

Solicitor General	Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK.
Controller of Customs	Hon. WM. PATERSON.
Controller of Inland Revenue	Hon. Sir H. G. JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE, K.C.M.G.

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Hon. JAMES DAVID EDGAR	*Speaker.*
LOUIS PHILIPPE BRODEUR, M.P.	*Deputy Speaker.*
JOHN G. BOURINOT, ESQ.	Clerk of the House.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, ESQ.	Clerk Assistant.
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS :

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1896.

ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.
ALBERT—William J. Lewis.
ALBERTA—Frank Oliver.
ALGOMA—Albert Edward Dyment.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—James Moffat Douglas.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—William Le Boutillier Fauvel.
BOTHWELL—James Clancy.
BRANDON—Dalton McCarthy. *
BRANT, S. Riding—Robert Henry.
BROCKVILLE—Hon. John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Hon. Sidney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—John Tolmie.
BURRARD—George Ritchie Maxwell.

CAPE BRETON—{Hector F. McDougall. / Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.
CARDWELL—William Stubbs.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederic Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Hon. C. A. Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—François Arthur Marcotte.
CHARLEVOIX—Louis Charles A. Angers.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Paul V. Savard.
COLCHESTER—Wilbert D. Dimock.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Mahlon K. Cowan.

FRONTENAC—David Dickson Rogers.

GASPÉ—Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Théotime Blanchard.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—Hon. Wm. Paterson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND AND MONCK—Hon. Walter H. Montague
HALIFAX—{Robert L. Borden. / Benjamin Russell.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—{Thomas Henry McPherson. / Andrew Trew Wood.
HANTS—Allen Haley.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—Jeremiah M. Hurley.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—Alexander W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—J. Alexandre Camille Madore.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Malcolm Colin Campbell.

---

* Elected for Brandon and North Simcoe; Resigned seat for Brandon, 25th August.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

JACQUES-CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk.
JOLIETTE—Charles Basinet.

KAMOURASKA—Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—George V. McInerney.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.
KING'S (N.B.)—James Domville.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—Augustine Colin Macdonald.
KINGSTON—Byron Moffat Britton.

LABELLE—J. Henri N. Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. Riding—John Fraser.
LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Liste.
LANARK, N. Riding—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier.
LAVAL—Thomas Fortin.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Francis Theodore Frost.
LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—William Gibson.
LISGAR—Robert Lorne Richardson
L'ISLET—Arthur Miville Dechene.
LONDON—Thomas Beattie.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MACDONALD—Nathaniel Boyd.
MAISONNEUVE—Raymond Préfontaine.
MARQUETTE—William James Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph Hormisdas Legris.
MEGANTIC—George Turcot.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—James Gilmour.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—Valentine Ratz.
MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—Malcolm McGugan.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel Bishop Meigs.
MONTCALM—Louis E. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Philippe A. Choquette.
MONTMORENCY—Thomas Chase Casgrain.
MONTREAL, St. Anne—Michael Joseph Francis Quinn.
MONTREAL, St. Antoine—Thomas G. Roddick.
MONTREAL, St. James—Odilon Desmarais.
MONTREAL, St. Lawrence—Edward Goff Penny.
MONTREAL, St. Mary—Hercule Dupré.
MUSKOKA—George McCormick.

NEW WESTMINSTER—Aulay Morrison.
NICOLET—Fabien Boisvert.
NIPISSING—James B. Klock.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—James Robinson.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—John A. McGillivray.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—Leonard Burnett.
ONTARIO, W. Riding—Hon. James David Edgar.
OTTAWA (City)—{Napoléon A. Belcourt. / William Hutchison.}
OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
Oxford, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G.

PEEL—John Featherston.
PERTH, N. Riding—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
PERTH, S. Riding—Dilman Kinsey Erb.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Lang.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Kendry,
PICTOU—{Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.M.G. / Adam Carr Bell.}
PONTIAC—William Joseph Poupore.
PORTNEUF—Hon. Sir Henri G. Joly de Lotbinière, K.C.M.G.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE, East (P.E.I.)—John Yeo.
PRINCE, West (P.E.I.)—Edward Hackett.
PRINCE EDWARD—William Varney Pettet.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. *
QUEBEC, West—Hon. Richard Reid Dobell.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, East (P.E.I.)—Alexander Martin.
QUEEN'S, West (P.E.I.)—Hon. Louis Henry Davies.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Thomas Mackie.
RENFREW, S. Riding—John Ferguson.
RESTIGOUCHE—John McAlister.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph A. Gillies.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Michael Thomas Stenson.
RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.
ROUVILLE—Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—John Valentine Ellis.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and Co.—Joseph John Tucker.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—Hon. Joseph Israël Tarte.
SASKATCHEWAN—
SELKIRK—John Alexander Macdonell.
SHEFFORD—Charles Henry Parmalee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Hon. Wm. Bullock Ives.
SIMCOE, E. Riding—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
STANSTEAD—Alvin Head Moore.
SUNBURY AND QUEEN'S—Hon. A. G. Blair.

* Elected for Saskatchewan and East Quebec; at By-Election chose latter constituency.

TÉMISCOUATA—Charles Eugène Pouliot.
TERREBONNE—Léon Adolphe Chauvin.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, Centre—William Lount.
TORONTO, East—John Ross Robertson.
TORONTO, West—Edward Frederick Clarke. Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER—William Wallace Burns McInnes.
VAUDREUIL—Henry Stanislaus Harwood.
VICTORIA (B.C.)—Thomas Earle. Hon. Edward Gawler Prior.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—John L. Bethune.
VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—George McHugh.

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.
WELLAND—William McCleary.
WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.
WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
WELLINGTON, S. Riding—Christian Kloepfer.
WENTWORTH AND BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Thomas Bain.
WESTMORELAND—Henry A. Powell.
WINNIPEG—Hon. Hugh John Macdonald.
WRIGHT—Charles Ramsay Devlin.

YALE AND CARIBOO—Hewitt Bostock.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse Samuel Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
YORK (O.) E. Riding—William Findlay Maclean.
YORK (O.) N. Riding—Hon. William Mulock.
YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clarke Wallace.

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

BEAUSOLEIL, Mr. Cléophas (*Berthier*).
BERGERON, Mr. Joseph G. H. (*Beauharnois*).
CHARLTON, Mr. John (*N. Norfolk*).
CHOQUETTE, Mr. P. A. (*Montmagny*).
CRAIG, Mr. T. D. (*E. Durham*).
DAVIN, Mr. N. F. (*W. Assiniboia*).
EARLE, Mr. Thos. (*Victoria, B.C.*).
ELLIS, Mr. John V. (*St. John City, N.B.*).
HALEY, Mr. Allen (*Hants, N.S.*)
LARIVIÈRE, Mr. A. A. C. (*Provencher*).
MONET, Mr. D. (*Laprairie and Napierville*).
RICHARDSON, Mr. R. L. (*Lisgar*).
SCRIVER, Mr. Julius (*Huntingdon*).
SOMERVILLE, Mr. James (*N. Wentworth*).
TAYLOR, Mr. Geo. (*S. Leeds*).

Chairman:—Mr. PHILIPPE A. CHOQUETTE (*Montmagny*).

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr FOSTER'S proposed resolution (*re* Governor General's Warrants) in amendment to Mr. FIELDING'S motion (3rd September) for Committee of Supply (Division 8th September) :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. BURNETT,	Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. TISDALE.
Mr. BEITH,	Mr. CARGILL.
Mr. ERB,	Mr. BENNETT.
Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE.	Mr. GANONG.
Mr. McCARTHY,	Mr. SEAGRAM.
Mr. FISHER,	Mr. RODDICK.
Mr. GIBSON,	Mr. CORBY.
Mr. CAMPBELL,	Mr. KENDRY.
Mr. WOOD (Hamilton),	Mr. BERGIN.
Mr. HUTCHISON,	Mr. BOYD.
Mr. COWAN,	Mr. MACLAREN.
Mr. POULIOT,	Mr. COSTIGAN.
Mr. McINNES,	Mr. FERGUSON.
Mr. GUAY,	Mr. DUGAS,
Mr. DAVIES,	Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

On Mr. FOSTER'S proposed resolution (*re* Tariff Legislation) in amendment to Mr. FIELDING'S motion (22nd September) for Committee of Supply (Division 23rd September) :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. McCARTHY,	Mr. INGRAM.
Mr. LANGELIER,	Mr. POUPORE.
Mr. POULIOT,	Mr. HUGHES.
Mr. CAMPBELL,	Mr. KENDRY.
Mr. EDWARDS,	Mr. RODDICK.
Mr. COWAN,	Mr. MACLAREN.
Mr. HUTCHISON,	Mr. BOYD,
Mr. FORTIN,	Mr. CHAUVIN.

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

The Seventh Parliament of the Dominion, which had been prorogued from the twenty-third day of April, 1896, and thence from time to time, was dissolved by proclamation on the 24th day of April, 1896, and writs having been issued and returned, a new Parliament was summoned to meet for the despatch of business on Wednesday, the 19th day of August, 1896, and did accordingly meet on that day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th August, 1896.

On which day, being the first day of the meeting of the First Session of the Eighth Parliament, for the despatch of business, John George Bourinot, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Commons, Henry Robert Smith and François Fortunat Rouleau, Esquires, Commissioners appointed by Dedimus Potestatem for administering the Oath to Members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty, Samuel E. St. O. Chapleau, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said John George Bourinot, a Roll containing a List of the names of such Members as had been returned to serve in this Parliament, together with Certificates of Returns of Members for the Electoral Districts of Quebec East, Oxford, South Riding, York (O.), North Riding, Kings (N.S.), Brome, Quebec (County), Queen's West (P.E.I.), Portneuf, Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.), and St. John and Iberville.

The aforesaid Commissioners did administer the Oath to the Members who were present,—which being done, and the Members having subscribed the Roll containing the Oath, they repaired to their seats.

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

Gentlemen :

The Honourable Sir Henry Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate, when the Speaker of the Senate said :—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I have it in command to let you know that His Excellency the Governor General does not see fit to declare the causes of his summoning the present Parliament of Canada, until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law, but to-morrow, at Three o'clock in the afternoon, His Excellency will declare the causes of calling this Parliament.

And the Members being returned,

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Dr. Bourinot, in accordance with the intimation conveyed by the representative of the Crown, and in accordance with the long-established usage of Parliament, the duty now devolves upon this House—fresh as it is from the people—to elect a Speaker. It would be mere presumption on my part to remind hon. gentlemen that the Speakership of the House of Commons is one of the most important offices under our parliamentary system of government. The Speaker is the channel of communication between the Commons and the Crown. He is the spokesman of the Commons. It is his duty on every occasion when the Commons think proper, to address the Crown, to convey the messages which the House wishes to convey, whether they be in approval or dissent, or whether they be expressions of joy or of grief. He is in that respect pre-eminently the Speaker of the House of Commons. In the olden days, when the nature of the relations between the Crown and the Commons were somewhat hazy and undefined, these functions of the Speaker, as we know, were of paramount importance ; but in the later centuries, as the relations between the Crown and the Commons have been more clearly defined and better understood, those special duties, though of course still continuing, have lost some of their degree of importance. But the Speaker is also the presiding officer of this House, and, as time has developed our parliamentary system of government, we have found that the duties of the Speaker, as presiding officer of the House, are now the chief duties of the office. The experience of all parliaments, and especially the experience of the Mother of all Parliaments, as well as our own experience, has taught us that the discharge of these duties requires, on the part of the presiding officer of this House, a

sound and firm judgment, a judicial mind, and a thorough knowledge of the customs and usages of Parliament; and above all, the proper discharge of the duties of the office requires from the Speaker absolute impartiality and fairness in his decisions.

I submit to the members of this House that in all these respects the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is eminently endowed, and that he is a proper person to be the Speaker of this House. All the members of this House who sat in the last Parliament—and there are still a few—all those who sat in the previous Parliament will agree with me that in the hands of the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) the honour and dignity of this House, the sound traditions of parliamentary government, and the rights and privileges of individual members will be in safe keeping. All will agree with me, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) will discharge the duties appertaining to his office with favour to none and without fear of any, and they will agree, too, that he will be in every respect, as the office implies, the First Commoner of the land. Therefore, Dr. Bourinot, it is with great pleasure that I move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright:

That the Hon. James David Edgar, Esq., member representing the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Ontario, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of raising any question with regard to the nomination which has just so ably been placed before the House by the hon. the leader of the Government. I have no doubt that the duties of the high office of Speaker of the House of Commons will be discharged with great ability and with great impartiality by the hon. gentleman who has just been named. But I desire to express my regret, and the regret of gentlemen on this side of the House, that it has been found necessary to depart from the time-honoured precedent of having the Speaker alternately French and English. I think I am quite safe in saying that it has been, if not the uniform, the all but uniform practice of this House, that the Speaker during one Parliament should be of one nationality, and the Speaker of the succeeding Parliament of another nationality. As I said before, while taking no exception to the high qualifications of the gentleman who has been named for the position of Speaker, I wish to express my regret that it has been found at all necessary to depart from the precedent which has so long been the practice of this House.

The motion being put to the House,

The Clerk of the House (Dr. Bourinot) declared the motion carried in the affirmative, nemine contradicente; and James David Edgar, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of West Ontario, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Mr. Edgar was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. SPEAKER ELECT. I beg to tender to this House my sincere and hearty thanks for the high honour they have conferred upon me by electing me as their Speaker. It will be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to endeavour to deserve that high honour by dealing with all questions which come before me in my official character, with firmness and with impartiality. I am fully sensible of my unfitness for the position, but I rely confidently upon the co-operation of hon. members on both sides of the House to assist me in maintaining our rules and regulations, in vindicating our rights and privileges, and in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate, according to ancient usages.

The Serjeant-at-Arms (Col. Smith) then placed the Mace on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th August, 1896.

The SPEAKER Elect having taken the Chair,

PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER,—

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Honourable James David Edgar, Speaker Elect, said:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their de-

bates, access to Your Excellency's person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from Your Excellency the most favourable consideration.

The Honourable the Speaker of the Senate then said :

MR. SPEAKER,—

I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor General to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the House of Commons to Her Majesty's person and Government, and not doubting that their proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temper and prudence, he grants, and upon all occasions will recognize and allow their constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you, that the Commons shall have access to His Excellency upon all seasonable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

Then His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to open Parliament by a Speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER said : I have the honour to state that the House having attended on His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, I informed His Excellency that the choice of Speaker had fallen upon me, and, in your names and on your behalf, I made the usual claim for your privileges, which His Excellency was pleased to confirm.

FIRST READING.

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

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The necessity of making provision for the public service has compelled me to summon you together at this somewhat inconvenient season.

It is impossible to lay before you, at this session, the public accounts for the past year ; or, indeed, any of the reports usually submitted to Parliament.

Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that you will be required to re-assemble early in the ensuing year, it does not appear expedient to invite your attention to any measures beyond the passage of the supplies.

The operation of the tariff will be made the subject of careful inquiry during the recess, with a view to the preparation of such a measure as may, without doing injustice to any interest, materially lighten the burdens of the people.

Immediate steps will be taken to effect a settlement of the Manitoba school question, and I have every confidence that, when Parliament next assembles, this important controversy will have been adjusted satisfactorily.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The Estimates for the current year will be laid before you forthwith.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I hope that when you will have given the necessary attention to the consideration of the year's supplies, I may be able to relieve you from the duty of further attendance at this session of Parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr Laurier). I beg to move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright :

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General, to both Houses of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, be taken into consideration to-morrow,

or on any other day that may suit the hon. gentleman opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would just say, in reference to that, that I do not think any time will be lost by the adoption of Monday instead of to-morrow, as the hon. gentleman who is leading the Government is aware that a number of gentlemen who are likely to take part in the discussion of the Address will not, probably, be here till Monday. If that would be equally convenient, I would be glad that Monday should be adopted. While on my feet, I desire to ask the hon. leader of the Government to be good enough to obtain His Excellency's permission to lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence which took place in connection with the resignation of the late Government. It would be very desirable, I think, to have before the House that correspondence when the Address is considered, as it would enable us to deal with the question of the change of administration at the same time.

The PRIME MINISTER. With regard to the first demand of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, that is to say, that the Address should be taken into consideration on Monday, I certainly have no objection. I would not like to break the present harmony which has existed so far, and which I hope will continue to the end of the present

session ; and it is therefore with great pleasure that I accede to the demand of my right hon. friend. With regard to the correspondence which has taken place attending the resignation of office by the late Administration, the hon. gentleman is aware that I cannot give him the answer at this moment, but I will do so to-morrow.

Motion, that the Speech from the Throne be taken into consideration on Monday, agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a Special Committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House this day, and that Mr. Laurier, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Davies do compose the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House the Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament up to date.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Debates Committee was composed last Parliament of 15 members, 9 representing the Government and 6 the Opposition. The members whom I suggest now are Messrs. Beausoleil, Charlton, Somerville, Scriver, who were members of the committee last year, and Messrs. Haley, Monet, Richardson, Ellis and Choquette. On the Government side last Parliament were Messrs. La-Rivière, Taylor, Earle, Davin and Craig. This leaves a sixth one to be appointed to represent the Opposition, and I leave the choice to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he has taken into consideration the fact that the numbers 9 and 6, composing the committee last year, were no doubt arranged in view of the relative proportions of the two sides of the House, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the fact that the Opposition is now represented by a larger element than it was when those numbers on the committee were arranged.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have thought of all that, and the difference seems to me so minute that it is not proper to make a change. If the hon. member has a sixth member to suggest, I shall be happy to add his name.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest the name of Mr. Bergeron.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time ; to be composed of Messrs. Beausoleil, Bergeron, Charlton, Choquette, Craig, Davin, Earle, Ellis, Haley, La-Rivière, Monet, Richardson, Scriver, Somerville and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the motion to adjourn is adopted, I take the opportunity of asking the hon. the leader of the Government whether the statement contained in a leading journal, that negotiations were now pending and likely to result favourably with regard to the question of the Manitoba schools, is well founded. The hon. gentleman is quite aware of the great anxiety which is felt on both sides of the House—I think I may say by every member of the House—to have this unhappy question brought to a satisfactory conclusion at as early a period as possible. It will be a great source of relief to the House to learn that this statement contained in a leading journal is well founded, and that negotiations are now pending and likely soon to result in a satisfactory arrangement.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have great pleasure in informing the hon. gentleman that, at my invitation, Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General of Manitoba, came down to Ottawa with the view of entering into negotiations for a settlement of that important question. Further than this I am not at liberty to say at this moment.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to questions to be put by members and notices of motion, it would be perhaps as well, at the beginning of the Parliament, to have a clear understanding of the rule, I think it is 25, which provides that when questions or motions are not brought forward in their order, they shall be dropped, unless, under the usage which has grown up, they are allowed to stand at the request of the Government. It is not a part of the rule, but it is a usage or understanding, which of course will be observed unless the House decides to the contrary. But I wish to indicate to the hon. members, a large number of whom are new, that when questions are called and not put, and when notices of motion are called and not moved, for any reason, they disappear from the Order paper unless they are allowed to stand at the request of the Government.

GRAIN STANDARDS FOR MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to make any changes in the rules regulating the selection of grain standards for Manitoba and the North-west during the present year ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is not the intention to make any changes as to the selection of grain standards, which will require any amendment to the Inspection Act. The department is considering several minor features which the Act permits to be dealt with departmentally ; but I am unable at present to state positively that any changes will be made this year.

THE METRIC SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt the metric system of weights and measures in lieu of the system now in force in Canada ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is not the intention of the Government to adopt the metric system of weights and measures. It is practically optional now under the 35th section of the 104th Chapter of the Revised Statutes.

THE RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before calling the next order, I would like to state, what will no doubt be interesting to all the members of the House, particularly the new members, that I have made inquiry as to the time when the printed rules of the House will be ready for distribution among the members, and I find that they will be ready on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT—THE CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House do adjourn, and I beg to state to the hon. gentleman opposite, with regard to the correspondence he asked for yesterday, which took place between the late Prime Minister and His Excellency on the occasion of the resignation of the Ministry, that we have the assent of His Excellency to bring down this correspondence, and it will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as the Address is passed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the statement which the hon. leader of the Government has just made, that I think it would be very desirable to have that correspondence, which His Excellency the Governor General has consented to being laid before the House, on the Table of the House previous to the Address being passed. There is no reason that I can possibly imagine why it should not precede the passage of the Address, and the hon. gentleman will see at once that as it may raise a grave constitutional question, it is very desirable that the House should have an opportunity of discussing that matter in connection with the Address. I think I am correct in the impression which I have at this moment that it is usual for ministerial explanations, or explanations on the part of those in the Government in regard to the formation of a new Government, or explanations of gentlemen who have held positions in an administration, to be at the very earliest possible moment submitted to Parliament. The House is entitled to know, and the country is entitled to know, at as early a moment as possible, the circumstances that have attended the resignation of one Government and the formation of another. I do hope, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will kindly reconsider that matter, and, having obtained the consent of His Excellency the Governor General to lay the correspondence upon the Table of the House, will be good enough to lay it on the Table before the consideration of the Address in answer to the Speech.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say to the hon. gentleman that for my part I have serious doubts as to the constitutionality of

the procedure which he suggests—that this correspondence should be brought down so as to form part of the debate on the Address. It is quite possible that the correspondence which took place between the hon. gentleman and His Excellency at the time he mentions may be made the subject of a debate ; but if it is to be debated at all, my impression is, in the constitutional view as well as in point of propriety, that it would be better that this correspondence should be the subject of a debate by itself, and should not be mixed up with the matter of the Address. For my part, I think the only constitutional method is to debate on the Address the issues raised in the Speech from the Throne. As to the explanations resulting from any change of government, I am not aware that any explanations are due from the fact that a new government has been formed, consequent upon an appeal to the people and the result of a general election. If, however, the hon. gentleman is of opinion that he has any point of debate to raise on that subject, I think it can be raised and debated later on. If my memory serves me, and I appeal also to the hon. gentleman's memory, no such change of government or administration has ever been made the subject of discussion in the debate on the Address, but has always been the subject of debate by itself ; and on the whole, I think we had better adhere to the plan I have suggested. The papers will be laid on the Table as soon as the Address is adopted ; and if there be any controversial matter in them, I shall be happy to give the hon. gentleman every opportunity for debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that if there were any grave constitutional reasons why the course I have suggested should not be pursued. I would be quite prepared to bow to them ; but at the same time I may say that the Speech from the Throne raises questions which materially affect the very point at issue. The resignation of the late Government and the correspondence attending that resignation, with His Excellency the Governor General, have a direct and most important bearing on the Speech which His Excellency has delivered. Under those circumstances, I hope that my hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so——

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope that my hon. friend will carefully reconsider that question, with the view, if possible, of meeting what I think will greatly facilitate the progress of the work of the session, and dispose, in the debate on the Address, of questions that are very important and are incidental to the Speech from the Throne. I will not, at this moment, press the hon. leader of the Government further than to ask him to give that his most careful consideration, because I feel that the House will be placed at a very great disadvantage if we have not that correspondence laid on the Table and in the hands of hon. members on both sides when considering the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Is this, Mr. Speaker, on a motion to adjourn ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn is before the Chair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the motion to adjourn——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course I am in the hands of the House, and no doubt the courtesy I am asking will be readily extended. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House if his attention has been called to the fact that under the Audit Act it is necessary, I believe, to lay upon the Table of the House copies of all special warrants which have been granted by the Governor General, and that this is the last day upon which the Government or the Auditor General is required to have them laid on the Table. If the hon. gentleman's attention has not been called to that point, I hope that on Monday he will be good enough to lay on the Table copies of all the special warrants and the expenditure thereunder as required by the Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. My impression is, at this moment, that the delay is four days. At all events, it does not matter, and they will be laid on the Table on Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion before the Chair is that the House do now adjourn.

RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the House adjourns, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the leader of the Government to an alleged interview with him which is reported in the "Globe." I shall read the report, and if necessary follow it with a written motion. It is from the correspondent of a Chicago paper called the "Record." The "Record" correspondent says :

When I told Mr. Laurier that the victory of the Liberal party in Canada and his appointment as Premier were considered good cause for congratulation in the United States, as they offered hope for more friendly relations between the two countries, he smiled and said : "I appreciate the kindly feeling of your people most sincerely, and I am sure their confidence has not been misplaced. The Liberal Government, which has just taken office, desires and intends to signalize its administration by a renewal of neighbourly relations with our friends across the border. As you have suggested, the relations between Canada and the United States have not been as cordial for some time past as I hope they will in the future. Providence has placed us in the position of neighbours, and we should strive to live side by side on terms of mutual friendship and respect.

"Some years ago, when considerable friction

had been created by the North Atlantic fishery troubles, I took an opportunity to say that the question should be adjusted in a friendly manner, becoming an enlightened and friendly people, by the simple process of give and take, and I do not see now why an arrangement should not be made resembling that effected under the treaty of Washington in 1871, and the treaty of 1854, whereby not only the ports but the inshore waters of both countries were thrown open to the fishermen of both on equal terms, and the markets for the fish of the two countries made equally free. That, it seems to me, would be the sensible way of settling the fishery question. The North Atlantic fisheries would be more valuable to the United States and Canada alike if some such arrangement were adopted."

The Canal Question.

"Then," continued Mr. Laurier, in reply to a question, "as to the canal question, the American mercantile fleet upon the upper lakes now numbers many large steamers. There are twenty vessels of four thousand tons, and I hear that your shipyards are turning out vessels of even six thousand tons. The day of small steamers like that of the wooden sailing ship has passed. Between Buffalo and Duluth there is a channel deep enough to accommodate vessels of twenty feet draught. We in Canada are aiming to make a channel of the same depth from Lake Erie through the Welland Canal and the canals below Kingston to Montreal, but the task is a formidable one, owing to the immense expense involved.

"Up to date, we have spent $60,000,000 on our canals, the major portion on the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, which is a large sum for 5,000,000 of people, and especially when it is considered that we have also contributed very liberally for railroads. It goes without saying that very great benefits would be conferred upon the farmers of the western and north-west states, no less, of course, than upon the farmers of the Canadian North-west, if these great steamers could load at Port Arthur and Duluth, and carry produce without breaking bulk, as they have to do now at the Welland and again at Prescott, right through to Ogdensburg, Kingston, Oswego, Montreal or Quebec, and carry back merchandise and manufactures for the western settlers, at cheap rates.

"Farm produce is low the world over owing to the immense production which modern science—the self binder, the railroad and the compound marine engine—has rendered possible and, so far as I can see, it is not likely to reach its former price for some time, if ever.

"You cannot, if I may be allowed to say so, help the farmer on this continent by any quack device. You can do it only by cheapening the cost of producing the stuff and by reducing the expense of getting it to the European market. A twenty-one foot channel from Lake Superior and Lake Michigan to the Atlantic Ocean would reduce the cost of what the farmer has to buy from the eastern states, and give him lower transportation rates for what he has to sell. I suppose, too, that a reduced rate on the lakes and the St. Lawrence water route would oblige the railroads north, that is in Canada, and south, that is in the States, to meet it with an equally lower rate, and from the seaboard during the season of navigation, so that the farmer far inland from the route would experience equally the good effects.

"Commissioners have been appointed by the governments of the two countries to consider the question of a deep waterway system, and I am in hopes that a perfectly feasible scheme will shortly be reported—a scheme that will enable the United States to participate in the work and exercise control without in any way compromising the sovereignty of Canada over her own territory. It should be a purely business arrangement with nothing political about it.

Closer Trade Relations.

"As to closer trade relations, the Liberals have always been in favour of freer trade with the United States, and I am prepared to make an arrangement with your country for the free exchange of such natural products and such manufactured articles as may be mutually agreed upon. This question, together with those of deep waterways and fisheries and the coasting trade of the lakes should, it appears to me, be all taken up together and dealt with in a broad, serious and comprehensive spirit on one anvil.

"I observe that the bonding privilege has recently been discussed in the United States congress. Let that question be taken up along with the rest. The alien labour law of the United States, which has created a good deal of unpleasantness, should be included. In short, let us have a thorough understanding and better relations all round. Canadians of every political stripe watch with profound satisfaction the growth of feelings of good-will and affection between England and the United States, and the Liberal party of Canada will do what it can—all it possibly can within its sphere—to aid in getting rid of old prejudices and bringing together the two sections of the Anglo-Saxon family for their own good and for the good of mankind."

I would ask the hon. gentleman if that interview is at all correct, and, if so, to what extent?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is rather inquisitive. He asks me to speak off-hand as to the correctness of an interview of two or three columns which I have not read for some time. However, I can assure him that it is substantially correct.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NOTICES OF MOTION POSTPONED.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved that notices of motion be deferred until after the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of this session.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—INTERNAL ECONOMY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Honourable Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce ; the Honourable Louis Henry Davies, Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, and the Honourable Joseph Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

Government House,
Ottawa, 24th August, 1896.

CAPTAIN McGREGOR, OF THE "BAYFIELD."

Mr. CAMERON asked,

1. Is the Government aware that Capt. A. M. McGregor, of the survey boat "Bayfield" has been an active political canvasser and partisan on behalf of Conservative candidates in the West Riding of the County of Huron for the last fifteen years ? 2. Is the Government aware that at last general election the said Capt. McGregor abandoned said survey boat on Lake Erie and went to Goderich, in West Huron, to vote for the Conservative candidate ? 3. Was the absence of said McGregor from his said duty with the knowledge, consent or authority of the Government on the occasion aforesaid ? 4. Was any application made by him to the department or any of its officials for leave of absence on the occasion aforesaid ? 5. If such application was made and leave granted, by whom was the leave granted, and for what cause ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has had no official knowledge that Captain McGregor has been an active political canvasser, &c., for the past fifteen years, but complaints have lately been made to the department charging Captain McGregor with being an active and offensive political partisan and these complaints will be investigated. 2. The department is aware that Captain McGregor was absent from his vessel and it is presumed for the purpose of voting. 3. Yes ; I am so informed by the officials of the department. 4 and 5. There is no record of any application having been received for leave, but the officer in charge of the survey was instructed to grant leave to any officer or member of the crew of the "Bayfield" if he wished to avail himself of the privilege of voting.

Mr. LAURIER.

CAPTAIN DUNN, OF THE "PETREL."

Mr. CAMERON asked,

1. Is it within the knowledge of the Government or any of the departments thereof, that Captain Dunn, of the Government cruiser "Petrel," on service on Lake Erie a few days before the 23rd June, 1896, took said cruiser from said service to Owen Sound and conveyed voters from the various ports on the east coast of Lake Huron to Owen Sound to vote for the Conservative candidate at last general election ? 2. Was the use of such cruiser for such a purpose with the knowledge, consent or authority of the department, or had said Captain Dunn authority to so use said cruiser ? 3. Had the said Captain Dunn leave of absence from the department to go from Lake Erie to Owen Sound to vote at said election, or for any other purpose at that time ? 4. Is the same Captain Dunn appointed by the present Government, with one McNeil, to investigate the complaints of the Wikwemikong Indians ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The department is aware that Captain Dunn took the cruiser "Petrel" into Lake Huron on the 20th June, 1896, and was in Owen Sound on the 23rd of that month, but is not aware that any person was taken on board for the purpose of being conveyed to Owen Sound to vote or otherwise. 2. There is no record in the department of any such knowledge, consent or authority. 3. Captain Dunn had instructions to go into Lake Huron for the purpose of patrolling these waters. He was not limited to any particular point, as the whole of such waters are within his jurisdiction as a fishery officer. There is no record of any directions having been given about voting or interfering in any way with elections. 4. The Department of Indian Affairs requested this department to allow Captain Dunn to proceed to Manitoulin Island, and jointly with Mr. McNeill of that department, investigate complaints of the Wikwemikong Indians, of alleged unjust fishery prosecutions. Captain Dunn being a fishery officer, no special appointment is necessary.

FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CAMERON asked,

Is it the intention of the Government, during the present session of Parliament, to introduce a Bill to repeal the present Franchise Act or to otherwise deal with that Act ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation during the present session, their intention being that, in so far as practicable, the session should be short and expeditious. Should, however, the session be protracted beyond the expected length, the Government may then think it advisable to introduce a Bill to repeal the present Franchise Act.

FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked,

1. What is the amount of the lowest tender for a fast steamship service between Canada and England ?
2. From whom was the tender received ?
3. Do the Government intend to award the contract to the parties who have made the said tender, and when ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Two tenders have been received, one from the Messrs. Allan, and the other from Mr. Jas. Huddart. Neither of these tenders is in accordance with the specifications, and the Government proposes to make further investigations before taking final action in the matter.

PROPOSED BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a bridge in front of Quebec, or in the vicinity, to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to aid in the construction thereof by a subsidy or otherwise ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is not the intention of the Government to build a bridge in front of Quebec, or in the vicinity, to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government have no application before them for aid in the construction thereof.

NORTH-WEST EXHIBITION—OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether the Government intends to place a sum in the Estimates to pay the outstanding indebtedness in connection with the North-west Exhibition held at Regina in 1895 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The matter is under consideration.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. KAULBACH asked,

Is it the intention of the Government during the present session in view of the increased numbers of fishermen, and for further encouragement of the industry, to increase the amount of bounty for distribution ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The vote granted annually by Parliament to encourage the development of the sea fisheries and the building of fishing vessels, being a statutory one, it is not the intention of the Government during the present session to introduce any legislation on the subject.

CORN AND CORNMEAL.

Mr. KAULBACH asked,

As Indian corn is not grown in Canada in quantities sufficient to satisfy Canada's demand for consumption, is it the intention of the Government during the present session to place the article on the free list, free of customs duty, so as to enable cornmeal to be manufactured in Canada ? Or is it the intention of the Government to admit cornmeal free ?

The FINANCE MINISTER (Mr. Fielding). It is not the intention of the Government to propose any legislation during the present session amending the tariff.

CONTROLLERS OF INLAND REVENUE AND CUSTOMS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

1. Are the Controllers of Inland Revenue and Customs, or either of them, members of the Cabinet ?
2. Was any assurance given either of these hon. gentlemen on behalf of the Government, on taking of office, respecting his position in the Government, and if yes, what was it ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). 1. The Controllers of Inland Revenue and Customs under the existing law are not and cannot be members of the Cabinet. 2. It is the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to amend and remodel the existing law concerning the Department of Trade and Commerce, so as to restore the heads of the Inland Revenue and Customs Departments to the rank of Cabinet Ministers, and the fact has been so publicly stated by the Prime Minister.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman overlooked the second branch of the question. Was any assurance given to either of those hon. gentlemen on behalf of the Government, on taking office, respecting their positions in the Government ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think I have stated that in my answer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman contends his answer covers both paragraphs ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH IN WINDSOR HALL.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

Is the following a substantially accurate report of a part of the hon. the First Minister's speech delivered in Windsor Hall, 22nd January, 1895 :—

"I have read in the 'Gazette' the statement that if you remove protection, raw material would no longer be free. I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff raw material would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day un-

der the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank Heaven they have not thought of taxing it. Cotton is free also, but is iron free? Cotton is a raw material, and wool is a raw material for certain manufactures, but there are two articles which are raw material of every manufacturer, and these articles are coal and iron, and are they free? If you have a revenue tariff the object will be to develop the country, and all raw material should be free under such a tariff."

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I must tell my hon. friend that notwithstanding every desire I have to oblige him, I am afraid I shall not be able to gratify his rather fastidious curiosity. I am forced to make the painful admission that my memory, which I had the weakness of supposing pretty good, is not equal to the task of remembering, word for word, a speech delivered more than eighteen months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. That must have been a moment of weakness.

THE TRENT CANAL.

Mr. HUGHES asked,

Has the contract for that section of the Trent Canal from Lake Simcoe to the point where the first section of the Balsam Lake to Lake Simcoe division meets the Talbot River, been let, in accordance with the advertisements calling for tenders for the same?

2. If not, why not?

3. Is it the intention of the Government meantime to abandon the enterprise?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. No; the contract has not been let. 2. Because the receiving of tenders has been postponed. 3. No such decision has been reached, but the matter of entering into new contracts is under consideration.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. INGRAM asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act, and if so, when?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have already answered that question.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if he will be good enough to lay on the Table of the House, without a formal motion, the Orders in Council under the authority of which these Governor General's Warrants were issued a return of which has just been brought down; and also the report of the Minister of Justice upon the application for the Governor General's Warrants. I do not think it is necessary to make a formal motion; that is a courtesy which will be readily accorded.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I shall be very glad to place on the Table any documents of the nature referred to by the hon. gentleman, at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Would he be good enough to have the ten days' statement laid on the Table of the House, commencing the first of the month.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

THE CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government whether he has considered the urgent appeal which I made to have the correspondence between the Governor General and myself, as the leader of the late Government at the time of its resignation, laid upon the Table of the House, in order that it may be under our observation in connection with the debate on the Address.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have, Mr. Speaker, and I have seen no reason to depart from the decision which I intimated to the hon. gentleman the other day. My intention is to have this correspondence laid upon the Table of the House immediately after the passage of the Address, and to have it printed, so that it can be in the hands of all the members of the House before it comes up for discussion.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. McINNES. Before proceeding to discuss the matters which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, I wish to acknowledge the compliment which is paid by the Government to British Columbia upon this occasion, in selecting a representative from that province to take part in the preliminary proceedings of this Parliament. This is the first occasion upon which this honour has been done to my province; and although it is a mere honour, and as such is of little practical importance, yet, Sir, I hope I am justified in regarding the circumstance as evidence that at last we have a Government in power in this country that recognizes the importance of, and is prepared to pursue a policy of generous treatment towards that great far west. Unfortunately, the Government which has controlled the affairs of this country in the past, has not given that considerate treatment to the west which its importance and its probable future entitled it to. With respect to their general trade policy, it militated against the development of the west; it handicapped those who were engaged in

those enterprises which were calculated to develop the resources of the west, as it compelled those persons either to pay enormous import taxes to the Dominion Government, or to pay large tribute to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The result was that it produced a condition of stagnation in the development of those resources in that province, which has continued throughout a number of years. And although during the last year or two, this inactivity has been burst through in one or two directions, yet that is entirely due to the irrepressible energy and perseverance of the pioneer prospectors of that country, and not to any kindly conditions which were imposed on it by the late Government. Of course, I recognize, and I freely admit, that there was a time in the history of the Conservative party when they did pursue a progressive policy towards the west; but, unfortunately, the working out of that policy even at that time was marked by a number of serious mistakes and instances of crude legislation which tended to keep back the progress of the country. But years have elapsed since the Conservative party pursued that policy. Latterly, as I have said, they have forgotten altogether the former tendency of their policy towards that part of the country. They have failed to appreciate altogether the magnificent resources and possibilities of that section of the Dominion; they have treated our demands and even our interests with indifference, and, in so far as they have shown us any special treatment, it has been characterized by such ignorance of local conditions there as to have very materially lessened the intended benefits. I have just said, with respect to the working of the trade policy, that it worked out disadvantageously to that part of the Dominion; but also with respect to less important matters which required special treatment, the late Government have also shown a tendency to treat us unjustly.

Let me state an instance. We have, for the last five years, contributed to the Dominion treasury on an average about $2,000,000 per annum. The largest amount we have received back in any one year, to cover all public expenditures in the direction of all special appropriations for public works, has amounted to only $1,200,000. The result has been a direct annual drain on that province for the last five years, of something like three-quarters of a million dollars. That circumstance, taken in connection with another circumstance which is equally known, that the people of British Columbia contribute three times as much per capita in federal taxation as the people of any other province, makes the injustice shown towards our province complete, and no wonder, in view of facts like these, and the additional fact that we require special treatment on account of the almost insuperable difficulties with which we have to contend, we no longer see the solid six supporting a Conservative Government. Sir, there has been a change of sentiment out there. That change has been based on good, solid and substantial reasons, and we are here to-day as members from that province no longer supporting that party, because the electors in British Columbia have no longer faith in that party. We are here demanding fair-play; we ask for greater justice and more considerate treatment, and if we receive these, no doubt in return we will show the people of the east an expansion of trade, a development of resources, and an outburst of prosperity which will simply astound members of this House. But, in order that the House may understand, in its fullness, the wrongs that have been done to the western section of the country by the late Government, it is necessary to compare the natural conditions out there with the social conditions. Hon. members have heard, undoubtedly, of the great natural resources of British Columbia, but although they may have heard them praised to the sky, they have not heard those resources praised too highly. We have resources which make British Columbia the most favoured spot on this continent, if not in the world, as regards natural wealth. We have our timber limits, mighty forests practically without limit, of fir, cedar and pine; we have our fishing industries, which can be developed to almost any extent; we have enormous deposits of coal, enough in my own district to warm and run this continent for centuries; we have deposits of copper and iron, inexhaustible; and, above all, we have, as the House is aware, the precious metals, our hills and mountains honeycombed with these minerals, and I might almost say, the beds of all our rivers are laid with gold and silver. I say all, in order to express the extent of our wealth, because there is a peculiar fact in connection with the mineral wealth of British Columbia, and it is that the precious metals are not limited to any particular section, the whole country being one great mineral region through which gold and silver are thickly distributed. Unlike other countries, Africa and Australia, we have this distribution of precious metals through the whole length and breadth of the province. To-day you are hearing something of Kootenay and Cariboo, but I can assure this House that within a year or so at the outside, hon. members will be equally familiar with the names of Alberni and Texada. The people have not heard of these regions simply because time is required to develop the mines and to place them on a dividend-paying basis, at which time they are first heard of. To show what the possibilities of the great mining industry of British Columbia are, let me say that at Rossland, the centre of the Kootenay district, whereas two years ago it boasted of but fifty inhabitants, to-day the population is nearly 5,000; that

whereas two years ago the prospectors brought out a few little bits of gold, samples to lay before investors, at the present time there are mines in operation which this year will contribute to the wealth of this country, I believe, upwards of $10,000,000. When it is considered that this is only one small section which contributes that wealth to the Dominion, with no more mines in operation than can be counted on the fingers, and when we can state it as an assured fact that there are a dozen centres of equal importance to Kootenay, which will undoubtedly spring up within the next few years, the House will begin to understand the tremendous importance this industry will assume in the near future in British Columbia. But if we are to derive full value from the gold industry in that province, I suggest as worthy of the consideration of the Government, the establishment of a mint in that province. It is a peculiar fact that all other colonies of the Empire have mints, where they produce their own currency; and although from a commercial standpoint it would undoubtedly be advantageous to British Columbia to have a mint there, yet I think there are considerations of a more national character which will commend this suggestion to the Government, and I hope they will see that it will be in the interest of that industry to establish a mint, and that there is no place more suitable for the establishment of that institution than British Columbia. There is another report going the rounds of the press just now, I observe, and that is a suggestion to establish a Department of Mines. This suggestion if carried into effect would have a tendency to stimulate gold mining and other classes of mining in British Columbia. In this connection, of course, there can be no doubt that if that department were established, British Columbia would receive Cabinet representation, as undoubtedly the portfolio of that department would almost as a right belong to that province; but whether we receive Cabinet representation in that way or not, I hope the importance of giving British Columbia representation at the Council board of this Dominion will not be overlooked. In British Columbia we regard this representation now as a matter of right. Whether you compare our population and our representation in this House with those of other provinces, or whether you regard our province and our right in this regard from the revenue producing standpoint, we are more than entitled to Cabinet representation compared to some of the other provinces. But, Sir, if you consider the influx of population which undoubtedly will pour into that province in the near future; if you consider the difference in the conditions of life in that province, as compared with the conditions of life in the east; if you consider, above all, the great future which is before that province, I think all hon. gentlemen will agree, that British Columbia should receive proper recognition from the rest of Canada. I am pleased to know that the interests of my province are being considered by the present Government, and although the late Government did make a step towards recognizing the rights of British Columbia, I am glad that the Liberal Government is preparing to give them a fairer and a fuller recognition. Sir, I spoke of the influx of population which will undoubtedly flow into the province of British Columbia. There can be no doubt about that, because there is nothing which draws population and immigration to a country like the glitter of gold. We rest assured in British Columbia that come what may we will have a large population, and because of this certainty, we are not perhaps so much interested in the question of immigration as are other parts of the Dominion; for instance Manitoba and the North-west. Different policies of immigration have been spoken of, but it seems to me, Sir, that the best immigration policy is a policy which will promote natural trade conditions. It seems to me preposterous to speak of introducing population into this country when the conditions of life are such that our population will not remain with us. When the conditions are such in this country, that we cannot even retain our native-born population, what is the necessity for spending large sums of money in endeavouring to induce people from the old country to come here. We want to make the conditions of life in Canada easy for our people, and so attractive that when immigrants come here they will remain with us. Our country is a grand country, capable of maintaining in prosperity millions of people. Good wine needs no push, and, Sir, if the present Government—as I have no doubt they will—if they establish trade conditions over this country which will promote prosperity, there will be no trouble about the immigration question. Might I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a phase of the immigration question which particularly concerns my own province. This particular class of immigration to which I refer affects British Columbia more than it does any province in the Dominion. I speak of the immigration of Chinese. I shall not weary the House with any extensive references to this question to-day, because it will undoubtedly be brought before your attention in a more particular manner before the session closes. However, at the present time, I wish to take this early opportunity of expressing my confidence that this Parliament will recognize that the importation of hordes of Chinese coolies such as are coming to British Columbia at the present time, is detrimental to the best interests of that province, and, Sir, I hope on an early occasion to show that if you regard this matter from a national standpoint as well as provincial, it will be

found that it is highly desirable that restriction should be placed on Chinese immigration.

Now, Sir, I started out to show what were the natural conditions in the west and in British Columbia particularly. I wish to show, that the conditions which exist in that province to-day are a crowning proof of the inadequacy of the policy of the late Government. We have enormous natural wealth in that province, but while that is true, it is unfortunately equally true that we have no great measure of prosperity. There are evidences of want and of poverty in the midst of all this abundance and plenty, and it seems to me, that there must be some clear reason why these two conditions should exist side by side. I do not know why there should be poverty in British Columbia unless it be that the Government which has controlled the affairs of this country in the past, has removed the natural advantages of the country from the grasp and control of the great majority of the people. What is true with respect to British Columbia is true also of the North-west Territories and Manitoba. There are in those parts of our Dominion immense opportunities for people to take up homes, and live a happy and prosperous life. They have rich and fertile prairies enormous in their extent and wonderful for their fertility of soil. But Sir, as you know, Manitoba and the North-west Territories are not populated. You can travel for hours through that country without seeing the hut of a settler, and the whole of that vast domain is almost as virgin as it was when the buffalo roamed on the plains. It was in connection with this portion of Canada that a certain gentleman who stands very high in political circles in Canada, made wonderful prophecies which earned for him the name of the great stretcher. But, Sir, so far as any prophecy he has indulged in with respect to the North-west and Manitoba is concerned, that prophecy does not entitle him to any such distinction. If the existing condition of things in that country is ridiculously different from what he prophesied, it does not prove that he was a great stretcher. It, however, proves what is more important, and that is, that the policy which he and his colleagues sought to inflict upon this country was utterly inadequate for the development of Canada, and what applies in that regard to our western country is in a sense true of the whole Dominion. Ours is undoubtedly a rich country, rich in natural resources, rich in the fertility of its soil and rich in its mines. Our people are energetic, economical and persevering, and let me ask why it is, that in view of all this, poverty and depression exists? Why have some of our people to make such a desperate struggle to gain a miserable existence? Sir, I think there can be but one reason and only one reason, and that is, that while the opportunities of this country are great, and while our natural advantages are enormous, it has been rendered possible for these advantages to be cornered by a favoured few. While it is said by some that a Government cannot cause depression or prosperity, I consider, Sir, that in so far as the late Government has fostered a system of monopolies in this country, which turned from the grasp of the people the blessings which nature conferred upon them, they are responsible very largely for the depression which has existed in Canada for the last few years. Sir, some of us—and some of the hon. gentlemen possibly on the other side of the House, may have doubted a short time ago that there was any depression in this country; but since we have won our seats we can no longer think that, for I do not suppose that there is a member here who has not been deluged by applications—in many cases from men of culture, refinement and ability—for some miserable petty position. Is that not an evidence that the existing conditions of things is such that the people wish to flee from this struggle for existence?

But I was speaking of monopoly, Sir. I said that the Government had created and fostered monopolies in this country; and the placing of all the opportunities for wealth in this country in the hands of these few monopolists is the reason why prosperity has not been very general among our people. Just look at that for a moment. You will see that every condition to the gaining of an existence in this country is characterized by monopoly. Our whole land system—without entering into a discussion of Henry Georgeism—is based on the principle of monopoly. We will not discuss that matter; but the late Government aggravated the prevailing condition of affairs by giving enormous grants of land to people to hold at their own sweet pleasure. For instance, in giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that magnificent heritage in the North-west Territories, they have done an enormous injury not only to the present but to future generations. I say, then, that the land, as a condition of existence, is monopolized. Look at the different branches of trade, and you will find the same condition of affairs. The National Policy undoubtedly fostered monopolies which could not have existed but for the enormous protection granted them. Look at the means of conveyance in this country, and you will find them also in the hands of monopolists. So I say that every condition to an existence—land, trade, means of conveyance—is monopolized, and it is for that reason, I say again, that the opportunities afforded by this country have not been enjoyed by the people as they should have been.

These monopolists have run this country so long that, like all people who rule a country for a considerable length of time, they have become impressed with the idea that it was their natural right to rule. They became so strong and powerful in the country that they not only controlled its com-

merce, but actually controlled the Government which in the first instance created them, and the Government, entrenched behind such a powerful influence, also became possessed with the idea, like the old kings, that they had a divine right to rule. But, fortunately for this country, they discovered on the 23rd of last June that whatever may have been their right to rule, they had no right to ruin ; and even after the people had pronounced against the Government, after they had expressed their want of confidence in them, those gentlemen clung to office and gave an exhibition of lust for power which, whether constitutional or not, was certainly most indecent.

But in all these matters, as you know, the people finally rule ; the rights of the people are finally triumphant, and it was not surprising that the hon. leader of the Opposition, like a certain other Charles, who history tells us, was very fond of official abuse and dictatorial methods, had to bow his head to an indignant and outraged public. On the 23rd of June last the people of this country most unmistakably declared their discontent and dissatisfaction at the condition of the country, and expressed a desire for a change. Sir, that change has come about ; and it seems to me that the people on that occasion commissioned the new Government to inaugurate a new administration of affairs in this country—to tear down those monopolies which were in possession of rights belonging to the people, and to broaden out the opportunities for wealth, so that there would be brought about an era of more general prosperity throughout the country. That, Sir, I take it, is the work of the Liberal Government to-day. For what is liberalism if it is not relentless opposition to all class privileges—if it is not the spirit that declares every man to have an equal right to common opportunities at the hand of the state ? That is the liberalism wanted in Canada to-day. That is the liberalism which makes a democracy possible, and which alone can make a democracy great. We want more of that kind of liberalism, that justice to humanity, which was celebrated by the young Scottish ploughman when he sang :

"A man's a man for a' that."

It is pleasing, therefore, to find in the Speech from the Throne an assurance that this new Administration realizes the importance of recognizing the interests and rights of the great mass of the people. With respect to the tariff, they give us an assurance that so far as it operates at present as a burden on the people, they are prepared materially to lighten that burden. It is pleasing and reassuring to see that they realize the existing condition of affairs ; because, while we on this side of the House are not socialists, while we do not wear red shirts nor carry daggers, yet we do see that the conditions of society at the present day are becoming strained, and relief must be given to those who are suffering from an enforced condition of poverty in our country, and if this relief is not forthcoming from these legislative halls, it will be enacted in the streets.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McINNES. Hon. gentlemen laugh ; but, Sir, it appears to me that those who laugh most at that statement fail most to recognize the existing condition of affairs ; for justice is crying out for a redress of the grievances which are felt in every city and home in this country, and that cry can no longer be withstood or ignored.

There is another assurance in the Speech from the Throne with respect to the trade question, and that is, that a searching inquiry will be made into the question. That shows that the Government, while intending to do justice to one section of the community, have not the slightest intention of doing injustice to any other section of the community. This announcement in the Speech from the Throne must be reassuring to the business people of Canada ; but, Sir, while it is true that the business people of the country have every right to receive consideration, and while their rights and interests are in a sense vested and must be respected, I hope the fact will not be lost sight of that there are other rights and interests in this country which are just as vested, but which have not been respected in the past. There are other rights just as strongly based upon the principle of justice as any rights that can be bought for a few dollars. These rights, commonly called vested, are merely speculative rights, and I hold that they have not the same importance and are not entitled to the same regard as those rights of a higher nature to which I have just alluded. So much for the tariff. I think that the assurance in the Speech from the Throne that justice will be done to all parties can be taken in the spirit in which it is meant. Justice will be done to all parties ; but I hope that the Government, when dealing with a revision of the tariff, will see that so far as the tariff affords any protection at all, that protection will be afforded to those who most need protection.

The Speech from the Throne then deals with the Manitoba school question and gives the assurance that before next session this question will in all probability be settled. That must come as a great relief to all classes in the community. Sir, it is gratifying to notice that the present Administration are pursuing the same policy which they so earnestly advocated while in opposition ; and when giving the assurance that they are likely to succeed in settling this matter, it was scarcely necessary for them to breathe into that Speech from the Throne the spirit of conciliation, because conciliation is the only method by which questions of this kind can be settled. The Speech from the Throne does not declare along

what lines this settlement will proceed. We do not know what terms of settlement will be arrived at, but I think we may take for granted that the settlement, when finally reached, will be in accord with the liberal principle of provincial rights. I think we may take for granted that it will be in harmony with progressive modern thought, and will in no way violate the principle of self-government. It must have been a matter of regret to all parties that this question was ever introduced into Dominion politics, and it is a matter of greater regret that it should have been introduced for the express purpose of furthering party ends, for I take it there can now be very little doubt that the late Government did introduce this question into Dominion politics as the very last hope of their retaining power. They knew, as well as the people throughout the country knew, that they had forfeited the support and respect and confidence of the country; they knew that the corruption and iniquities which marked their administration had alienated from them the confidence of the people; they knew there was a general dissatisfaction throughout the country consequent upon the failure of the National Policy. They knew those things, and as a last hope they sought to stir up religious and racial strife, thinking that by this means their iniquities and shortcomings would be lost sight of and that they would secure the support of one of the contending elements. Sir, they did not hesitate to set creed against creed, race against race, province against province. They did not hesitate to create a fermentation which practically led the people of this country to the verge of civil war.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McINNES. Hon. gentlemen smile, but I think I am within the mark in making that statement. They brought the different elements into a position of the greatest antagonism—it would be impossible to imagine greater antagonism without open violence—and they did this, altogether for party ends; and these are the men who for years have been deluging this country with political clap-trap about patriotism and loyalty and the unity of Canada. Sir, they would not hesitate to disrupt this whole confederation if they could thereby gratify their inordinate greed for power. If you have any doubts about that, consider the situation to-day. The fight has been fought, the principle of coercion has been contended for. It was contended for by one hon. gentleman who was prepared, you will remember, to lay down his life for it. But now that the fight has been fought, what do we find? Where is the principle of coercion to-day which these hon. gentlemen were contending for? They have discarded it, they have thrust it to the winds, and I am constrained to ask whether the hon. leader of the Opposition has thought better of his life, since the new Government came into power, or whether he has thought less of that principle. But worse than that, to show what opportunists, what mere opportunists, we have to contend against, you need but go to North Grey to-day. What is the cry there? Sir, after the late Government had used every effort to gain the support of the province of Quebec, after it had done everything and was prepared to do everything to flatter their religious or racial instincts, after having failed in their efforts to compel the people of that province, by the most ungodly use of godly influences, to support them, what do we find? We find that rather with the hearts of a foiled seducer than with the spirit of a great party, they now turn upon that province and malign the character and nobleness of that province which they could neither win nor conquer. We find that up in North Grey to-day they are howling about French domination, forgetting altogether that they were the party who tried hardest to secure that French support in this House. Having failed to do this, they now raise the cry that this country is being subjected to French domination.

Sir, they have failed to hit the mark altogether. They have lost their power, and a sort of insanity appears to have seized them similar to that which possesses a she-bear who has lost her cubs. But even that does not explain their condition, for although we cannot expect them to see things in a normal way, yet in casting around for the reason for their loss of power, they ought to be able to see that the reason they are not on this side of the House is not because the French Canadian people of Quebec have turned against them, but because they have forfeited the confidence and respect of the young element of the electors of this country. It was not the French in Quebec nor the Orange nor the Protestant or English vote in Ontario or anywhere else that returned this Government to power. It was the young element in Quebec and Ontario and throughout the whole country. Have you ever, Sir, considered the fact that of those who cast the first vote on the 23rd of June last, thousands of them had attained the age of 29 before they could exercise their franchise? As you know, five years elapsed between the last general election and the election before that. The election before that was made on lists which were three years old, which meant that the man who had attained his majority in 1888, the day after the lists were made up, had no right to exercise his franchise until the 23rd of June last. Thus tens of thousands of young electors, between the ages of 22 and 29, cast their first vote on the 23rd of June last. That is the element which placed in power this new Government. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that 80 per cent of the young electorate of this country are believers in the principles of Liberalism, and have been attracted to the Liberal party, by the justice of its cause,

the clean records of its leaders, and their lofty and national sentiments. And I can assure this Government that as long as they possess these principles, as long as they endeavour to work them out in a definite programme of progress and prosperity, they will have the support of the young men of this country and will retain the respect and confidence of that ever recruiting class.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the confidence in the Government which is prevalent throughout this country. On this side of the House we are proud to regard the present Government as the best that has ever held power in Canada. Whether this be true or not, whether this be a right estimate or not, I do not know; but, Sir, one thing is certain—that this Government is composed of the ablest and purest and most honourable men that can be brought together in Canada to-day. It is because I believe our honoured leader and the distinguished gentlemen whom he has associated with him in the Government will do what is right and fair by all classes and sections of this community; because I believe, Sir, they also appreciate the importance, the national importance of developing that greater Canada beyond the lakes, and that greater west beyond the Rockies; because I have every confidence that they will strive to make broad the foundations of our national life and to build up in this Canada of ours a democracy greater and truer than any the world knows, that I am pleased to move this Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, in accepting the task of seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I did not disguise from myself how ungrateful is the task and onerous the burden involved.

More accustomed to another atmosphere, I do not, I hasten to avow, feel quite at ease in this Chamber, where the rules of debate circumscribe one, denying to eloquence itself the right to move the heart, appealing only to logic and reason. However, Mr. Speaker, if, as has been said, "noblesse oblige," youth also compels; and as in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver, I have the great honour to be more especially the spokesman of the deputation from the province of Quebec, I submit, therefore, with good grace to the arduous task which has been imposed upon me; at the same time claiming your indulgence.

Your election, Sir, as First Commoner of this House has been greeted with pleasure by the old French province of Quebec, where you were born, where you obtained your education, where you have learned our language and studied our literature, and of which you have made yourself the generous defender during the course of your political career. It is a most agreeable duty for me to offer you, on behalf of my colleagues, this testimony of our sympathy.

The important events which have taken place in the country during over a year of political agitation, the henceforth historic date of the 23rd of June, and the notable changes which have been brought about in the constitution of this House, are cause that at this moment, from one end of Canada to the other, from the seacoast of Gaspé to the far-famed Eldorados of British Columbia, general attention is rivetted upon us.

However, if we except the Supplies which this House will be called upon to vote for Her Majesty's Government, the work of this session should be of short duration and will necessarily be of little importance.

The advanced period of the year, the short interval of time which separates the two Parliaments, the haste with which it was necessary to prepare and revise the Estimates, are so many obstacles which have prevented the new Administration from bringing forward, during this session, those measures of public policy upon which we had counted. The Speech from the Throne, however, gives us an insight into important reforms, the accomplishment of which will be hailed with pleasure by the whole country.

No change will be made in the tariff, for the present at least. This announcement, while reassuring to those who have their capital invested in the various industries with which our young country is dotted, need not alarm the agricultural community, whose shoulders have until now been so heavily burdened by such heavy taxes and who, during the last general elections, have so emphatically declared in favour of a change of regime, that is to say, for tariff reform. The Ministers will put themselves in touch with all classes of the population, and their work will consist mainly in removing the shocking inequalities foisted upon our fiscal system by twenty years of extreme protection. The Government, Mr. Speaker, does not aim at revolution, but at peaceful reform and at the reconciliation of conflicting interests, without any disturbance or violent crisis: such is their ideal. This scheme of tariff reform, I am aware, will meet with systematic opposition from those interested. The selfish interests fostered by the present system, the men who had cherished the hope of living a quiet life here below, have an instinctive abhorrence of any change; but they should remember the old Latin adage "Vita in motu" (there is life in motion). Like all who have abused their power, they should be prepared to submit philosophically to the alterations brought about by the exercise of the electoral suffrage.

In this work of tariff revision, the Government will, I have no doubt, have a due regard for public opinion. They will proceed gradually, without too much precipitation, so as to relieve, with care and discernment

the farmer, the artisan and the fisherman from the grasp of certain industries.

The Speech from the Throne also deals with the Manitoba schools question. The settlement of this vexed question, which has given rise to such stormy debates, was no further advanced at the dissolution of Parliament, three months ago, than it was six years since. For motives which I do not see fit to scrutinize or qualify, the Conservative party has done nothing but procrastinate, postpone and dilly-dally with this question every time it was brought before the House during the last Parliament. It was only at the last hour, after a ministerial crisis, unprecedented in parliamentary annals, when all delays had expired, that a Bill full of imperfections and more remarkable for what it left out than for what it contained, was proposed. The School Bill had been dignified with an imposing title, but in reality it contained two radical vices which rendered it unacceptable to one side as to the other. This Bill guaranteed nothing substantial to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and at the same time antagonized by its violent provisions those whose help and good-will were so necessary for the allaying of a dangerous agitation. The position then taken by the distinguished chief of the Liberal party was the most rational and the most equitable. Let us not forget that we live in a country composed of diverse elements, enjoying equal rights. The races which inhabit it have the same interests and are entitled to the same share of liberty, to the same right to bask in the sunshine of liberty. But if conflicts arise between them, conciliation and tolerance should be resorted to, above everything else, to dissipate prejudice, hatred and passion. It was this wise and prudent policy which was endorsed at the polls by the electorate. Despite the manifestly unfair fight carried on and the unjust attacks made upon it, the Liberal party, we feel confident, will settle this Manitoba school question, a few months hence, without disturbance or shock, so as to satisfy all parties interested. The alliance, formed at the opening of the electoral campaign, and which offers a striking analogy to that between Lafontaine and Baldwin, is already an assured pledge of success. The noble veteran of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat, has been for the last quarter of a century, the champion of liberty in educational matters, and his name alone is a talisman. As to the eminent gentleman whom we are so happy to see in the position of Prime Minister, his past career is a sufficient guarantee of the tact which he will display in the settlement of so irritating a question on the lines of justice and equity. In this work of pacification, the Government ask the active co-operation of all those who believe in the future of Canada. My task, Mr. Speaker, is now accomplished, but before resuming my seat, I believe I will but be echoing the opinion of the large majority of the electors of this country in expressing my sincere satisfaction at the signal triumph achieved by the Liberal party at the last elections. After twenty years of ostracism, of bitter combats, of repeated defeats, the Liberal party resumes the helm of affairs with a revival of youth, of vigour and of energy. With leaders of integrity, a scrupulous economy in the administration of public affairs, a firm and vigorous adhesion to the path of reform and progress, with respect for the constitution, with fidelity to its promises and attachment to its traditions, the people expect much from the Liberal party. Like the signal placed on the mast which protects the ships from the rocks and shoals, the Liberal party is also bound to guide and protect with jealous care the country whose destinies have been entrusted to it. At the beginning of this century, in the first Canadian Parliament, when an intriguing and ambitious party diverted the public funds from their proper destination and smothered the popular liberties, the Liberal party was ever to the fore and energetically insisted upon respect for rights and franchises trampled under foot. Out of this memorable fight were born our public liberties and responsible government. By a curious return of human events, at the dawn of the new era, which will be called the 20th century, the Canadian people, instructed by past events and moved by a sentiment of gratitude, confide anew their destinies to their defenders of old. But, Sir, despite the verdict so freely and so spontaneously given by the electorate on June 23rd last, a discordant note continues to be raised. A group of public men and journalists whom I would not confound with what was once the great Conservative party, exert themselves to raise the cry of French domination, because, for the first time since confederation, the Prime Minister is of French origin. It is true, and I am glad to avow it, the old French province of Quebec, the mother of the confederated provinces, hailed with pride and joy the day when the hon. Premier was called by His Excellency the Governor General to take the reins of Government. But to whom do we owe this honour, if not to the English Liberal party, who, in 1889, without considering the race and the religion of Mr. Blake's young lieutenant, have given him the command, relying upon his proverbial integrity, on his political genius and on his grand eloquence? The province of Quebec is, no doubt, legitimately delighted at the result of the elections, but, Sir, more than any other, you can testify that she has no desire to dominate. Her dream, as I said, is not to dominate but to meet in friendly rivalry with the English provinces upon a ground where the foot is sure, where the hand is free and where the heart will feel neither weakness nor shame; and that ground is Canada, our common country. And let me repeat

here the language used by the Prime Minister before his electors at St. Rochs : "We are French Canadians, but our country is not confined to the territory shadowed by the citadel of Quebec. Our country ! it is all that which is covered by the British flag on the American continent, the fertile lands which border the Bay of Fundy, the valley of the St. Lawrence, the region of the great lakes, the prairies of the west, the Rocky Mountains and the lands bathed by that celebrated ocean where the breezes are as gentle as those of the Mediterranean."

The future of this country depends to a large extent on the sentiments which its several nationalities entertain towards each other, on the spirit of tolerance or intolerance of which they will give proof. As already said, Sir, and it cannot too often be repeated, English and French are called upon to play in America the glorious role France and England have played on the other side of the ocean. To us belongs the noble mission of continuing on the virgin soil of the New World the immortal work achieved by those two proud nations on the historic soil of Europe. Our fellow-citizens of English origin have brought with them from the banks of the Thames that practical spirit, that sense of business and that commercial genius which have placed them undisputably at the head of commerce, of finance and of industry. They have above all brought with them that art of governing men, which they possess to such a high degree, and which their ancestors have undoubtedly borrowed from the Romans.

We, of French origin, have preserved that precious deposit which was bequeathed to us by France, when

Notre vieux drapeau, trempé de pleurs amers,
Ferma son aile blanche et repassa les mers.

We shall never lose that taste for the fine arts and belles-lettres, that harmonious style, that pure and sonorous language, that fine flower of exquisite urbanity, in a word, that thirst for the ideal which is the necessary complement of the Celtic character. If we are generous enough to establish a fair compensation between our faults and our reciprocal qualities, we will give to the world the spectacle of a people endowed with a special type and physiogonomy, a jealous guardian of rich national traditions, and remarkable for its intellectual culture. Union and concord ought to preside over all the phases of our political existence, if the idea of our country is to be our object, the desideratum of each of us. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do better than quote with passing emphasis the words which Daniel Webster addressed to his fellow-citizens and which at the present moment are replete with interest :

In a day of peace let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered. Let us cultivate a true spirit of union and harmony. Let our conceptions be enlarged to the circle of our duties. Let us extend our ideas over the whole of the vast field in which we are called to act. Let our object be our country, our whole country and nothing but our country. And by the blessing of God may that country itself become a vast monument not of domination and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration for ever.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to know the pleasure of the House as to taking the Address en bloc, or paragraph by paragraph ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the first paragraph.

On paragraph 1,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, it now becomes my duty to tender my congratulations to the hon. mover and seconder of the Address which has just been listened to with so much attention by the House. I cannot help feeling, however, that so far as the hon. memebr for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) is concerned, that duty, very vigorously discharged, was discharged rather in an aggressive form, and I cannot therefore, quite tender the same hearty congratulations to the hon. gentleman that I would otherwise have it in my power very gladly to do. I noticed, however, a little inconsistency in two portions of the hon. gentleman's speech. In the first place he expressed great gratification at the fact that, for the first time, the Government of Canada had honoured the province of British Columbia with due consideration—referring to the invitation which the hon. gentleman had received to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Before the hon. gentleman finished, however, he made a very earnest and very impassioned—and, of course, a very unselfish—appeal to the Government to do for their supporters from the province of British Columbia what the previous Government had done. I was inclined to believe that the hon. gentleman considered the compliment paid him in asking him to move this Address was much greater than that of having conferred a seat in the Cabinet and a portfolio upon a member from his province. I do not intend, however, to traverse the speech made by the hon. gentleman further than to say this : he referred to the change of sentiment that had caused the province of British Columbia to send a majority of supporters of the present Government. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman represents in his own person that change. But for the presence of the hon. gentleman in this House the Government would have no majority in British Columbia, so that it is the hon. gentleman's presence that consti-

tutes that change. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman did not owe his seat in this House to any change in popular sentiment in British Columbia as between the political parties, but to the unfortunate circumstance that the Government of which I had the honour to be the head was represented in the election contest by two supporters, two gentlemen who offered themselves as Conservatives with the hon. gentleman against them; with the result that the hon. member for Vancouver sits here having polled a minority of 450 votes. So far as British Columbia is concerned, it appears that the Government do not owe their majority in this House to any change of sentiment in the province of British Columbia, but to the unfortunate circumstance that we had too many candidates in the field, that two strong supporters of the Government of which I had the honour to be the head competed on that occasion for a seat in this House, and thus enabled the hon. gentleman to sit here, representing, as he does, a minority of 450 of the votes polled.

Now, Sir, I may say with reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), that I listened to them with great attention, and with deep regret that I was not able to follow more carefully the expression of his sentiments in the beautiful language in which they were conveyed. But I may say that I was a little surprised to learn from that hon. gentleman that the farmers and the fishermen had high hopes of deriving great benefit from the recent change of Government. I was under the impression that the late Government, and the Liberal-Conservative party for the last eighteen years, had done a great deal to promote the interests of the fishermen and of the farmers of Canada; and I was under the impression that there was no portion of this Dominion in which the advantage resulting from the efforts of a Conservative Government had been more marked than in the province of Quebec. I may be wrong, but I believe that in connection with the efforts made by the late Government, and by the very able man who was placed at the head of the dairy department, great services were rendered to the farmers of Canada, and in a very marked degree to the farmers of the province of Quebec. I may also remind the hon. gentleman that the Conservative Government even exposed themselves to the charge by hon. gentlemen then sitting on this side of the House, of becoming dairymen, and in fact of lowering the dignity of a government, by the efforts they made to develop the various industries in which the farming population were so deeply interested. Now, Sir, it may also be within the memory of the House that on a certain occasion a treaty was submitted to this House by the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, the Washington Treaty of 1871; and the House will recollect that under that treaty an award was made in favour of the Government of Canada, by which Canada obtained some five millions and a half, a million of which went to Newfoundland. It will be remembered that that treaty made by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald as one of Her Majesty's High Commissioners at Washington, was most strenuously opposed in this House by the Liberal party. Hon. gentlemen opposite then sitting on this side of the House gave the most vehement opposition to that treaty, which, however, was carried to a successful completion, and under which the sum of $4,500,000 was received from the award of the Commission at Halifax, as representing the increased value of our fisheries over those of the United States of America. It will be remembered that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government was to treat that money as the property of the fishermen, and the interest which it represented, which has increased recently from $150,000 to $160,000 a year, has been annually distributed among the fishermen as an earnest and an indication of the deep interest that the Liberal-Conservative Government and party took in that very important and interesting class of people.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to say more upon that subject at this moment; but while tendering my personal congratulations to my hon. friend who has attained the high position of First Minister of the Crown in Canada, I desire to express my deep regret at the mode in which that object was attained. I say my deep regret, because, Sir, no person would be more proud, no person would be more pleased than myself, to see a gentleman of the nationality of my hon. friend occupying that distinguished position. But so far as my knowledge goes, I believe it is the first time in the history of parliamentary government in which any gentleman has attained the triumph which that hon. gentleman has attained, without having succeeded in obtaining a majority upon any of the great issues upon which the two parties went to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find that statement creates a little amusement on that side of the House, but perhaps, I may be permitted to point out the reasons and the grounds upon which I make the statement that that hon. gentleman did not succeed in obtaining a majority on any of the great issues that were submitted by the two parties when we went to the country. The hon. gentleman is aware that in 1878 a very sharp issue was created between the two great parties in this country. The Government of which the hon. the First Minister was then a member, and of which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was the Finance Minister, were pressed very urgently by the Opposition of

that day, during the latter portion of the period that they governed this country, to make a substantial change in the tariff of the country; and the issue was placed broadly and squarely before the people of Canada as to whether the free trade policy to which those hon. gentlemen had pledged themselves, and to which they determined to stand, or the protection of Canadian industries to which the Opposition were committed, should be the policy of Canada. The hon. gentleman knows that the result on that issue was not doubtful, and he knows that on the accession to power of the Government of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, measures were promptly taken to carry into effect the policy which had been ratified by the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman knows very well that when the tariff was brought down by the late lamented Sir Leonard Tilley, who crystallized the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party into an act of Parliament, the hon. gentlemen opposite said that at all events we had carried out our pledges to the country; they admitted that there had been no faltering in carrying out the policy on which we went to the country, in the Act which we submitted. Now, the hon. gentleman is also aware that in 1882 that same issue was submitted to the people of Canada. For years the hon. gentlemen forming Her Majesty's Opposition in this House stood by their guns, and the battle was fought over that question in the election of 1882, and with a like result. A large majority was found to confirm the verdict of 1878, which had been given in such decisive tones, and it remained the policy of Canada. There was another issue, that of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but as that has ceased now to be an issue, I do not propose to refer to it. Then in 1887 the same issue was taken between the two parties in this country, those still standing by the principles of free trade, and those still maintaining the policy which the country had adopted in the protection of Canadian industries, and with a like result. Again the people of Canada declared themselves in a very clear and unequivocal manner in favour of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and Government in protecting Canadian industries. In 1891, after these three defeats, hon. gentlemen opposite finding that it did not seem to be exactly a successful policy on which to go to the country, constructed a new policy, and that was a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. It was a rather long jump certainly from the policy of free trade to the adoption of the highest tariff that perhaps existed in any part of the world; but at all events, without going into that question, for I do not wish unduly to occupy the time of the House, the issue joined in 1891 was on the question as to whether we should continue the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government and party of fostering and protecting Canadian industries, or whether we should adopt a policy of continental free trade, of having one tariff between the United States of America and Canada. The hon. gentleman is aware that the policy of the Opposition, the new policy of unrestricted reciprocity, met with a like defeat, and the policy of affording efficient protection to Canadian industries was still maintained by the electors of Canada.

In order to reach the point at which I am aiming, that of showing the issue which was submitted to the country at the recent election, I shall be obliged to read to the House a few brief extracts that will place in a clear and unmistakable manner before the House the policy upon which hon. gentlemen opposite stood when they went to the country on the last occasion. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, as I have stated before, was the financial head of the Mackenzie Administration and who has always been recognized in this House as the great financial authority and exponent of the fiscal policy of the Liberal party, stated the policy of the Liberal party as appears at page 714 of the "Hansard" of 1893. I do not intend to go through the voluminous extracts I could give from various speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite and the strong terms in which that policy was placed before the country, but I simply desire to place on record a very few extracts in order that there should be a very clear understanding as to what the issue was on the recent occasion. The hon. gentleman said:

> The hon. gentleman desires to know our policy. I will tell hon. gentlemen what has been our policy from first to last. Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous protective system, which has been grinding out the vitals of the people of this country. I do not care in what particular way the reptile is destroyed. I do not care whether it is cut off by the head or the tail, or in the middle. I do not care whether it is by free trade, positive or absolute, or by revenue tariff, or by continental free trade.

Then at a later date, in 1894, as will be seen by reference to page 336 of "Hansard" of that year, the hon. member for South Oxford used the following language:—

> These hon. gentlemen challenge us—these consistent mortals who are shocked at our inconsistency demand our policy, and in especial they demand mine. Sir, they shall have it. I announced it years ago; my policy from first to last, ever since this infamous system was put on the statute-book, has been to do away with protection—how, I did not care.

Well, Sir, I think that will place satisfactorily on record the views and sentiments of the financial authority of the Liberal party in this House.

I come now to the views expressed by another high authority on that side of the House, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). I may say that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity was not exactly a

success and that the party finding that it did not appear to be the road to power, felt it necessary that that policy should receive its quietus, and the funeral obsequies were performed by the hon. member for Queen's, who went down to Middleton, in the county of Annapolis, N.S., in 1893, for that purpose. In a speech delivered there the hon. gentleman said :

Well, gentlemen, I need say no more. Whatever doubts or difficulties there may have been about understanding our trade policy in times past, there is none now. Our platform is clear and definite. * * * To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be one between free trade and protection. * * * The policy of the Liberal party, on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection.

There can be nothing more clear and definite than the frank statement which the hon. gentleman made as to the policy of the great party to which he belonged. Then at Sussex, N.B., on January 4, 1896, a very recent date, that hon. gentleman, who is the leader of the party in the maritime provinces and a very able leader, gave expression to the following sentiments :—

A 17 or 20 per cent tariff was high enough to give encouragement to any manufacturer; if it were not, the manufacturers should go down.

No intelligent elector could obtain from that statement any opinion except that it was the determination of the Liberal party, if they came into power, to give a tariff of 17 per cent or at the outside 20 per cent, and if manufacturers could not live under it they must die. In 1891 the leader of the Government in May of that year, as will be seen by reference to page 27 of "Hansard," still clung with a good deal of longing, notwithstanding the defeat of the party at the polls, to unrestricted reciprocity, and he used the following language :—

While they commit the mistake of basing their trade policy, uniformity of allegiance and a mere sentiment, we of the Liberal party maintain that the policy of this country must be based not upon sentiment but upon business principles ; and, fresh as we come from the people, I say that the only policy which will benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade. Sir Charles Tupper says in an article published a few days ago in the "North American Review," that the delusion, as he calls it, of unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried. Dead and buried ! I am as good an authority on the subject as is Sir Charles Tupper, and I say that it is more alive than ever.

Well, the hon. gentleman changed his opinion upon that subject at a later period, and he found that the statement which I have ventured to make, that unrestricted reciprocity was dead and buried, proved to be true. And if any doubt remained, the funeral obsequies of that ill-fated bantling, performed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) for ever set at rest the question as to what the fate of unrestricted reciprocity had ever been. The hon. the First Minister, however, revised his view in reference to that, and he returned to his first love free trade. He said not very long ago :

The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines, such as exists in Great Britain ; and upon that platform, exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party will fight its next battle.

That was a tolerably conclusive statement as to what the views of the First Minister were as to the issue between the two great parties at the recent election. Then, as late as the 22nd of January, 1896, the hon. the First Minister said :

I have read in the "Gazette" the statement that if you remove protection, raw material would no longer be free. I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw material would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free ; thank heaven they have not thought of taxing it. Cotton is free, also, but is iron free ? Cotton is a raw material, and wool is a raw material for certain manufactures, but there are two articles which are raw material of every manufacturer, and these articles are coal and iron, and are they free ? If you have a revenue tariff, the object will be to develop the country, and all raw material should be free under such a tariff.

No statement could be clearer, no statement could be stronger than that as to the determination of the hon. gentlemen—and this, mark you, is down to a comparatively short period before the battle was fought—that the duty on coal and iron should be removed. Again, at Sohmer Park, on the 18th February, 1896, the hon. gentleman said :

They have a tax on iron, which is a raw material of every industry. The tax on iron is $4 a ton, and at the present price of iron, that means a tax of 63 per cent ad valorem. The tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry is 60 cents a ton. Although I have not the latest quotations of coal, I am sure that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. There is a tax on coal oil of six cents a gallon, which, considering the price of coal oil in the United States, is equivalent to a tax of 100 per cent, to which must be added the tax of 40 cents on the barrels containing the oil. Can the industries which are thus taxed for the raw materials they use produce advantageously ? You have piano factories in Montreal ; the duties on imported pianos is 25 per cent. Can the piano manufacturer support foreign competition when he is taxed to the extent of 40, 60 and 100 per cent on the raw materials that he uses, and only gets a protection of 25 per cent on his manufactured products ? The same is true of your wagon factories ; it is true of the mass of industries. Protection is a fine thing only for a few monopolies. It mars the growth of all our great national industries. Now, I have been asked, what are you going to do do? I have just told you what we are going to do. We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely all the duties on raw materials.

Now, Sir, as stated by the highest authorities in the great party opposite, that is the issue upon which the two parties went to the country. We have never changed. From 1878 we have consistently maintained the vital importance to Canada of protecting Canadian industries, and we believe that the policy ratified on four different occasions by the electors of the country in an emphatic manner, was ratified because under that policy the country had prospered, as it had failed to prosper under the contrary policy of free trade pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. I say, Sir, that on that issue we went to the country. Free trade versus protection, as stated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), a revenue tariff and the freeing of raw material, such as coal and iron from the duties on them, as stated by the First Minister. Well, some rather curious things have occurred, and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will himself say to-day that he has obtained his majority from the electors of this country on that great issue clearly and succinctly stated and put before the people of Canada. Some facts to which I will draw attention, I think, warrant me in the conclusion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) found, as did the great leader of his party on a previous occasion. In the contest of 1887, the Hon. Edward Blake, face to face with the electors of the country, made a somewhat remarkable speech, in which he practically stated, that if the Liberal party attained power, their policy would not be to disturb the great manufacturing industries of this country, and he frankly admitted that he had arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary, practically to adopt the tariff as it existed. Now, Sir, as is well known, that hon. gentleman was not supported by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in that view of the case, and when we met in Parliament, Mr. Blake shortly afterwards resigned his position as leader of his party, and subsequently ceased to be a member of Parliament. Very much the same state of things has occurred during the present contest. I believe I am warranted in saying that the hon. gentleman opposite has received no mandate from the people of this country to break down the protection that is now given to our industries, and to adopt a policy of free trade or a revenue tariff policy. At a public meeting held at Westmount on the 19th of May, 1896, as reported in the Montreal "Witness":

> Mr. Madore impressed upon his hearers that he was utterly in accordance with Mr. Laurier's policy. He was with him in tariff reform and also in his policy with regard to the reform in the general administration of public affairs, also on the question of Manitoba schools. * * * Speaking of the reform of the tariff, of which he was decidedly in favour, he said it did not mean a radical change, but it was purely and simply a legislation on a better scale with regard to the duties on different goods. The tariff reform had been a necessity for more than one year. It would be beneficial to every one, including manufacturers, and would not injure them as the Conservative party makes it appear. It would lessen the taxes and it could be called a kind of protection.

Well, Sir, that, I think was climbing very vigorously on to our platform, and adopting the issue upon which we were standing, and forsaking the issue upon which hon. gentlemen opposite said they would go to the country. The "Star" of the same date gives this report of the same speech:

> The speaker was in accord with his leader on the tariff question. The Liberal party was not seeking to make any radical change in the tariff, but simply wished for a readjustment of the duties on a more equitable basis—a tariff which would assist the manufacturers, and, at the same time would not press too heavily on the consumer.

That does not exactly square with the views expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That desire to assist the manufacturers does not exactly square with the policy of removing every vestige of protection, to which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), had committed himself. But I may remark that the hon. First Minister, who was present when Mr. Madore made this speech at Westmount, stated in the course of his address:

> The issues now before the electors had been well defined by Mr. Madore.

So that this view of making no radical change in the tariff, but rather improving the condition of affairs in the country, was heartily endorsed by the hon. First Minister, who was there to ask the electors to accept the policy stated by Mr. Madore as the policy of the Liberal party.

Then, Sir, in Maisonneuve, the hon. First Minister supported Alderman Préfontaine. At that time Alderman Préfontaine delivered his views in the presence of the First Minister, who endorsed his candidature and asked the people to elect him. This is what Alderman Préfontaine said:

> He (the speaker) was not a free trader, neither was the party; but he wished it understood that he was in favour of protection for the national industries. By protection he meant protection for all classes, not only for the manufacturing interests.

Now, Sir, I think have said enough—it is not necessary that I should detain the House longer—in regard to the point I have made, and that is, that on the great issue submitted to the electors of Canada on the 23rd of June, the hon. gentleman has received no mandate from the people, considering the extent to which he had qualified the views in regard to free trade and protection uttered on previous occasions by the two hon. gentlemen who sit now on his right and on his left.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a speech at St. John's, Quebec, which does not materially differ from that delivered by His Excellency ; and in that speech he said :

We do not intend to introduce any important legislation. The consideration of tariff changes will be adjourned until the session of January or February, and from now until that time my colleague, Mr. Fielding, will interview the different business men in the country, and will prepare a tariff which will be of a nature to satisfy all established industries, and to lighten the burden of taxation.

Protection is not at present to be torn up root and branch ; the industries which have grown up under the policy of the last 18 years are not to be ruthlessly destroyed ; but the hon. Minister of Finance is to interview the business men of the country and ascertain what tariff can be adopted that will, as Mr. Madore has said, improve the condition of the manufacturers rather than destroy their industries. I do not intend to pursue that matter further than to say that, regarding as I do the absolute necessity of maintaining protection to the industries of Canada in order to insure the progress and prosperity of the country, far from expressing any regret at the changed views and sentiments of the hon. First Minister, which undoubtedly represent the policy of the party, I congratulate the hon. gentleman most heartily and most warmly upon the enlightened views which he has at last been able to adopt, and upon the safety and security which the industries of this country will enjoy in consequence of that change. But I maintain, as I said before, that on that issue the hon. gentleman has not gone to the country ; and I do not hesitate to say that if he had gone to the country upon that issue as it had been presented down to a recent period, and as it was indicated by the speeches of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., and the hon. member for South Oxford—had he gone to the country upon that issue, unconnected with that unfortunate question which was interposed, and which produced such a striking and marked effect upon the result of the recent election, the hon. gentleman, instead of sitting where he now sits, would be sitting here. In my judgment, it is impossible to see this change of base in the presence of the electors of Canada without arriving at the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite, whatever they may think of the wisdom or the unwisdom of the policy of protection, know that it is deeply seated in the minds and feelings of the great body of the electors of this country ; and their opposition to that policy would have secured their defeat just as it had done on the four previous occasions when it was submitted to the country.

But, Sir, there was another question, and one of very great importance, which was submitted as an issue in the election, and I will briefly draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to that question. That was the question of remedial legislation. The House is perfectly well aware that the Government of my predecessor, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, had adopted the policy of remedial legislation. They had adopted the policy of accepting the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Queen's Privy Council as throwing upon them the duty of introducing into this Parliament the means of restoring the privileges that had been taken away by the Act of 1890 from the French Catholic minority in Manitoba. Hon. gentlemen are perfectly well aware that when I was invited to become the leader of the party in the House of Commons, I placed before the House that question as one of the very gravest possible importance ; and believing, as I did, that it involved very grave and important consequences, and that the duty was undoubtedly thrown upon the Government of the day of sustaining the position taken by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, I did not hesitate to stake the life of the Government upon that policy. I need not detain the House further than to say that when the Bill was introduced for the purpose of giving effect to that policy, the hon. First Minister moved the six months' hoist, and took his stand—as firmly, as distinctly and as unequivocally as any hon. gentleman ever took a position, in my judgment—upon the unwisdom of interfering with the autonomy of the province of Manitoba. He took the position of maintaining that, as the majority of the people of Manitoba and of the representatives of Manitoba had taken away those privileges, they must not be restored by an Act of this Parliament, but that conciliation must be used, and in fact the majority must be induced to modify their views in such a way as to restore the privileges of which the minority had been deprived. That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman here and was also that taken by him in the province of Ontario, as I shall show the House. On the 12th June, 1896, the "Globe" newspaper reports the hon. First Minister as having said :

He (Mr. Laurier) desired to secure the sentiment, not of his own people of Quebec but of the English-speaking people of Ontario. (Cheers). He was there to say not that he would give either a small or large amount of relief to the minority, but that, assisted by his friend, Sir Oliver Mowat, he would settle the question, not by appeal to any class, but by appeal to the sense of justice which was implanted in every one by the Creator. He was a Roman Catholic, and a French Canadian, and therefore might have strong sympathy for the minority. But as he himself would not be coerced by anybody, so he would not consent to force coercion upon anybody.

Can any language be clearer or stronger than this emphatic declaration by the First Minister that he would not resort to an Act of Parliament of the Dominion to override the majority of the legislature of Manitoba.

The cry raised throughout the country was "hands off Manitoba" and "no coercion." It was denied that this Parliament had the right to pass an Act which would override the deliberate policy of the Manitoba legislature. I do not intend to go into any argument in relation to that question. I am not dealing with the subject with that object, but in order to show on what issue we went before the country. That was the issue clearly and emphatically put. The Government of which I had the honour to be the head, declared in a public manifesto, issued by myself, that a cardinal plank in their platform was the restoration of the privileges which had been taken away from the Catholic minority of Manitoba and they appealed to the country for support on that issue. As the hon. gentleman knows, there was no more clearly defined issue ever put before any country than that which was put openly by the Government of which I had the honour to be the head. The late Government believed that it was the bounden duty under the circumstances, of the Government of Canada to respect the judicial decision of the Queen's Privy Council. They believed it had become their duty, under that decision, to pass an Act which, so far as we were able to do it, would restore the privileges of which the minority had been deprived. The hon. gentleman joined issue with the Government on that question. He declared that there should be no coercion and that whatever was accomplished must be done by persuading the majority to undo what they had done. At Chatham, the hon. gentleman said emphatically:

> Mr. Laurier dealt fully with the school question. It was, he declared, a provincial question.

There is a sharp issue joined. We held that it was a provincial question down to the time when the legislature of Manitoba invaded the rights of the minority, but that it then ceased to be purely a provincial question, and the duty devolved upon this Parliament to redress the wrongs which had been inflicted. The hon. gentleman, however, said it was essentially a provincial question.

> But because, at Ottawa, there was a Government which had not the courage to do right, it was dragged into the federal arena.

That could only mean one thing, namely, that the Government of Canada had failed in its duty to this country in not vetoing the Act of 1890. The hon. gentleman will see at once that if that be the case, it only renders the duty still more imperative of remedying the wrong. Until at Ottawa there were men prepared to show the courage to do right, the school question would never be settled. That is a good deal like the Delphic oracle, it will admit of half a dozen constructions.

> It was the privilege——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

This is the point to which I wish to ask the hon. gentleman's attention.

> It was the privilege of the minority to agitate and agitate until the majority were convinced.

There is no suggestion that in case the majority failed to do justice to the minority, Parliament would intervene. There is no suggestion that it was the duty of Parliament and in the power of Parliament to restore the privileges which had been taken away from the minority.

I will refer to another leading member of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, a gentleman whom I am glad to see occupying the position of Secretary of State at this moment, the Hon. Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott in a public speech, delivered here in the city of Ottawa, and reported in the Montreal "Star" of 29th May, 1896, said:

> If that question could be laid aside for two or three years it would settle itself, and people would see and do what was fair, but they could not allow questions of race and creed to arise. Mr. Laurier's was the only possible solution of the question. Manitoba was returning members pledged against remedial legislation, so that claims that a Bill should be passed next session was a fraud. It required delicate handling, gentleness, conciliation and fair reasoning, not coercion and talks of standing on rights. The minority would realize that anything could only be granted by the good-will of the majority.

This is the point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House.

> The minority would realize that anything only could be granted by the good-will of the majority.

There is the position to which Mr. Scott committed himself before the electorate of Ontario in the most emphatic manner in his declaration that nothing should be done, that there was no means by which this question could be settled, and he spoke as with authority from the hon. First Minister, whose opinions he endorsed. The hon. First Minister, who is quoted by Mr. Scott, was committed, so far as his colleague could commit him. The fact of Mr. Scott having been taken into the Government is, to a certain extent, an endorsement of the declarations which that hon. gentleman made, that there should be no coercion, that there should be no action by this Parliament to override the legislature of Manitoba.

I think I have made clear the issue between the hon. gentleman and the Government of the day on this question, taking the hon. gentleman's position as he put it throughout the province of Ontario during the recent election. But I now come to a rather curious part of this question, and that is that while the hon. gentleman obtained his support—not a majority I am happy to say—while he obtained the support which he did receive in the province of Ontario on the distinct pledge and declaration that he would never interfere, by any Act of this Parliament, but that only means of

conciliation should be used, yet when he found himself face to face with his own constituents in the province of Quebec, he propounded a new and entirely different doctrine from that on which the issue had been fairly and squarely joined on the floor of this Parliament and before this country. And I will call the attention of this House for a few moments to the speech that the hon. gentleman made to his own constituents at St. Rochs. I am reading from a translation of an article that appeared in "Le Soir" which, I understand is an organ of very high authority with the hon. gentleman. The translation, which is a strictly literal one, of what was published in "Le Soir" of May 12, 1896, gives the statement the hon. gentleman made at St. Rochs:

If the people of Canada put me in power, as I am convinced they will, I will settle that question to the satisfaction of all interested parties. I will have with me Sir Oliver Mowat, who, with his popularity at stake, has always been, in Ontario, the champion of the Catholic minority and of separate schools. I will place him at the head of a commission which will look into all interests in jeopardy, and I assure you that I will succeed in according justice to those who are now suffering. Is not the very respected name of Mowat a guarantee of the success of this scheme? And lastly,—

And I invite the hon. gentleman's attention to this emphatic statement.

—should those means of conciliation fail, I shall have recourse to constitutional means, and these I will use fully and in their entirety.

What more could be said. Says "Le Soir":

Could any one bind oneself in a more solemn and straightforward manner?

He could not. And thus we see that the hon. gentleman who made a most emphatic appeal to this House against coercion, against overriding by this Parliament the act of a majority in the province of Manitoba, who went from platform to platform in the province of Ontario maintaining the same policy of non-interference, of avoiding anything like coercion and depending upon conciliation alone in order to obtain redress of those grievances, when standing in the presence of the electors of the province of Quebec placed himself not only on the same platform as the Government he opposed, but, in gambling parlance, he went one better than the late Government, and stated not only that he would adopt the same means as they adopted, that he would fall back upon the law and constitution of the country and by Act of this Parliament give the redress that Manitoba, if it proved obdurate, would not give—but that he would do it in its entirety. It is known very well that one of the charges the hon. gentleman made, and one of the charges most emphatically stated by a gentleman now a member of his Cabinet was that the measure proposed by the late Government fell altogether short of what was necessary in the interests of the minority. The leader of the present Government gave his pledge that he would use the constitutional remedy in its entirety and would go far beyond what the Liberal-Conservative party had proposed in this House to do. Now, I do not hesitate to say that a majority thus obtained, by the avoidance of a sharp issue clearly defined between two great parties when before the electorate of the country, is not a majority obtained by fair or legitimate and justifiable means. And, as I have shown, the hon. gentleman having obtained almost all his support he has outside the province of Quebec upon the policy of non-interference with the legislature of Manitoba, cannot turn round and obtain the support of the province of Quebec by a declaration that he will not only do that to which he has objected on the floor of this House and on the various platforms of Ontario, but that he will go much further than has been proposed by any other party in giving that redress and by the same constitutional means. I submit, therefore, that on that question the hon. gentleman is not at the head of a majority, but of a minority. Speaking on the authority of the First Minister, Mr. Monet, his candidate in Laprairie and Napierville, according to "La Patrie," of April 20th last, pledged himself to vote for no Remedial Bill unless it gives more advantages to the minority than were accorded in the famous Remedial Bill of last session. So the hon. gentleman sought the support of Quebec on a solemn and unequivocal pledge to carry out the policy of the Government to which he was opposed, and to go further in that direction than they proposed to go. And without that change of front in the face of the enemy, or of the electorate of this country, the hon. gentleman would still be sitting on this side of the House and not where he is. Now, Sir, I will make a short quotation from a speech which the hon. gentleman ventured to make at St. John's, in the province of Quebec, since the elections—a ministerial utterance. In that I find that he reverts again to his former position:

I have declared on the floor of the House of Commons, I have declared in Ontario, I have declared in Quebec——

I venture to question the accuracy of that portion——

—that the only means by which to settle this question was not by coercion, but by conciliation.

Since the elections are over, the hon. gentleman says he has declared on the floor of the House and in Ontario—about that there is no question, and in regard to it I agree with him—that he had emphatically declared that the only means—not a means, but the only means—by which this question could be settled was by conciliation and not

by the action of this Parliament. Now, Sir, I think I have given the House sufficiently good grounds for the opinion which I have expressed—that on the two great issues between the parties in this country, the hon. gentleman is sitting here not by virtue of having had his policy maintained either on one question or the other, but that so far as the country is concerned, the hon. gentleman is in a minority. But, Sir, I must now draw the hon. gentleman's attention to a charge made by him against myself, and one which had a great deal to do with the results in the recent election—that I had endeavoured to raise a race and religious cry in this country. Sir, I stand in the presence of this House and before the people of this country ; I stand here with a record of over forty-one years of public life, and I say in a most clear and unhesitating manner that from the hour I entered public life to the present, no man has been able fairly to charge me with endeavouring to set race against race or religion against religion. On the contrary, my whole life bears testimony, every act of it, that such is not the case. I could cite proofs innumerable, if I did not fear to weary the House, to show that my great aim as a public man has been to promote the utmost harmony, the utmost confidence and the most kindly co-operation between those of different races and of different religions. I recognize fully and in the most unequivocal manner that in this country, divided as we are into two great races and differing largely on the questions of religion, it would be impossible to look forward with any hope or any confidence to the future of Canada if questions of race and questions of religion were permitted to enter into the decision of the electorate of the country. I have always set my face against it, and I shall always continue to do so. Now, Sir, on the occasion of the welcome which the hon. gentleman received in the city of Ottawa, he is reported in the Montreal "Gazette" as saying :

> You well know that when Sir Charles Tupper was appealing to the prejudices of my fellow-countrymen and co-religionists, while he was trying his best to arouse passions which we know when aroused, are uncontrollable ; when he was doing that the Liberal party in the province of Quebec never appealed to passion, and that the Liberal party obtained victory upon the same grounds in Quebec as in the province of Ontario and every part of the Dominion, Liberals we were in Ontario, in Nova Scotia and in Quebec as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I think he has forgotten the fact that I have given the House the most clear and unmistakable evidence, from the lips of the First Minister himself, that his policy as propounded in the province of Quebec on this great question, was as unlike his policy propounded in the province of Ontario and on the floor of this House, as day is unlike night. Well, Sir, I will now come to the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman charged me with having appealed to the electorate of this country to oppose him by reason of his being a Frenchman and a Catholic. I say, Sir, that I should feel myself utterly degraded if I were capable of doing either the one or the other. I will briefly give the House the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman made that charge, one of the gravest, one of the most important charges that it is possible for one public man to make against another ; and I put it to his own sense of candour and justice as to whether he has not misrepresented me in the most palpable manner. The hon. gentleman, speaking at Terrebonne, on the 13th of May last, is reported as follows :—

> Mr. Laurier next quoted from Sir Charles Tupper's speech in Winnipeg, the following : "To my Conservative friends who have turned their backs upon me, I want to make another appeal, and it is this : I want to know where is the man with any brains in his head, where is the man who has any capacity for exercising intelligent reasoning who would justify himself, or could justify himself to his countrymen, if he oppressed a feeble minority, and that for the purpose of bringing into power a Roman Catholic French Premier, who declares he will do more ? Do you think he would stultify himself ? Perhaps I hear a person say, that Mr. Laurier has done much to deter the passage of the Remedial Bill. Quite so, but I want to ask that person the reason Mr. Laurier gave for it. It was that the Bill was useless, that it was a half-hearted measure, that it was good for nothing, that it could do nothing for the Roman Catholics, and that he would have a much stronger Bill."

The First Minister then went on to say :

> I protest against the language of Sir Charles Tupper, who says to the Protestants of Manitoba, "Are you going to put at the head of the Government a French Canadian, a Catholic, for, gentlemen, if the Liberal party triumphs the Prime Minister will be a French Canadian and a Catholic." I protest against the language of Sir Charles Tupper, who speaks thus in Manitoba. He will speak on Friday in Sohmer Park, in Montreal, and he will not dare to speak like that.

Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman whether that is not a complete misrepresentation of the quotation as I read it to the House. What did I say, Sir ? I made no appeal to the electorate of Canada to reject the hon. gentleman because he was a Frenchman or a Catholic. So far from that being the case, there has not been a word in any speech I ever uttered, here or elsewhere, that will bear that construction for a single moment. The appeal I made was not to Protestants, it was to my own friends. To my own friends I said : Will you turn your back upon me, will you desert the party to which you belong for the purpose of bringing into power a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic as Prime Minister ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentlemen opposite are not very acute logicans, they fail to see my argument. I was not appealing to the electors, I was not appealing to Protestants, but I was appealing to my own friends who were proposing to desert me on the question of this Remedial Bill, and to vote against me because I was prepared to support remedial legislation in the House of Commons on this issue ; and I said : Will you not stultify yourselves if, in so doing, you strike me down, if you strike down the Government and party to which you belong, for the purpose and with the result of bringing into power a French Roman Catholic Premier who declares that he will do more ? I say I am in the judgment of the House, I am in the judgment of every man in this country who knows anything of reason or logic, when I say that no such construction can be given to my words as that they were an attack either upon the nationality or the religion of the hon. gentleman in connection with the high office which he now holds. I say that is perfectly clear and perfectly palpable, and therefore the hon. gentleman has no warrant whatever for the statement. I repel with the utmost indignation the insinuation that I could be capable of referring to the nationality or the creed of any hon. gentleman in regard to any position he might hold in this House or in this country. In my judgment I say such conduct would be utterly intolerable. I should regard confederation as a complete failure if the high position of Premier of this country were not equally as open and as accessible to a French Canadian as to any man of any other nationality. Those are my views, views that I have always expressed here and elsewhere. I could give evidence to the hon. gentleman of the most unmistakable character that on an occasion not very remote when the prospective position of Premier was pressed upon me I refused it and declined to take the course suggested, because I thought it would not be undesirable that a French Canadian should occupy the position of First Minister in this country.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have but little to add to the point I was making in regard to the criticism upon the speech which I delivered at Winnipeg. But I may say this, Sir, that on the morning of the day on which I made that speech the "Free Press" newspaper, which certainly up to that time had been a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite of a rather pronounced character, published a telegram containing the speech of the hon. First Minister made at St. Roch, to which I have referred. It was as follows :—

Quebec, May 7th.—In the course of a speech last night Mr. Laurier said in reference to the Manitoba schools, the Government had finally introduced a Bill which was such a miserable thing, that though called a Remedial Bill, the principle of remedial legislation was not within its four corners. * * *
My friend Mr. Ross, Minister of Education in the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat, (great cheering), is with me here on the platform and agrees with me, (Mr. Ross, hear, hear), that there should be religious teaching in the schools. * * * *
Mr. Mowat would have approached the Protestant people of Manitoba, not with threat, as was done by Bowell, but would have addressed himself to Christian conscience and told them to give to the minority the privileges of conscience they claimed for themselves, and if the people of Manitoba remained obdurate there were always reserved the powers of the constitution to fall back upon.

On the following day, 9th May, the morning of the day on which I addressed the people at Winnipeg, the "Free Press" said under the head of "Mr. Laurier's Announcement :"

Whatever the reason, the impression created in the minds of those opposed to separate schools here was that Mr. Laurier and the Liberal party represented the forces opposed to coercion in toto, and that from them under no circumstances might a remedial Bill be expected. This impression must now go, and instead of it will come a better understanding of the attitude of the parties toward the question.

I give that as the report in the "Free Press" newspaper of the speech delivered on the evening of the 7th by the First Minister, and the conclusion at which the very able editor of that journal arrived, and they show that the policy of the First Minister and that of the Liberal-Conservative Government were one and the same so far as that matter was concerned. I have endeavoured to show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) did not on the recent occasion triumph in regard to either of the great issues that were submitted to the people ; and in confirmation of my statement of that fact and of my opinion that the hon. gentleman owes his position in this House to-day as First Minister of Canada, not to the fact that the policy which the hon. gentleman propounded on either of the great issues submitted to the people was adopted or ratified by the electors of Canada, but that the hon. gentleman's triumph was a triumph of race, I read the following extract from "Le Pionnier de Sherbrooke," of 29th June, 1896 :—

Mr. Laurier's candidates in this province have gained votes by saying that the Remedial Bill presented on the 2nd of March last, did not grant enough to the oppressed minority, and that if the Liberal leader were returned to power he would grant a measure that would be much more efficacious.

It is on the faith of this promise that thousands of electors have been induced to mark their ballots in favour of the Liberal cause.

We shall await Mr. Laurier's action on this head of his programme, and if he makes sincere efforts to put a stop to the persecution from which our friends have been suffering for the last six years, we shall give him in that not only our sympathies, but also our most cordial support.

So much for the fact that the hon. gentleman, having changed his attitude altogether on this great question in the presence of the electors of the province of Quebec, announced that he was ready to go further than the Government had done.

"L'Union des Cantons de L'Est," Mr. Laurier's own organ, published at Arthabaskaville, concludes its editorial comment as follows :—

Patriots of the province of Quebec, thanks! You have done your duty and have shown the country that you have heart and intelligence. Mercier must have shuddered in the eternal peace of the grave at seeing his executioners of 1892 crushed by public wrath in his own dear province. Papineau, Dorion and the old leaders must be proud to-day at the uprising of their race in Parliament and in the councils of the nation.

"La Gazette de Berthier" says "that it was Mr. Laurier's name which acted like a torrent that carried the day." This tribute to the hon. gentleman's personal popularity is one in which I entirely concur. I have no doubt at all that it was to a very large extent the question of race which decided the issue in the late election, and not, as I have said, the adoption by the electors of this country of the policy which the hon. gentleman had propounded in regard to either of the two great issues that were submitted to the people. But notwithstanding the result, the fact remains that upwards of 19,000 of the electors of Canada polled their votes for the Liberal-Conservative party over and above all that voted in support of the Liberal party. So the hon. gentleman will find that while he has a majority in Parliament, obtained by the very extraordinary means to which I have referred, the fact remains that the great party which I had the honour to lead during the late contest polled over 19,000 votes more than was polled by the party whose members now have the pleasure of sitting on the Treasury benches. I will not detain the House, unless the point is questioned, by giving the details, which I am prepared to submit to the House. Outside of the province of Quebec, an alteration of five votes would give the Liberal-Conservative party a majority in every province of the Dominion ; and as it stands, outside of the province of Quebec, a decided majority of the members was returned to support the party which I had the honour to lead. I may be asked what about Quebec ? All I can say is that Quebec was a great disappointment to me. I frankly admit that I was entirely unprepared for the course pursued by the electors of that province. It was stated in the discussions on the hustings during the late campaign by hon. members of this House that I had made a compact, a bargain with the bishops of the province of Quebec to give me their support in return for the course which I had pursued in this House in respect to the question of remedial legislation. I am here to say in the presence of this House that a more unfounded statement never emanated from the mouth of any hon. gentleman. I am here to say that from the moment I came from England last winter down to this hour, I have never had the pleasure of meeting a single bishop of the province of Quebec or of having any communication with them, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, Sir, I am not in a position to reproach the hierarchy, or any person else in the province of Quebec, for the course they pursued. But, Sir, I may say this : I think it unfortunate—and I am now speaking apart altogether from the question of the effect upon the position of political parties—I think it a very unfortunate thing that a Government, that a party who from a sense of duty, a sense of what they owed to the constitution of the country, a sense of what they owed to the peace and happiness and prosperity, as they believed, of the country ; I think it unfortunate that they should take their lives in their hands to carry out a policy which was stated to be one to which the province of Quebec attached the most vital importance, and that under these circumstances a course should have been pursued that is calculated to lead to the impression, that whatever sacrifices a great party may make in carrying out a policy which is specially dear to any section of the Dominion, these sacrifices should be disregarded and entirely overlooked. As I said before, I have no ground of complaint, because I had no pledge, no assurance, nor anything of the kind. The course that I pursued on this question, the course that the Government of which I was a member pursued, the course that the late Government of which I had the honour to be the head pursued, was a course dictated by the sincerest convictions of duty and of what they owed to the country. And, Sir, I am free to confess that I entirely over-rated the importance of this question. I say, Sir, that in the light of what has occurred, I am in a position to frankly admit that I greatly over-rated the importance of this question of remedial legislation. I entered upon it, as I say, under the conviction that the Government of Canada were bound by every principle of right and justice, and of statesmanship, to carry out a policy which they believed to be for the maintenance of the law and the constitution of the country as expounded by the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire. It was in that spirit that the late Government entered upon the discharge of their duty. It was in that spirit that

they did their utmost, and that they did all that men could do to carry it out. I may say more, Sir. In addition to the conviction I had that it was right and proper, and that it was the absolute duty of the Government to maintain the law and the constitution as thus expounded, I did believe that it was a question of much more far-reaching importance than I now find it is. I had the conviction, I entertained the opinion, and I entertained it sincerely, that the Roman Catholics of Canada attached the most vital importance to the question of religious education for their children. I entertained the belief, and I entertained it sincerely, that it would be a cause of deep resentment on the part of the great body of the Roman Catholics of this country, if the Parliament of Canada refused to carry out the law and the constitution of the country as expounded by the highest tribunal of the Empire. Having these views, I attached, as I say, the utmost possible importance to this question, and I regarded it as a still more imperative duty on the part of the Government of the day to avoid anything that would leave the impression upon the minds of a great body of the population of Canada, that equal justice was not meted out to every man in Canada, by the Parliament of Canada, irrespective of race or creed. Under these circumstances, as I say, I find that I attached much greater importance to this question than the result of experience has shown to belong to it. I find that there has not been that deep importance attached to this question, by a very large portion of that denomination, that I had previously supposed. I make that admission frankly to the House, and I cannot but feel that it is not unlikely that it will be much more difficult in the future than it was in the past—and it was difficult enough as gentlemen in this House all know in the past—it will be much more difficult in future to induce gentlemen to sacrifice their own judgment to some extent, and the feelings of their constituents to some extent, to maintain a policy, which when subjected to the test of actual experience, is not found to have the importance attached to it that was previously supposed.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to say more upon that subject on the present occasion, but I will say this: that in the future as in the past the cardinal principle with the great party to which I have the honour to belong will be: equal justice to all without respect to race or creed. I am glad to know that the responsibility of this question—an important question, although not so gravely important as I had supposed—I am glad to know that the responsibility rests no longer upon my shoulders, but upon those of the hon. gentleman who is now the First Minister of the Crown. I can only say, that I trust and sincerely hope, that he will be most successful in obtaining such a settlement of this question as will do justice, and give satisfaction to all parties. I can assure the hon. gentleman not only that he has my most cordial wishes for a happy, and early, and fair settlement of this important question, but that anything that I can contribute to that end will be at all times most cheerfully done. I say that, Sir, as to my views on the course that should be pursued, and, as to the course that was pursued my view remains unchanged. My desire to see equal justice dealt out regardless of race or creed remains as strong now as ever. While I have the honour of a seat in this House, or even after I should cease to be a member of this House, I have no hesitation in saying, that the same principle will always obtain with me, and I shall always be found true to that principle which lies at the very foundation of Canada's prosperity, progress and advancement. That principle is, that there should be the conviction established in the minds of all persons irrespective of race or creed, that there is but one law, and one measure of right and justice to be meted out to those whose interests are at any time imperilled.

I may say in regard to the very erratic speech of the mover of the Address (Mr. McInnes) that there was some little apology for the gentleman, and that is, that the First Minister had called upon him to make bricks without straw. As a matter of fact, to move an answer to an Address which contains nothing is rather calculated to tax the powers of even an experienced member of this House, not to speak of one who has had no previous experience. The Speech from the Throne is more remarkable for what it does not contain than for what it does contain. I cannot help wondering why this Parliament was called together at all. Why are we here? For what object are we here? It is not certainly for the statement that is put in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General, who says:

> The necessity of making provision for the public service has compelled me to summon you together at this somewhat inconvenient season.

Why, Sir, in view of the fact that the first act of this Government has been what I regard as a gross violation of the law, that the first act of this Government, as exhibited by the papers laid on the Table of the House to-day is not only a gross violation of the law, but shows that Parliament is not required at all in this country. Their very first act, on coming to power, shows that hon. gentlemen opposite entertain very different views from those which they entertained and pressed upon this House when on this side of the House. They have now discovered a new law and a new gospel. Let me invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite for a moment to the question of providing for the public service, which it appears obliges His Excellency the Governor General, at very great inconvenience, to call this Parliament together. Why, Sir, the enormous sum of money pro-

vided for the public service by the Governor General's warrant, shows that it is a mere matter of form to call Parliament together to vote public money—that it is entirely apart and outside of any necessity. The papers laid on the Table to-day disclose the fact that these hon. gentlemen, who held yesterday that it was a gross violation of the law for Governor General's warrants to provide money for such purposes as are provided for by this Government under this warrant, are no sooner placed in a position to advise His Excellency the Governor General than they advise him to commit this violation of the law which they had condemned, and which the Act on the Statute-book shows to be altogether unjustifiable. I will remind the hon. gentleman opposite that a gentleman who has always been regarded as a very high authority in this House on questions of this kind—I mean the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the former Finance Minister—will be found in "Hansard," of 1891, vol. 3, page 4540, to have used the following language :—

> The language of the Act is quite plain and I will read it for the information of the House :
>
> If when Parliament is not in session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof ; or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then on report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General, that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared for the purpose of supplying this.
>
> It is scarcely necessary for me to point out that the obvious meaning of this clause is, that when any occasion arises when any expenditure which cannot fairly be foreseen by the department or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required ; then and then only, is it intended that such a warrant should issue. Now, Sir, I say it is an evasion of the principle intended and of the meaning of this Act, for the Government, or a department of the Government, first of all to neglect their duty, first of all to neglect to take proper precautions to inform themselves of what money would be required and to apply to Parliament ; and then afterwards, to plead their own deliberate neglect of duty as an excuse for having recourse to this extraordinary provision, and obtaining use of the Governor General's warrant.

And the hon. gentleman, on the strength of that declaration, moved a resolution which concluded by saying :

> That under such circumstances the issue of a Governor General's warrant for the said sums was a gross abuse of the power vested in the Governor in Council under the said Act.

Now, Sir, I want to ask the hon. gentleman what was the position in this case ? Was the occasion unforeseen ? Does the hon. gentleman forget that my hon. friend on my left, the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) begged and implored this House to provide for the public service—to provide even a small amount that would carry the public service on until Parliament could be summoned ? But, Sir, with their eyes open, and with perfect deliberation, these hon. gentlemen, controlling at the time a small minority of this House, and abusing the position of power in which they were placed by the near expiration of the life of Parliament, refused to permit this House, although a large majority were begging and imploring them to do so, to make provision for the public service. Was it an unexpected contingency, when the hon. gentlemen, with their eyes open, and knowing what would occur when the public service could not be provided for, deliberately refused to make that provision, and then came down to the Governor General and asked him to adopt a course which they themselves have declared, and properly declared, to be a gross abuse and violation of the law, for the purpose of covering, not an unforeseen contingency, but a condition of things which they, by wilful obstruction, forced upon this House ? It bodes unfavourably, Sir, for the future of Canada. It is a bad start for a new Government to commence with a gross violation of the law, with an abuse of the power they possess, with trampling under their feet the very principles which they themselves have laid down in this Parliament as fundamental principles. The hon. First Minister had occasion to speak on this subject in the city of Toronto on a recent occasion, when he denounced it as un-English, unparliamentary and improper on the part of a Government to spend a single dollar of public money that was not voted by Parliament ; and yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman, instead of adopting a course in accordance with his own declaration, first brought about the contingency by the most palpable and determined obstruction which any party were ever guilty of on the floor of this Parliament—a course which, I trust, will never be paralleled again ; and then, Sir, the moment it was found to be convenient for his own purposes and the purposes of his Administration, he advised the Governor General to perform an act in violation of the statute, and one which has been correctly denounced by the hon. member for South Oxford as a gross abuse of the statute and a gross impropriety. Under these circumstances, I need not quote authorities. I have here the authority, which we all regard as a very distinguished one, of Dr. Bourinot, who says on this subject :

> Special warrants may issue, when Parliament is not in session, and any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good ; and a statement of all such warrants is laid before the House, not later than the third day of the next session.

I will not detain the House further on the

present occasion on this question, as we shall have an opportunity of discussing it more at length on a future occasion; but I ask again if we can expend a million under Governor General's warrants for the public service, what need of calling this House together at all? Is it anything but a farce to summon this Parliament from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to come together here in midsummer, to be told that they are brought here for the purpose of voting supplies, when all that is necessary is for the Government to obtain the signature of the Governor General to a warrant to furnish them with any amount of money for the public supplies that they may require? I have said already that I do not intend to press that matter further at the present moment, but I may say that this speech is rather remarkable for what is not in it than for what is in it. The hon. gentleman is unwilling to take the House into his confidence. He is very reticent indeed. He intends to take seven or eight months to ascertain what his policy is, to find out what he proposes to do and submit to Parliament.

I wish the hon. gentleman had been equally reticent and cautious in submitting his policy to a foreign country. I have spent many years on the floor of this House, but I confess I have never, on any occasion felt the unbounded amazement that I did when the hon. the First Minister declared in this House that the report read by my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart), from the Toronto "Globe," was an authentic statement. In my judgment, it would have been better for the hon. gentleman to have taken his colleagues into his confidence. But no doubt he must have done so. I suppose he must have had their authority before he propounded the foreign policy of Canada in relation to a foreign country, and confided it to a newspaper of a foreign country. I believe, Sir, you would search the records of statesmanship in any country in vain to find any parallel for an act so utterly unjustifiable. Why, just imagine, the hon. gentleman is here, he has brought the Parliament of Canada together from one end of the Dominion to the other, and he tells us that he has nothing to say to us. All I want, he says, is money. He has no confidence to give us, he has no policy to propound or submit. Although he has had eighteen years on this side of the House to formulate a policy and arrive at an opinion of what is in the interests of this country, he has not a word to say to the assembled Parliament of his country as to what policy he proposes to pursue on any single question touching the interests of this great country. But what do we find in this interview? Why, I can only describe it —and I do not wish to use too strong a term—as an act of unmitigated folly. I cannot imagine in the interests of Canada any course which the First Minister of Canada could pursue which is more calculated to defeat the very objects he himself has in view than to take into his confidence the reporter of an American newspaper, and make known to the world the policy of Canada through such a channel. Does not every one know that in diplomacy it is of the utmost importance to proceed cautiously? Does not every one know that in diplomacy you must follow in the most tactful and displomatic manner, the views and sentiments of the parties with whom you are about to negotiate, and that to wear your heart on your sleeve and state to the seventy million people across the border what you propose to ask them to do, and under what great necessity you are to obtain what you ask, is simply to give your whole case away. If the hon. gentleman had sought how best to defeat any object he had in view with regard to questions of that kind, he could not have taken a more effective means of accomplishing his purpose. But I have a graver objection than that to make. I hold that it is in the last degree unpatriotic on the part of any Canadian to commit himself to the statement to which the hon. gentleman did commit himself regarding a great party in this country. The hon. gentleman has charged the Liberal-Conservative party with being hostile to the United States of America. He declares that the Liberal-Conservative party, which has been in power for the last eighteen years, has not treated the people of the United States in a proper and neighbourly manner. Why, Sir, the statement would be bad enough if it were true, but it is not true. I state most unhesitatingly that every historical fact which bears upon the question proves that there is not a tittle of foundation for this statement. Sir, the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada have, for the last eighteen years, on every occasion, done all that men could do, and all that a Government could do, to show the people of the United States that they were anxious to live upon the most neighbourly and friendly terms possible with the people of that country. I am aware that the hon. gentleman had the good fortune to obtain the support of the whole press of the United States in the late contest. I will not say that he obtained any other support, but, so far as the press of the United States is concerned, the hon. gentleman was able, by one means or another, to indoctrinate the people of that country with the impression that the Liberal party of Canada was more friendly to them than the Liberal-Conservative party, and that the American people were more likely to obtain the accomplishment of their own hopes and wishes from the Liberal party than from the Liberal-Conservative party. Not only is that not the case, not only have the Liberal-Conservative party, on every occasion, shown the utmost desire to maintain the most friendly possible relations with the United States,

but the hon. gentlemen opposite are men who, whenever the question arose between Canada and the United States of freer intercourse, always endeavoured to obstruct the carrying out of those arrangements that were found to be calculated to promote cordiality and good feeling between the two countries. Let me remind the hon. gentlemen again of the treaty of 1871. I need hardly tell you, Sir, that when the treaty of 1854 was abrogated by the United States in 1866, instead of the Government of Canada meeting that unfriendly act on the part of the United States—an act which certainly was within the control and jurisdiction of the United States—in a hostile spirit, took exactly the opposite course. At the very moment when that treaty terminated by the United States, we could have prevented them from taking fish within the three-mile limit, but we, instead, allowed their fishermen to go on throughout the whole season unmolested just as if the United States had not refused to carry out their part of it. That certainly was not an unfriendly act. What more? The hon. gentleman knows that from 1854 down to the present, all Canadian Governments—not only the Liberal-Conservative Government, but the Government of which the hon. gentleman himself was a member—have done everything in their power to bring about friendly relations, and obtain such a treaty as would promote the best of fellowship between the two countries, and serve the interests of both. But the hon. gentleman knows that all these advances have been met by the United States—I will not say in an unfriendly manner—but by a refusal which they were perfectly justified in making within their own rights. They have always said: We do not intend to make any treaty with you. The hon. gentleman knows that the Government of the late Mr. Mackenzie sent one of the most distinguished members of the party supporting it, the Hon. George Brown, to Washington, to negotiate a treaty. And he knows that that hon. gentleman was obliged to return unsuccessful because he could not obtain any treaty with the United States which he could ask the Parliament of Canada to ratify or which he himself would be willing should go into operation. The hon. gentleman knows that in 1871, at a time when there was a very great deal of feeling between the United States and Great Britain with regard to the Alabama question it was regarded by the Imperial Government as important—and it was a matter in which we ourselves had a very deep interest—to settle these vexed questions between the two countries. The hon. gentleman knows that the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was appointed a joint High Commissioner with the present Marquis of Ripon and the late Lord Iddesley and a number of other gentlemen to negotiate a treaty with the United States. They went to Washington and after several months of negotiation succeeded in making a treaty. That treaty was made subject to the ratification of the Parliament of Canada. In England of course, as the hon. gentleman knows, Parliament is not required to ratify a treaty at all; the Government has supreme power to arrange a treaty and give it complete effect without reference to Parliament at all. But in view of the importance of the treaty and in deference to the wishes and the independent position that Canada occupies, the treaty was made subject to the ratification of this Parliament. Well, Sir, what happened? Why, these very gentlemen opposite, the First Minister who now endeavours to show that the Liberal-Conservative party of this country have been unfriendly to the United States, instead of saying: This is a great Imperial question, this is a matter in which the mother-country is deeply interested—so deeply interested that she was prepared to pay an enormous sum of money to the United States to obtain a settlement of the question—and therefore we will support it; instead of this they attacked and denounced Sir John A. Macdonald for having as they said, sacrificed the dearest interest and rights of Canada. They spent day after day in this House denouncing that treaty and doing all that men could do to show that it was a base surrender on the part of the Liberal-Conservative Government and party to the United States. And had it depended on their views or their influence that treaty would have had no existence and these difficulties would have continued. But the Liberal-Conservative party in this House was strong enough to carry the treaty in defiance of the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite on that occasion. And now, in the light of experience, what does the hon. gentleman say? Why, Sir, it is ludicrous in the view of the course the Liberal party took on that occasion to find that now the hon. gentleman's ambition is to renew the treaty of 1871, the very treaty that he denounced as a base surrender to the United States of Canadian rights and Canadian interests. This treaty, it now appears, is an object and the highest ambition of the hon. gentleman to get renewed. And well it might be. I can well understand it in the light of experience. I do not believe there is an intelligent Canadian within the bounds of this Dominion, that does not feel the same way, that does not know the course the Liberal-Conservative party took on that occasion was right, and the course hon. gentlemen took was wrong. If any ever entertained a doubt of it, they have that doubt removed by the declaration conveyed to this American reporter and to the press of a foreign country that the hon. gentleman wishes to renew the treaty of 1871. But, Sir, there is another statement here to which I take the strongest possible exception, and I am astounded that any gentleman knowing the

facts should have lent himself to such a statement:

> Some years ago, when considerable friction had been created by the North Atlantic fishery troubles, I took an opportunity to say that the question should be adjusted in a friendly manner, becoming an enlightened and friendly people, by the simple process to give and take, and I do not see now why an arrangement should not be made.

Why, Sir, does the hon. gentleman not know that long after 1871 the present distinguished ambassador in London, Mr. Bayard, addressed a letter to myself couched in the most friendly terms and intimating that he thought the time had arrived when we might deal satisfactorily with the Atlantic Fishery trouble. And what happened? This happened—that the present Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Sir Lionel Sackville-West, now Lord Sackville, and myself were appointed plenipotentiaries by Her Majesty to negotiate the Treaty of Washington of 1888. The hon. gentleman knows that when the United States terminated the treaty of 1871—again by their own motion and in opposition to the desire of everybody in Canada that it should be continued—we had no alternative but to fall back upon the treaty of 1818. He knows also that, having been accustomed under the treaty of 1854 and under the treaty of 1871 to frequent our waters, great irritation was caused among the fishermen of the United States, and that the press of the United States, both Republican and Democratic teemed with abuse of Canada for the unfriendly course pursued by our Government for the protection of our undoubted rights under the treaty of 1818. The plenipotentiaries sat down around a table and discussed this question for three months, with the result that we reached a treaty which practically conceded every point of practice that Canada had pursued in regard to the United States. It was signed by the plenipotentiaries of both countries, and it was sent to the Senate by President Cleveland with the declaration that it was a fair and honourable settlement of the question and should be accepted by the Senate. And the hon. gentleman knows that the reason the treaty was not accepted was because the Republican party were in a position to prevent any settlement being reached, because it required a two-thirds vote in the Senate to ratify the treaty. Now, Sir, that it is not all. When this treaty was passed the British plenipotentiaries submitted for the consideration of the representatives of the United States a modus vivendi to go into operation pending ratification of the treaty. Under that modus vivendi means were provided by which the American fishermen could at once enjoy to a large extent the advantages which the treaty afforded upon the payment of a tonnage fee. That modus vivendi is in operation to-day, and not only that, Sir, but President Cleveland publicly tendered his hearty thanks to the British Commissioners for submitting it, and his Republican successor, President Harrison, included in his inaugural address to Congress a statement of the fact that under that modus vivendi all friction had been removed between the two countries. Is that an indication of unfriendly action? Here is an action of the Government of Canada outside the treaty which has virtually settled all that irritation on account of the Atlantic fisheries, and has received the hearty commendation of the Presidents of both the great parties in the United States, both of Mr. Cleveland and his successor; but to read this, one would suppose that the only man in Canada who had ever taken any interest in removing this irritation, was the hon. the First Minister. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, knows that from 1888, from the time that treaty was signed by the plenipotentiaries of the two countries, and under that modus vivendi, down to this hour, there has never been a complaint on the part of the Government of the United States against Canada for anything in relation to that question. I think before the hon. gentleman opens his heart to a reporter of the press of a foreign country in a way that he will not do to Parliament, he should take the trouble to learn a little more of this question. Now, Sir, there is another question of considerable magnitude and one which, after the commission had reported, I suppose might be brought under the notice of the Parliament and people of Canada. Not so, Sir; before any decision is reached on the part of any Canadian commission, or any joint commission, the hon. gentleman confides his policy to the press of a foreign country, and expresses his readiness to engage in the deepening of our canals to the extent of 21 feet. Why, Sir, it is enough to take away one's breath to find this economic Government prepared to undertake an expense, no person knows whether it will be fifty millions or one hundred millions, probably much nearer the latter sum, as our portion of it. But that is not all. He proposes not only to rush into this wild expenditure without any authority of Parliament, or any consultation in his own country, but he makes a proposal that the canals of Canada, that the great waterway of the St. Lawrence, to which the people of Canada attach the most vital importance, and upon which the life or death of Canada may some day depend—he proposes to confide that enormous waterway that nature has placed in the hands of Canada, to the joint control of this country and seventy millions of people in the United States of America. It is enough to take one's breath away to find the First Minister rushing into a declaration of policy of this kind, which is calculated, in my judgment, to create a great deal of difficulty by arousing hopes that may never be realized. But supposing that was his policy, there is no way by which he could

defeat it so effectually as to say, in thus unburthening his heart to the press of a foreign country, that Canada is practically dependent upon the great republic to the south of us, and is prepared to do anything, to go upon our knees at any moment, to grant any concession that may be necessary.

Now, Sir, I have another objection to this matter. The hon. gentleman says that among all these questions he proposes that the bonding system shall be taken up. What does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he not know that the bonding system enjoyed by Canada to-day is under a solemn treaty made between Great Britain and the United States of America. Occasionally, some people in the United States, who are very anxious to create trouble with Canada, who do not hesitate to do everything in their power to hand us over to the United States, have been kind enough to suggest to the United States Government to stop the bonding privilege as a means of bringing Canada to her knees, just as they have been kind enough to suggest that the United States have it in their power to adopt a course that they saw would render the great railway lines of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, bankrupt in a very short time. That is a policy that I can understand emanating from the Farrars, from the Wymans, and from the Glens; but I cannot understand the First Minister of Canada committing himself to a declaration that is tantamount to saying that the bonding privilege is one that we have yet to settle. Sir, it is a privilege that has been conceded after the most solemn declarations by the plenipotentiaries of both countries, and has been ratified by a treaty under which we now enjoy it. I do not intend to take up the time of the House longer in reference to this matter, but I felt that it was absolutely necessary that the earliest opportunity should be taken of showing the consequences of this extremely reckless and imprudent course which the hon. gentleman seems disposed to pursue.

Now, I have only one word more to say and that is in regard to the postponement of the consideration of the fiscal policy of this country for the next eight or nine months. I may say, Sir, that a more fatal policy for Canada I do not believe could be conceived. Free trade would be bad enough, a revenue tariff would be bad enough, a declaration that the industries of Canada were to be struck down at a blow would be bad enough; but, Sir, uncertainty is worse. I say that while it was not necessary, under the view which those hon. gentlemen take, to call Parliament for the sake of getting supplies, it is necessary, and it is in the most vital interest of the people of Canada, that they should know what is to be the policy of the Government of this country. Does the hon. gentleman not know what was the cause of that frightful disaster that has wrought ruin to millions of people in the great republic to the south of us? Does he not know that the election of President Cleveland, with the declaration that protection was to be struck down and that free trade was to be the policy of the United States of America, paralyzed every industry in that country? Does he not know the frightful financial and commercial disasters that ensued from that hour, until that country was brought into a condition that every person must deplore, a condition that we of all others have reason to deplore, because, situated as we are, separated by an invisible boundary line for so long a distance, it is impossible for that country to undergo a great financial and commercial crisis without its being severely felt throughout Canada, and such was the case. But, Sir, under the ægis of the National Policy, Canada withstood——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman an authority, not Canadian but American. Let me tell him what an eminent statistician of the United States of America said in regard to the position that Canada held, at the same time that this wave of depression, which did affect us, was crushing the great republic to the south of us, and causing hundreds of thousands of people to suffer for the want of bread, and carrying misery and desolation into the homes of millions of people of that country, for the reason that commerce was paralyzed, the industries of the country were paralyzed, because they did not know what was to be the fiscal policy of the country. Sir, under these circumstances, I will give hon. gentlemen, who seem so much amused at the position which Canada occupied, affected as it was to a considerable extent, but which, under the ægis of the National Policy it was enabled to withstand even to the overflowing of injurious results that naturally fell upon the country from its proximity to the United States, a statement which appeared in the "Forum," early in 1894, from Mr. D. A. Wells, the well-known American economist. He said:

> In the Dominion of Canada, separated territorially from us on the north by an imaginary line, there has been no panic, no unusual demand for money, no stoppage of industries, no restriction of trade, no increased rate of interest; in short, nothing beyond the ordinary course of events, except so far as these events may have been influenced by contiguity to what may be termed a financial cyclone, whose pathway of destruction was contiguous to, but not within, Canadian territory.

This opinion as to the condition of the two countries is not from a Canadian, but from a high American source. Does the hon. gentleman want to bring about in Canada the same disastrous conditions in every section of this Dominion from which the United States is now suffering? If he does, he is pursuing the best way to accomplish his

purpose. All trade reports indicated an improved commercial condition in Canada ; in fact, every evidence pointed to the fact, in the most clear and unmistakable manner, that Canada was merging from the wave of depression that has overspread the country for some little time. But what will be the effect of this announcement ? The capitalists who have been waiting to know what was to be the fiscal policy of Canada, as to which party was to triumph, in order to decide whether they would invest capital and employ labour, north or south of the boundary line, according as to whether Canadian industries were to continue to enjoy protection, or whether there was to be free trade, will be paralyzed in their action, and, indeed, there is not a business man in this Dominion who is not vitally interested in knowing as early as possible what is to be the fate of this country. Under these circumstances, I fear that while there was no ground, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, for calling Parliament together, because they have proved quite equal to getting supplies without any of our weak assistance, there was and there is reason why the Government should state its trade policy at the earliest day, aye, before this House rises. It is due, not to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, but it is due to the people of Canada, it is due to every enterprise in our country that they should know at the earliest hour possible what is to be the fate of this country, and govern themselves accordingly. Any decision is better, in my judgment, than no decision, because it was a state of undecision that produced such widespread disaster so graphically depicted by the pen of Mr. Wells, in the United States, and which no Canadian who has the interest of the country at heart, desires to see in this Dominion. Under these circumstances, I would even at this late hour implore the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, in the interest of the country, to let our industries know something as to what is to be their fate. Take the great coal mining industry of Nova Scotia, which has grown up under the fostering protection of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. It is a question of life and death with those engaged in it whether hon. gentlemen opposite intend to do in this instance what they have pledged themselves solemnly to do. They have pledged themselves solemnly to make coal free, and to make iron free. I wonder how they are going to obtain the consent of the Minister of Justice to that policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite are aware that my iron policy, as it is called, was branded in very opprobrious terms by hon. gentlemen opposite, as a system of monstrous protection, as one of monstrous bounties. But the Prime Minister of Ontario did not think I had gone far enough, and he took money out of the treasury of the province to increase the bounty. We want to know under which king we shall serve. We want to know whether the policy of the Minister of Justice at the other end of the building or the policy of the Prime Minister is to prevail. We want to know whether those great industries which have grown up, and which occupy an important position in the maritime provinces are to be sacrificed or not, and the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are unable to make their arrangements until nine months ahead is one of a most serious character. A great many manufacturers of this country, men who have large amounts of capital invested, naturally want to know whether their industries are to live or die. and I therefore say that, in my judgment, the Prime Minister would have been quite warranted in calling Parliament for so important a purpose as disclosing frankly and fully to the people what they had to hope for or what they had to fear, instead of bringing us together for what—with these Governor General's warrants on the table—appears to have been very inadequate cause. All I can say is this. I trust the hon. gentleman will go forward on the line on which he has taken such advanced steps during the campaign. I hope the hon. gentleman will throw behind him all that wild free trade rhodomontane in which he was in the habit of indulging and amusing the country, and that he will advance in the direction of giving the industries of Canada that protection which is necessary to allow them to live and flourish. If the hon. gentleman will do that, I can assure him that instead of receiving the opposition of hon. members on this side of the House, he will find us prepared to go heart and hand with him in any measure that is calculated to maintain the progress and prosperity of the country in connection with which we believe necessary protection to our great industries is absolutely indispensible.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have assuredly no fault to find with the speech to which we have just had the pleasure of listening, nor is it my intention to offer any criticism upon it. On the whole, it was a moderate speech, and if we remember the source from which it came, I think it was a very moderate speech, indeed. True, Sir, there was throughout it, from the first to the last syllable, a tone of disappointment and bitterness ; but with this I find no fault, and indulge in no criticism. I waive it in deference to the feelings of a man who, having abandoned a high and honourable position in the service of the country for the more noble and higher ambition of restoring the wrecked fortunes of his party, and having failed in the task, has not yet recovered from the surprise and the shock, that, like Cæsar, he came and saw, but, unlike Cæsar, he did not conquer. It is manifest from the tone of the speech of the hon. gentleman that he

has not yet rightly apprehended the full significance of the verdict which was pronounced by the people of the country on 23rd June last. It is quite evident from the speech delivered that the hon. gentleman up to this day does not know what are the causes which have produced that upheaval, that earthquake which shook the whole of Canada, from the island of Vancouver to Prince Edward Island on 23rd June last—an earthquake which was very similar to some earthquakes which we read about in the olden times, and in which the sinners were buried alive, and the just were spared and saved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) told us in the opening part of his address, that the Liberal party had not obtained a majority on any of the issues submitted to the people of this country. I fail to understand what was the object of the argument of the hon. gentleman. He says we have not obtained a majority on any of the issues which were submitted to the people of this country. Well, Sir, I care not to go very minutely into that argument, but I look at the result only, and whatever may be the cause the result is : there is the hon. gentleman in opposition, and here are we at the head of the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) stated more. He said that although his party were in the minority in this House, yet that they had obtained at the polls, no less than 19,000 votes more than the party which is victorious. Again I refuse to go very minutely into those calculations of the hon. gentleman, but all I have to say is, that if the victorious party polled a minority of the votes in the country, what has become of the Gerrymander Acts of hon. gentlemen opposite ? They certainly were never intended for that purpose, and if that be their result I am sure we shall have the support of my hon. friend when we repeal these Acts, as repeal them we shall. Nor do I consider that my hon. friend was any more happy in his reference to the hon. gentleman who moved the Address, when he said that although the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) had a seat in this House he had a minority of the votes in his constituency. True there were three candidates in the field, one Liberal and two Conservatives. There were two different kinds of Conservatives, however, in the constituency of Vancouver, as in many other constituencies in this country. There were Conservatives who were Ministerialists and who were prepared to swallow everything in connection with the Ministerial policy, but there were also Conservatives, who though remaining Conservatives, and yielding nothing of the conviction of their lives, were, however, no longer ready to follow the Government of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). That is the reason why my hon. friend (Mr. McInnes) is here. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not know yet what are the causes which have brought on this change of government, I may tell him. There are three causes. The hon. gentleman and his party were defeated because their fiscal policy, which by a strange misnomer has been termed the National Policy, had not fulfilled the expectations of the people, and although that policy had not fulfilled the expectations of the people, still the hon. gentleman adhered to it. The hon. gentleman and his party have been defeated because the administration of public affairs under his Government had been extravagant and corrupt. The hon. gentleman and his party have been defeated because upon a grave and important question,—a question which for its solution required great tenderness and care of treatment—instead of appealing to the honest intelligence of the people, instead of appealing to the convictions and to the consciences of the people, the hon. gentleman and his party appealed to sectional prejudices and to religious feelings. He was defeated, because by his policy on this question he created amongst the better classes of his party a distrust, which rent his party into factions which are now irreconcilable. Sir, these are the reasons why the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not succeed. And in view of the tactics which were adopted by the hon. gentleman and his party to succeed, in view of the methods which were resorted to by them, I say : blessed and thrice blessed is the day when these tactics were defeated, when these methods were rebuked, and when these appeals to sectional feelings were trampled under foot by the people to whom they were addressed. I am doing no injustice to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) when I say, that his speech to-day was rather a doleful and mournful one. But there was a single ray of sunshine in it. There was a ray of sunshine in it when he came to speak of my hon. friends, the mover and seconder of the Address. He paid them just and well deserved compliments, which I am happy to re-echo, but he discriminated somewhat between the mover and the seconder. He said that the mover had been altogether too aggressive for his taste. Well, I thought that this would have been a reason why my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) would have paid a greater compliment to the mover of the Address (Mr. McInnes). However, he chose not to do it. As to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Vancouver, I have to say that he pleaded the cause of his native province in a manner in which I have never heard it pleaded in this House before. He did it in a way which will commend itself to the Government, and I am sure it will not be forgotten by them at the proper moment. Now as to my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), the seconder of the Address. His reputation for eloquence had preceded him to this House, and much as we expected from him still more has he given us, and with regard to both himself

and the mover I am sure that members on both sides will be happy to find that such valuable additions have been made to the debating talent of this Parliament.

Now, my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has gone somewhat minutely, and more minutely than I care to follow him, into an interview which I gave some time ago to an American journalist. The only criticism—not the only but the principal criticism—which the hon. gentleman had to offer to that interview was, that I had been too candid and too sincere, and he said that it would never do for any kind of a diplomatist to carry his heart on his sleeve as I have done. If that meant anything, it simply meant that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) agrees with Talleyrand who said: that speech has been given to man to conceal his thoughts. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is of that opinion evidently, and we know from his past record that he is as good as his word, and that he preaches both by precept and example. We remember very well that in the campaign of 1891, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) stated to the people of Canada that the Government of Canada received an invitation from Mr. Blaine the American Secretary of State, to a conference at Washington with a view of renewing the reciprocity treaty of 1854. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) made that statement on all the hustings of Canada and he invited the support of the Canadian people because of it. He told them, that if Parliament had been dissolved it was simply to answer the invitation which had been given by Mr. Blaine, then Secretary of State for the United States, asking co-operation and a conference to renew negotiations, in order to have a reconsideration of the treaty of 1854. Well, Sir, the truth was, as the hon. gentleman knows, that no such invitation had ever been given by Mr. Blaine. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not carry his heart on his sleeve. He was not candid with the people. He was not sincere with the people, but the hon. gentleman knows right well that a few months afterwards he had to eat humble pie in the office of Mr. Blaine in order to get an audience from him. These are not my lines, however. It may be a weakness of mine to carry my heart on my sleeve. It may be a weakness of mine to be candid, but I believe it to be the best diplomacy of all to be honest in speech and honest in action as well.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) also rebuked me for what I said as to the control of the canals after they had been deepened. Was the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) sincere and candid, and did he carry his heart on his sleeve when he made that criticism? If he had been candid and sincere, and if he had carried his heart on his sleeve as he should have done, he might have said to the House, that when I made that statement to this American journalist, I was simply carrying out the policy of the late Government, because, Sir, there is to-day a joint international commission, a commission appointed by the Canadian Government to act in conjunction with the American government, to examine that very question of the deepening of the canals and the control of the same. Here is an Order in Council which was passed by the late Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell on the 30th of November, 1895:—

On a report dated 22nd November, 1895, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting that by petition to Your Excellency in Council, the President and members of the International Deep Waterways Association have set forth that the Congress of the United States has enacted as follows:

The President of the United States is authorized to appoint, immediately after the passage of this Act, three persons who shall have power to meet and confer with any similar committee which may be appointed by the Government of Great Britain or of the Dominion of Canada, and who shall make inquiry and report whether it is feasible to build such canals as shall enable vessels engaged in ocean commerce to pass to and fro between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, with an adequate and controllable supply of water for continual use; where such canals can be most conveniently located, the probable cost of the same, with estimate in detail; and if any part of the same should be built in the territory of Canada, what regulations or treaty arrangements will be necessary between the United States and Great Britain to preserve the free use of such canal to the people of this country at all times.

And, Sir, upon that the Canadian Government appointed three commissioners—Mr. Howland, Mr. Keefer, and Mr. Monro, to confer with the American Commissioners in order to see what reports, regulations or treaty arrangements would be necessary between the United States and Great Britain to preserve the free use of such canals to the people of the United States at all times. I must say, however, of that interview, that I have nothing to take back from the statement I made that the relations of the two countries had not been saisfactory; for I am bound to say that under the treatment accorded to American fishermen in 1886, 1887 and 1888 by the late Canadian Government the relations of the two countries were brought to such a pitch that one time the two countries were actually upon the verge of commercial war. Commercial war, Sir. I have a high authority for that statement; and who is my authority? The hon. leader of the Opposition, who made that statement upon the floor of this very House in the session of 1888.

The hon. gentleman said that the Speech from the Throne afforded but a very meagre bill of fare; but it is in season, and I do not suppose that my hon. friend would have any stomach for a very heavy meal at this moment. Moreover, the circumstances are

such that we cannot have at this time anything like the usual session of Parliament. We are not in a condition to do so. Even the examination of the Public Accounts, the hon. gentleman knows, cannot go on at the present time. He knows very well that it would not be for us anything that would break our hearts, if we were in a position to bring to the scrutiny of this House the Public Accounts of last year when the public expenditures were controlled by hon. gentlemen opposite. But, Sir, we cannot do it; we have to defer that pleasure to another session. We have called the session for one reason and for one reason alone, that is, to obtain from this Parliament the supplies for carrying on the business of the country—the supplies which the late Parliament, under the leadership of hon. gentlemen opposite, who had then the responsibility of public affairs, did not vote. This is the only reason why we have called this session of Parliament.

In this connection the hon. gentleman made some pleasant allusion, or bitter allusion if he prefers, to the issue of the special warrant. Well, all I have to say at this moment is that I will follow the example he gave at a later period in his speech, and will not discuss this question now, because we shall have an opportunity of discussing it by itself on a future occasion.

Another criticism which the hon. gentleman indulged in was, that though we were elected on the policy of tariff reform, we were not prepared to-day to lay on the Table of the House any measure of tariff reform; and he says that the uncertainty of delay is worse than what he calls free trade. Sir, the issue between the two parties in the last election was whether the National Policy should be preserved intact, as it was, or whether there should be tariff reform, and the policy of tariff reform succeeded. Now, the hon. gentleman says, go on and carry out your promise, and bring down at once your measure of tariff reform. All I have to say is that it is my extreme sorrow, and the extreme sorrow of my colleagues as well, that it is not possible for us at this moment to bring forward such a measure of tariff reform as we would like to have. But there is the obvious and manifest reason for it. Of all the evils that a protective tariff brings on the people, perhaps the greatest is that though the people have universally and unanimously determined to have a reform of that tariff, yet such conditions have been brought about under it that no such reform can be effected without exposing the country to some commercial disturbance. We must try to avoid this. One of the effects of a protective tariff, as the hon. gentleman well knows, is to create a high pressure atmosphere, in which all kinds of industry, trade and commerce have to live and operate; and a sudden disturbance of that condition of things, while dangerous to natural life, might also be dangerous to commercial life, and, therefore, though we are determined to reform the tariff, we have to do it cautiously and after deep and anxious consideration. We have to proceed slowly. There are, I admit, certain items which we might reform immediately. The hon. gentleman has instanced coal. But any reform in the tariff, to be effective, must be general. To reform the tariff upon any one article or two articles alone, might afford some relief to some classes; but it might perhaps jeopardize the interests of other classes; because in any civilized country, under a tariff such as we have, all interests are dependent upon each other, and to disturb the condition of one you disturb the condition of all. Therefore, we have been forced to the conclusion that if we are to reform the tariff, as we must, we must do it in a single measure, to be submitted to Parliament at one and the same time. But, Sir, let me go back a few years. I am not bound to take shelter under the examples of hon. gentlemen opposite; but let me call the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition to this fact. He has stated that in the election of 1878 the issues between the two parties were clear cut. So they were. There was a revenue tariff policy on one side, and protection on the other side. On that occasion the policy of protection prevailed. What took place? Did the hon. gentleman who succeeded at that time and his colleagues proceed at once to plunge the country into the throes of a reform of the tariff? The hon. gentleman knows that it took considerable time to consider the reform which they were to bring forward, even though the issues were clearly cut. The election took place on the 17th of September, the Government of Mr. Mackenzie resigned on the 9th of October, Parliament was not called until the 13th of February, and it was not until the 14th of March that the tariff measure was brought before the House. Here is an example from a source which I am not fond of following, but which still gives in this matter an example of caution which we are bound to follow and will follow.

But the hon. gentleman devoted by far the greater and most important part of his speech to the Manitoba school question, and the whole tendency of his argument to-day was to try and put us in contradiction with ourselves. He said that we had one policy here and another there. I take issue with him upon that. The hon. gentleman wants to know what is the policy of the Government upon this question. If I were to extend to him the same treatment which was meted out to us when on the other side, I would ask what is the policy of the Opposition. Now, we heard during the last session from the lips of the hon. gentleman, not once or twice but a dozen times, a declaration which is very different from what

we have heard from him to-day. We heard from him then the declaration that in this matter the sovereignty of Parliament was abridged, that Parliament was not a free agent, but was forced to lay violent hands upon the school legislation of Manitoba and restore the Roman Catholic separate schools. Nay more, we heard also the hon. gentleman state, in deep and solemn tones, that he was ready to die, if his death were necessary, to procure for the minority the justice to which they were entitled. Such was the language we heard from him last session, but it would appear that all that is now a thing of the past. It would appear that this policy of stern adherence to the constitution, this magnanimous policy of devotion to the minority is no more. There is an election going on to-day in the good riding of North Grey, and there we have the authority of the whip of the party (Mr. Taylor) that he was sent by the hon. gentleman himself, as a missionary, to tell the staunch Tories of that riding that remedial legislation is no longer part and parcel of the programme of the Conservative party. Now, it appears, Parliament is again a free agent, now the sovereignty of this Parliament is not abridged, and this Parliament is no longer obliged by the letter of the law and the judgment of the Privy Council to lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba, and is no longer obliged to restore to the minority their separate schools. The hon. gentleman is no longer ready to lay down his life, even though to die were necessary in order to obtain justice for the minority. Here are the words which the chief whip of the party pronounced yesterday at Owen Sound in the north riding of Grey :

> Mr. Taylor said that the circumstances of this campaign were different from the last, as the Remedial Bill was no longer a part of the Conservative policy. Sir Charles Tupper had sent word by him to this effect to the electors of North Grey ; that good feeling had now been restored between Sir Charles and N. Clarke Wallace and the other anti-remedial Conservatives. He said it was an insult to the intelligence of North Grey for Mr. Laurier to attempt to palm off in this riding a Minister who was defeated at home, and who did not own a cent here. A vote for Mr. Paterson would mean a vote for the domination of Quebec.

What is the meaning of this ? What did the hon. gentleman mean when on the floor of this House, not yet five or six months ago, he told the people of this country that Parliament was bound—bound by the terms of the law—to interfere in this matter, bound to lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba, bound to restore separate schools, and bound to die, if necessary, for the maintenance of the constitution. What was his meaning ? What was his object ? Was he simply playing a game in order to obtain the twenty votes of a majority in the province of Quebec which he expected ? And now, what is his meaning to-day when he sent the whip of his party to the good riding of North Grey to tell them that this is no longer the policy of the Conservative party, and that the Conservative party no longer intend to lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba. When the hon. gentleman appeals, by the mouth of the whip of his party, against French domination and Quebec rule what does he mean ? His meaning is the same as it ever was—a double game and a double policy. When you, Mr. Speaker, took your seat, the only criticism which the hon. gentleman had to offer to your nomination was that you had not the honour and the privilege of belonging to the French race. Sir, your nomination is an instance of the French domination which we intend to have, and which will be nothing more and nothing less than to select good men for every position, whether they be English, French, German, Irish or Scotch. But this is not the language which we hear to-day in the riding of North Grey. The language which is heard in that riding is an appeal to what sectional feeling there may be in the hearts of its electors by raising the cry of French domination and Quebec rule. Now, I do not care to carry this further. The hon. gentleman wants to know what is the policy of the Government and he has a right to know it, and I will tell him. We have always taken the ground that this question of the Manitoba schools has been bungled, from first to last, by hon. gentlemen opposite. They first exhausted every subterfuge, which they had under the law in order not to act, and when they determined to act, they acted on perfectly untenable grounds. We have a most peculiar constitution, and in that peculiar constitution there is a feature which seems to be altogether at variance with its very spirit. Of all the clauses which cemented these provinces together, the one perhaps which was the most potent and effective was that which expressed the desire of all classes of the community that every section of the community represented by a province should be independent and supreme within the sphere of the powers allotted to it. But, strange to say, although the subject of education is one of the powers referred to the provinces, yet there is a right of appeal given by the constitution to any minority whenever in any province there was existing a system of separate schools. If the minority in such province is dissatisfied it is given an appeal to this Parliament. This is altogether in contradiction to the spirit of the constitution, but let that pass. When the appeal is given let us consider for the moment to whom it was given. First of all, it is manifest that if an appeal was given, the right of the province to legislate upon the subject is thereby acknowledged, and this is a subject which is no longer in dispute. The appeal is given, not to a court. If it were, the court would only have to inquire whether or not the legislature had acted within its rights. The appeal, however, is

given, not to the courts, but to the Federal Government and Parliament. It is not, therefore, a judicial but a political appeal, and as such is to be exercised not only for the benefit of the minority but for the good and welfare of the Canadian people as a whole. This is the true interpretation of the constitution, and the hon. gentleman is surprised at the attitude which I have taken upon this question. Let me tell him, as he well knows that there is no party to this controversy, not even the government of Manitoba, which ever denied that the power of appeal existed in this Parliament, which ever denied that we had the power to interfere and lay violent hands upon the legislation of Manitoba. But, Sir, though we have that power, all reasonable men, all those who love their country, insist that it shall not be exercised violently, but that it shall be used only as a last resort when every other means had failed to obtain that degree of justice due to the complaining minority. The hon. gentleman knows right well that this is the view maintained by the Manitoba government themselves. Let me quote to him the very language of the Attorney General of Manitoba in answer to the communication of the Dominion Government:

> The remedy sought to be applied is fraught with great danger to the principle of provincial autonomy. An independent consideration of the subject, as well as the recognized constitutional practice in analagous cases, clearly indicates that it should only be made use of as a last resort: and after the clearest possible case has been made out, it is obvious that so drastic proceeding as the coercion of a province in order to impose upon it a policy repugnant to the declared wishes of the people can only be justified by clear and unmistakable proof of flagrant wrong-doing on the part of the provincial authority.

You have there the admission by the government of Manitoba themselves that they never denied the jurisdiction of this Parliament, but what they denied was the right of this Government to interfere in the way proposed without investigating the subject in a proper and friendly spirit as they had more than once asked should be done. The first duty of the Dominion Government when this appeal of the minority was brought before them six long years ago was at once to apply to the government of Manitoba, to treat with them and to endeavour to settle the question amicably. Sir, they failed to do that. But when we came into power the very first thing we did was that which should have been done by gentlemen opposite—we applied at once to the government of Manitoba. The government of Manitoba responded. They sent here their Attorney General. We conferred. All I can say at the present time is that I have every reason to hope, every reason to believe, that when again this Parliament assembles, this question will have been settled satisfactorily to all parties concerned. Sir, when I say that this question will have been settled satisfactorily to all let me make one exception. I know full well that any settlement we can make, however just, however fair, however meritorious it may be, it is condemned in advance by those extreme men who are ready to exact their pound of flesh even though they are cutting it out of the very heart of their country, those men who, whether they belong to one section of the Conservatives or the other are to-day sharpening their knives, in order to obtain from the bleeding corpse of their country, not justice but the satisfaction of revenge. These men I do not expect ever to satisfy. But I expect we shall be able to satisfy all reasonable men, all right-minded men, all those who, whatever may be their views upon this question, are prepared for the sake of peace, harmony and good-fellowship, to make some sacrifice upon the altar of their common country even of opinion and preference. And I hope that when we appeal to the sense of fair-play of justice and generosity in behalf of a united Canada, it will meet with a clear and unmistakable response from all classes. But I should despair of the future of my country, not merely as to the settlement of this question but as to the settlement of every other question which may come up if the tactics followed by the hon. gentleman opposite and his friends were to prevail in this country, if those who blow hot and cold who to-day are vociferously clamouring against the policy which they supported no later than the month of June were to prevail.

Sir, the hon. gentleman dealt a few moments ago with a subject which I was not surprised that he should tackle, because it is one which I am sure must have caused him some uneasiness and even pain as a Canadian for some time, because he cannot but regret. I hope, at all events, that he does regret the language which he made use of on former occasions. The hon. gentleman has at last taken issue with me because I reproached him that upon that question he had made an appeal to feelings of race and religious prejudice. Well, Sir, I accept the challenge, and I repeat to-day in his presence the charge which I preferred against him throughout the provinces I visited during the late election. Here in the great assizes of the nation, before the assembled representatives of the people, I arraign the hon. gentleman and his friends for that in the late election they did their utmost to arouse the religious prejudices not only of the people of Quebec but those of the Protestant and English speaking provinces as well. Let us join issue at once. The hon. gentleman quoted the speech he delivered at Winnipeg. Let me quote it again. —I think the very words that he read:

> To my Conservative friends who have turned their backs upon me I want to make another appeal, and it is this: I want to know where is the man with any brains in his head, where is the man who has any capacity for exercising

intelligent reasoning capacity, who would justify himself, or would justify himself to his country, if he oppressed a feeble minority, and that for the purpose of bringing into power a Roman Catholic French Premier, who declares he will do more.

"A Roman Catholic French Premier." The hon. gentleman was speaking in the city of Winnipeg, to an English-speaking audience. He was addressing his friends, as he said—his English-speaking friends in Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba where the great bulk of the people are opposed to intervention in this matter. If he wanted to make a point against me by saying I had promised to do more than his Bill provided, why, in the name of common sense, was he so particular to tell them that if they turned him out of power they would bring into office a "French Canadian Roman Catholic Premier." There was inuendo in that. He disclaims having had any intention of appealing to sectional or race or religious prejudice. A few days afterwards the hon. gentleman was at Port Arthur and this is the language he made use of there:

I am speaking now not to Liberals—it is no use speaking to them, but to Conservatives, and ask can you vote to turn out the present Government and put in a French Roman Catholic Premier.

If that was not an appeal to race and religion, what is the use of language? But the hon. gentleman went to the province of Quebec. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that he used in the province of Quebec the same language that he used in Winnipeg or Port Arthur? Here I have the speech he made in Montreal, at Sohmer Park, before a French-speaking audience. I quote from the report of the Montreal "Gazette":

I am prepared to say that what I said at Winnipeg was this:

Now, mark the words. The hon. gentleman was explaining to a French Canadian and Roman Catholic audience what he stated at Winnipeg, which language I have just quoted.

I made an appeal to the Liberal Conservative electors who were under the impression that the Dominion Government was forcing separate schools upon the province of Manitoba. I said, "Is there a man of intelligence here who does not see that the Government are only carrying out the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Queen's Privy Council, a judgment which declares that the privileges which belonged to the Roman Catholic minority have been taken away, and that it is the duty of the Parliament of Canada to restore those privileges." I took the ground that every Liberal Conservative was in honour bound to stand by his party in endeavouring to restore the privileges of which a feeble Roman Catholic minority had been robbed, instead of striking down that party for the purpose of bringing into power a French Roman Catholic Premier who himself had declared that he had opposed the Bill because——

He promised more? No, but because——

—it was too weak to accomplish its object.

Here is the language of the hon. gentleman in Winnipeg. Speaking to English Protestants his language is: Are you going to turn us out and bring into power a French Roman Catholic Premier who promises that he will do more? But in Quebec he says: Are you going to turn us out of power and put into office a French Canadian Roman Catholic Premier who declares the Bill is too weak, and that he will bring in a stronger Bill? There is the language of the hon. gentleman—an appeal to prejudice on both occasions, an appeal to the French Canadians because I had opposed this Bill on the ground that it was too weak; and an appeal to the Protestant and English-speaking electors of Manitoba because I had opposed the Bill on the ground that I desired to bring in a stronger one. Sir, on each occasion the hon. gentleman was doing his very best in order to arouse local prejudices in each province. Now, to-day, to crown all, the hon. gentleman is sending the whip of the party into an important constituency to tell the people that they are not to vote for Mr. Paterson because a vote for Mr. Paterson would be a vote in favour of Quebec rule and French domination. French domination! Sir, this is the time and the day to clear up that issue. This is the time and the day, I insist upon it. Let us deal with this question now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I disclaim having sent any person to make any such statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sir, to-morrow is polling day; it is only too bad that this declaration of the hon. gentleman was not made eight days ago. French domination! No person has a right to speak of French domination. It is true that we carried the province of Quebec; but there is no question of French domination, or English domination, or Irish domination, or Scotch domination, or German domination. We stand on British Canadian citizenship. What matters it, Sir, whether the majority supporting the Government come from one province or another if the policy of the Government rests upon the broad principles of truth, justice and honour? What matters it whether the majority comes from one province or another if the arguments we used in one province were those we used in all the provinces? Sir, the men who to-day occupy these benches are fully conscious that upon this and upon other matters they have before them difficult and anxious questions to deal with and to settle, not by appealing to one class, not by appealing to one section; but upon all questions and on all occasions, by appealing to all classes, and to all sections, with the view and with the end, with the supreme view and with the supreme end of making Canada a country, not a country only, but one country as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Unaccustomed as we are to our respective places, and being new in

the session, and wishing to commence, as I am sure we all wish to do on both sides of the House, with due moderation, I think the time of the evening is so far advanced that I may be allowed to move that the debate be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I presume that my hon. friend is exhausted by his efforts down in the county of Queen's and Sunbury, and that he is not, perhaps, ready to go on with the speech that he intended to make this evening. Although the hour is still early and rather premature for adjournment, I suppose we shall have to agree to his request; but I would like to tell my hon. friend that we intend to have, if possible, a short session, but, at the rate we are proceeding, it is going to be a very lengthy session.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not be long.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—DEATH OF SENATOR MACPHERSON AND MR. CLARKE, M.P.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before that motion is carried, the painful duty devolves upon me of calling the attention of the House to the loss by death of a very prominent Canadian. I refer to the late Sir David Macpherson. Sir David Macpherson, as the House well knows, occupied a very conspicuous position for many years in Canada. As a contractor, as a gentleman connected with large financial institutions, as representative of a large constituency in the old legislative council of Canada, and subsequently as a senator of the Dominion, as president of that body, and as a member of the Government of Canada, having held for some time the position of Minister of the Interior, the late Sir David Macpherson became well and widely known in every portion of Canada. It was my good fortune, from the time I first became acquainted with this portion of Canada, to enjoy the personal acquaintance and confidence of that hon. gentleman: and I believe my opinion will be confirmed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who had the pleasure of his acquaintance, when I say that he was in every way, not only a most estimable man, but one who, possessing great ability, took a very deep and keen interest in everything calculated to advance the interests of Canada. I feel that his death marks the passing away of one of the comparatively few remaining senators who sat in the old legislative council of Canada. I am quite sure that I am expressing the sentiments of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when I say that I feel the death of that hon. gentleman is greatly to be deplored by the people of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, has rightly expressed the feelings entertained on both sides of the House, which are called forth by the lamentable event which has just taken place. Sir David Macpherson, as we know, was one of the most important personalities in our country for more than forty years. His great business ability, his experience as a legislator, as a man of the world, as a contractor, and as a merchant gave him a place accorded to but few men during their lifetime. His removal of course comes at the end of the natural term of life, and in that circumstance takes away a good deal of the bitterness which death always carries.

Death has dealt severely with us during the present Parliament. This is the second death we have had to deplore since the last election. Apart from Senator Macpherson, we have to regret the death of a colleague, Mr. Clarke, whom I had not the pleasure of knowing personally, but whose acquaintance I made during the last few months. We did not know him, but those who are associated with him feel sure that if we had had the privilege of his company as a colleague he would have proved one of the most excellent members of this House. But such are the incidents of life. His death is still more deplorable because he was in the prime of life. Death respects neither sex nor person, and though we know this, and though it is a truth that has been recognized since the commencement of the world, still whenever it is recalled to us it renews the same pang and we deplore the event.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT—DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the Debates of the House, as follows:

The Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the Debates of this House during the present session beg leave to submit the following as their first report:—

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

P. A. CHOQUETTE,
Chairman.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved :

That this House does concur in the first report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—LOYALTY RESOLUTIONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, the annexed copy of a despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 26th March, 1896, acknowledging the receipt of a Resolution of the House of Commons, expressing the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the House to the British Throne and Constitution.

Government House,
Ottawa, 21st August, 1896.

1425 J.

PRIVY COUNCIL, CANADA.

Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Aberdeen.

Downing Street, 26th March, 1896.

Canada.
No. 106.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch, No. 62, of the 21st February, in which you forwarded a copy of the House of Commons Debates containing a resolution expressing the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the House to the British Throne and Constitution.

It has been a source of great satisfaction to Her Majesty to receive this assurance of Canadian loyalty, and to know that in its efforts to maintain the legitimate interests of the British Empire, Her Majesty's Government can always rely upon the support and approval of the Canadian people.

I have, &c.
(Sgd.) CHAMBERLAIN.

Governor General.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, the annexed copy of despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 5th of May, 1896, acknowledging the receipt of a resolution of the House of Commons, relative to the settlement by arbitration of disputes between Great Britain and the United States.

Government House,
Ottawa, 21st August, 1896.

P.C. 1508 J.

PRIVY COUNCIL, CANADA.

Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Aberdeen

Downing Street, 5th May, 1896.

Copy.
Canada.
No. 150.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch, No. 108, of the 7th of April, inclosing copy of a resolution of the Dominion House of Commons relative to the settlement by arbitration of disputes between the United States and Great Britain.

Her Majesty's Government have learnt with much satisfaction the terms of this resolution, which they believe expresses the sentiments generally entertained on the subject, both in this country and the United States.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) CHAMBERLAIN.

Governor General, &c., &c., &c.

RESIGNATION OF MR. McCARTHY, M.P. FOR BRANDON.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of being returned for two constituencies, namely, the constituency of the North Riding of Simcoe, and that of the electoral district of Brandon. Under the circumstances, I am called upon to elect for which constituency I shall sit, and as no petition has been presented against me, either respecting my return for North Simcoe or respecting my return for Brandon, I am now at liberty to elect, and I do so, Sir, by resigning my seat for the electoral district of Brandon.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. member states that no petition has been presented against his return for either of the two constituencies for which he was elected, the fact of his resignation will be entered in the Journals.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the first paragraph of the proposed motion of Mr. McInnes for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech at the opening of the Session.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address myself for a few moments to-day to some of the remarks which were made by hon. gentlemen from the Government side of the House on the Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. In doing so I shall take up very briefly one or two only of the points which remain untouched in the address of the mover, the

hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). After returning his thanks to the leader of the Government for at last recognizing the claims of his native province by calling upon him to move the reply to the Address, and after having put in an additional plea to that rather full recognition, that it might be well also to recognize the claim of that distant province to a portfolio in the present Cabinet, the hon. gentleman went on to give one very peculiar evidence of the effect of the National Policy and of the administration of the Liberal-Conservative Government during the last eighteen years. He said there were in that province, and in fact in all the provinces, evidences of a very great depression in the fact that numbers of people, many of them people of culture and refinement, were piling in applications for positions under the new Government, and to such a degree that the lives of the members, and particularly of the Cabinet Ministers, were becoming a burden unto themselves. Well, Sir, I give my hon. friend credit for originality in finding out one more evidence of the effect of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and Government. If he will allow me, I think I can find another cause to which to assign the circumstance, and belonging to another category. Sir, I should say that it was evidence of a wide and consuming hunger amongst the old adherents and life-long followers of the present Government, who, for eighteen years, have been in the cold shades of Opposition, yet looking longingly and regretfully at the public treasury, and the officers and employees who have been fulfilling the duties thereof, and drawing their salaries. It may also be looked upon as evidence of a full crib at which a Liberal hand was to stand ready and deal out to those old, tried and true, and cultured followers the little gifts and the large gifts that might come to hand, and which are for the time being at their disposal. But that it is evidence of a depression, I have not the least doubt, a depression which has long existed amongst the Liberal office-seekers, a depression which now settles upon the members of the Cabinet and members of the Liberal party who have recommendations to make, and a depression which will, by and by, settle upon nineteen-twentieths of the eager applicants for office, who will find that, even under Liberal rule, the crib is not sufficient to provide for them all. Yes, even the cultivated and the cultured are making their applications, for I notice that this depression manifests itself even amongst the old members and lately elected members to this House. We mourn the absence to-day of our genial, and talented, and cultured friend, the former member from Queen's (Mr. Forbes), who has had his longings satisfied and his desires met by being appointed to the office of a preventive employee at the munificent salary of $100 a year. We mourn also the absence of an old, true and tried friend of the Liberal party, and a colleague of my own from the province of New Brunswick, who, after having for eighteen years followed the fortunes of the Liberal party, has at last had his longings satisfied and his desires met by being appointed to the munificently salaried position of postmaster of Marsh Hill, in the province of Ontario, at the salary of $10 a year. These are, so to speak, the first fruits out of that long list of depressed office-seekers who have been wending their slow and tedious way towards the portals of the Government buildings at Ottawa during the last eighteen years, and many of whom are destined never to enjoy the benefits for which they have been longing. When the hon. gentleman who moved this Address was launching out in his aggressive and fiery way, a way which pleased my moderate friend who is now leader of the Government, I wondered whether this fiery zeal, and this hot manner of expression were products of the wild and free West, or whether they were cultivated under glass, so to speak. I diligently followed the tone of his remarks and the set of his phrases, until I got into a quandary between the two. I believed, from his language, that he had been sitting at the feet of some political Gamaliel, and I thought at first it must have been at the feet of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) when he coined the strong and well marked phrase of "hypocritical rot." But, by and by, when he commenced to talk of "the ungodly use of ungodly influences," I concluded that he had been sitting at the feet of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who used a somewhat similar expression in reference to the National Policy, and declared on one occasion in this House that it was "a system accursed of God and man." Well, Sir, I recommend my young friend, who did so well in his maiden effort, to avoid, as the "Globe" would say, the apostles and prophets of disaster, and confine himself to more moderate expressions, which, I think, would convey to the majority of his auditors a sense of greater power in the arguments which he may address to the House from time to time. I now come to the speech made by my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and I must say that the hon. leader's speech, his first ambitious speech after taking the reins of Government and meeting the high court of Parliament, did not impress me as being of a remarkably statesmanlike type. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman studiously avoided meeting every one of the positions, of the strong, moderate and well-fortified positions that were taken by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition—positions that were made in no cavilling spirit, that were directed to no trifling objects, but which touched three or four points of the greatest import-

ance, and which challenged the most serious and the strongest reply that the hon. gentleman could make. We shall see as we go through, item by item of the hon. gentleman's speech whether he has met them as we would have wished the leader of a great and strong Government, by its own professions and claims, including all the talents and all the virtues, should have met them. He complained of the bitter spirit in which my hon. friend couched his language. Now, Sir, there have been times when I think even I could trace just a little amount of acid, of acrimony, of bitterness in the attacks which my hon. friend has, from time to time, delivered upon the Liberal position, but I must say that during the two hours he spoke yesterday I looked in vain for a trace of bitterness. It did not exist in my hon. friend's speech. The reason for it the hon. gentleman gave. Here, he said, is a gentleman who left a high and lucrative position, who might have been to-day enjoying the sweets of office. He came over with an ambition to lead his party to victory in a great electoral contest, and to lead his party after victory, if victory should perch upon his banner. But he failed, and defeat came instead of victory, and therefore the hon. gentleman tries to find the bitterness of defeat in the words my hon. friend used. My hon. friend cannot grasp the situation; he knows that men on his side would have felt that bitterness under like circumstances. But men on the hon. gentleman's side were too canny, and they calculated the possibilities too closely to have left high and lucrative offices and risked all upon the cast of the electoral die. The whilom Premier of the province of Ontario, when approached by all those arts of flattery which the hon. leader of the Government possesses in so high a degree, to take the perilous jump into the vortex of a contested election with his party banner and his party chances within his grasp, was too canny to so act. He preferred to keep the office he held as Premier of the great province of Ontario, with his comfortable salary, with his still more comfortable patronage—of which the hon. gentleman is said to have made such good use in years that have passed—and determined that he would not place his political life in the balance and throw all into an electoral contest. Then there is an hon. gentleman sitting to the left of the First Minister, who was Premier of the province of Nova Scotia, and who, in 1893, by the unanimous consent of all those who toiled in that hot month of June or July in the convention at Ottawa, was marked out and designated as a minister of the Cabinet that was to come. He did not undertake to put his life into the balance, but he held comfortably on to his comfortable office and stayed there until the results of the elections were told and then when he saw on which side of the fence the straw was piled, he made his little jump and landed as Finance Minister in the Cabinet of to-day. And there is still another, not yet either to the right or left of the hon. leader of the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. He will be here to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. He to-day is fighting for his very life in a constituency in the province of New Brunswick. He was one of the two noble friends, the fratres marked out by the divine fire as coming members in the Ministry that was some time to be, which should include all the virtues and all the talents. That hon. gentleman did not propose to throw his life into the balance, either, but he kept comfortably on, at his comfortable salary, and with his comfortable patronage until he saw which of the dishes had the thickest cream, and then he landed down by the side of the richest, and he is to-day fighting, as I have said, for his life in a contest which he bewails, and which hon. gentlemen opposite would rather had not come on. No, the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman's colleagues, whatever you may say against them or for them, will never be open to the imputation that they are not canny, that they take their lives in their hands and that they risk all for their party fortunes and in their party's behalf. The hon. leader of the Government was good enough to inform this House, and I am sure the information came quite unexpectedly on the House, and fell, I am afraid, on incredulous ears on this side of the Speaker, that an earthquake had occurred in Canada, and as the result of the earthquake the hon. gentleman and his party were landed to the right of Mr. Speaker, and further that it shook all Canada, and that the saints were shaken up and the sinners were shaken down. Well, my hon. friend if he is going to use scripture for his similies, must read scripture thoroughly, and he will find out of it that it is not proof of the innocence of a man or a party that for the time being he or it happens to come out on the upper side. There is a verse, I think, something like this: "Or those eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloam fell and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem?" And the answer to that question was: "No; but unless ye also repent ye shall all likewise perish." Now, Sir, did this earthquake take place? That earthquake, in the sense of the hon. gentleman's rendition of it, it did not take place in the tight little province of Prince Edward Island. If it did, it shook them out on the other side, for in the island the party opposite have lost rather than gained. Was the earthquake very severe in the province of Nova Scotia?

An hon. MEMBER. Rather.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman could not come out of the contest with a majority, notwithstanding the close combination of provincial and Dominion authority and pat-

ronage, giving the lie to one of the best old tenets of the Liberal party, but from which they have entirely departed. Even from that province they could not bring a majority with all their powers, their added, double-jointed powers. Did the earthquake prove very severe in the province of New Brunswick? I trow not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) got four supporters out of the fourteen members from that province. Did the earthquake prove very severe in the province of Ontario? Where is my hon. friend's majority in that, the premier province of this Dominion? Where is their majority from that province where all their efforts and all their patronage were massed with the one object of destroying the Liberal-Conservative party?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The efforts of both governments.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the efforts of both governments. Did the earthquake act very severely in the province of Manitoba? Let Winnipeg answer. Take the Dominion generally, and the earthquake which my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) speaks of turns out to be not an earthquake but something very different. There is a suggestion of great force and power in an earthquake. There are hidden and pent up forces which after gathering for centuries burst all bounds and rend the earth asunder, and do their mighty work. But there is another way by which such events are hastened sometimes, and that is by the insinuating, quiet, unseen, disintegrating effect of the subtle fluid of water, which undermines and eats away quietly by night and by day, until by and by the landslide takes place, and the accumulations of debris of rocks and of stones, sometimes destroy, and always astonish the innocent people who unsuspecting had been living upon the surface of the earth. If anything occurred, my hon. friend, I think will agree with me, that it was such an insidious landslide which took place in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), however, may have this to comfort him with reference to that, and it will not be the best of comfort. The hon. member (Mr. McInnes) who moved the reply to the Address yesterday, sits here, not because of an earthquake; not even because of a landslide, but because of a division—as my hon. friend himself said—in the Conservative forces which were opposed to the Liberal forces in that constituency. The Liberal-Conservative party has convictions, and its men have convictions, and sometimes these convictions are strong enough to go even against party discipline and that influence which contributes to the solidarity of a party. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) and his party cannot lay claim to such a quality as that. However they may differ upon certain subjects, when the time comes that everything is at stake and the prize has to be won or not, convictions fall and the hon. gentlemen opposite mass themselves together, with their eyes only and solely upon the prize which is to be won. But, if my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) thinks that he will get any comfort out of the fact that there have been divisions in the Liberal-Conservative party, I am afraid, Sir, that he will be disappointed. There are two men who have seats in this House to-day from the city of St. John, N.B., and who would not have been here but for this divided conviction and opinion amongst Conservatives in that city. And, Sir, when that constituency is opened, as opened it will be by the courts, those two gentlemen will find that the Liberal-Conservative party which was divided in its convictions sufficiently to defeat its candidates at that election; they will find the Conservative party united and these two seats will revert to their proper and normal condition under the sentiment of Liberal-Conservatism in the city of St. John. From the city of Ottawa there sit two gentlemen who would not be sitting here if it had not been for the unfortunate division of the forces of the Liberal-Conservative party. The same thing can be said of the city of Hamilton; the same thing can be said with reference to the seat in Vancouver; and the same thing can be said with reference to Nanaimo. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) must remember that the woe will be upon him and his party, when in the coming time the Liberal-Conservative party, strong in its united power, strong in its forces welded together, will successfully face the Liberal party after this temporary victory has passed, and when the Liberal party come down to deal with deeds and not with words.

My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) when he was challenged by a moderate and strong statement—moderate in the way in which it was put and strong in the proof which was placed behind it—when he was' met with the statement, that he had not a majority in this Parliament, from the country, on the great dividing lines between the two parties; my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) devoted under two minutes of time to combatting that strong position. And he answered it in what way? He said: Well, you may go on with your elaborate discussion, you may place the points just as strongly as you please, you may produce all the arguments which you can, my answer to you is this: we are here and you are there, and that satisfies us. Well, Sir, I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) that that answer may satisfy him, but it does not satisfy a reasonable man, and it will not satisfy this House, and it will not satisfy the sober second thought of the country. The gambler who cheats at cards and gathers in the stakes, when you confront him with his sharp practices, may answer you: well, I am here and you are there, and I have the stakes and that satisfies me. But it does not satisfy the code of honour which ex-

ists amongst players, and my. hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) may use that argument with reference to the political situation, but as I have said, it will not satisfy the sober second thought of the people of this country who will see the indictment, who will note the answer, and who will not note it to the advantage or strength of my hon. friends opposite. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has stated that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is a disciple of Talleyrand who gave it as his dictum that speech was made for the purpose of concealing one's thoughts. Well, Sir, if there is a gentleman in this House, who I think cannot be charged with concealing his thoughts, to whom the credit must be given —whether he be deemed to be on the right side of a question or on the wrong side— to whom the credit must be given of stating boldly and strongly his position, and taking the consequences of his statement; that gentleman is the hon. gentleman who leads the present Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). And, if there is one man who typifies that doctrine of Talleyrand, and acts on it in his political life, and has always done so ever, it is my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. Try it again.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean the leader of the Government, the former leader of the Opposition. My hon. friends opposite have occasion once in a while to laugh at a mistake that one may make in language. They are quite welcome to that slight enjoyment. It may for the moment——

Mr. GIBSON. Of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, of whatever you please. It may for the moment induce a little jollity and disperse the coming clouds of depression, of which my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) spoke yesterday, but it does not affect the argument, and it does not obscure the point which I am trying to make. Now, a man who conceals his thoughts by his words comes under one of three categories. He either has no convictions to state, or he has convictions but expresses them poorly, or he possesses convictions and does not want to state them clearly. I leave my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and I leave the House to judge to which of these categories he belongs. But I make this statement, that no public man in Canada has for the same period been able to float so long upon words, and simply words, out of which no definite and true meaning could be taken, and upon which almost any construction could be placed, as my hon. friend who formerly led the Opposition and to-day leads the Government in this House. But I want to say to my hon. friend that another period has begun in his life, and hereafter he must translate his words into legislation, into deeds; and the test of the hon. gentleman will come when he has to leave the region in which he has so long airily floated, and has to come down to the hard matter-of-fact work of translating his opinions, his convictions and his thoughts, into the legislation and the administration of the country. The hon. gentleman has given an admirable instance of the way in which he appears to say something and yet says nothing, in a paragraph of the Address which is before me. It says:

> The operation of the tariff will be made the subject of careful inquiry during the recess——

Now it comes——

> —with a view to the preparation of such a measure as may,—

And we are on the tiptoe of expectation to know what kind of a measure it is, when he slants off into this expression:

> —without doing injustice to any interest, materially lighten the burdens of the people.

There you are. Talleyrand himself would be nowhere with that sentence. It would so far outshine his great powers that he would conduct the rivalry no further. Why, Sir, that is a mere matter of opinion. The free trader could say: From my point of view, a tariff put in force on my principles would do injustice to no interest, and materially lighten the burdens of the country. The unrestricted reciprocity advocate, in which category nearly every hon. gentleman on that side of the House has come at some time or other in his life, might say: From my point of view unrestricted reciprocity, embodied in the legislation of the country, will not materially affect any great interests to its injury, and will materially lighten the burdens of all. And so every shade of tariff and fiscal belief could come under the hon. gentleman's phrasing, and be justified, no matter which might afterwards be framed into the matter and make-up of the tariff.

My hon. friend said, in justification of the very light repast which he had placed on the public table, that we had no stomach for a heavy meal. Well, Sir, after hard work I find one's appetite is sometimes apt to be pretty keen, and it is a great disappointment to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to have the appearance of a table put before them, a beautiful mirage, as it were, and, when you come up to it, to find neither potatoes, nor salad, nor meat, nor any other thing that would satisfy one's hunger.

An hon. MEMBER. There is "Tarte."

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the "tarte" is not upon the table. Now, Sir, what is the reason the hon. gentleman gives for having no viands upon the table?

Mr. GIBSON. He is a prohibitionist.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, Sir, that remark is not very apropos, so far as the subject is

concerned, but it is as near as my hon. friend gets to it generally. The only reason that the leader of the Government has given why there are no viands upon the table is that all he wants is supply. He puts this declaration in the mouth of the Governor General :

The necessity of making provision for the public service has compelled me to summon you together at this somewhat inconvenient season.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was perfectly at liberty not to ask for anything but supply, and to say so in the Speech he put into the mouth of the Governor General ; but I submit that when my hon. friend proposed to state that, he should at least have given the real reason, and not put a wrong reason in the mouth of the Governor General. Why, Sir, if it had been a truthful expression it would have read, I think, something like this : "The stupid and unreasonable obstruction pursued by the Liberal party at the late session of Parliament having resulted in a refusal of all supplies for the fiscal year 1896-97 at a time when they might have been voted with comfort to the House and economy to the country, has compelled me to call you together at this inconvenient season and at great public expense." That would have been a truthful reason to have given, and to have put in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General. The supply that is being asked for is the supply for the fiscal year 1896-97. The time to make that supply was in the session of 1895-96. That time came about last year. There was ample time in which to make the supply ; there was information ready for every item that was asked. There was a pressing necessity for every session must make and ought to make, unless very grave reasons intervene—a sufficient and ample supply for the services of the succeeding year. There was the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General. Why, then, was the supply not granted ? No extraordinary supply was asked for. It was only the simple, ordinary supply for the regular and ordinary services of the country. A supply was asked for one year. When the gentlemen in opposition opposed the granting of a full supply, the proposition was made that supply for six months should be given. That would have avoided altogether the necessity of an extra session, and would have allowed the House to convene at about its usual time without the great inconvenience and the great expense attendant upon this session. When that was refused, the proposition was made to the hon. gentleman to give a three months supply, which would tide over the season of the hot weather, and allow Parliament to meet late in the autumn, when one session would have done for the services of the two years, instead of two sessions, which are now necessary. Why was this not done ? Simply because the hon. gentlemen then in opposition to the Government thought fit to obstruct and prevent a supply. They gave as a reason that the Remedial Bill intervened ; but, Sir, if you search the records you will find that ample time was spent in the obstruction to going into supply to grant the ordinary supply for three months, for six months, for a year, and therefore no necessity whatever existed for the calling of this session. Why it is called to-day and why supplies must be voted is due entirely to the unreasonable obstruction of hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in opposition. But even supposing they were unreasonable and obstructed supply then, was there any reason really for calling us together now to get supplies ? None ; not the least. The hon. gentlemen entered upon a course of policy boldly and recklessly. Why did they not pursue it ? If they had been as brave as they were reckless to pursue it, they need not have called Parliament together until January, they need not have called Paliament together until next July, they need not have called it together at all. These hon. gentlemen, after having been asked to vote a foreseen and regular expenditure, and after they had deliberately refused, when they fell into the pit that they had dug for others, had recourse to the authorization of Governor General's warrants, and have been appropriating moneys for the public service of this country without the sanction of law and without the sanction of Parliament. What do I find ? I find that in the month of July a Governor General's warrant was asked for, and given without hesitation, for one million dollars. For what ? To meet an unforeseen expenditure ? Was it because some cataclysm had destroyed the public works of the country and made it necessary to implement them at once before Parliament could be called ? No, Sir, but to pay the salaries and wages and working expenses of the departments of the Government—to meet foreseen expenses, stated expenses, which they themselves refused to vote. These careful, prudent, law-abiding men, did more than that. They took the Governor General's warrant freely given for one million dollars. They could spend but $600,000 of it. These are the close financiers, these are the admirable estimators of what they require. Somebody acting as Minister of Finance, on his word as Minister of Finance, and buoyed up by his coadjutors, made a solemn declaration to the Governor General that the Government were in absolute necessity for a million dollars in order to meet the departmental expenses for the month of July. They got the million dollars and spent $600,000 of it, and had to put back $400,000 perforce at the end of July into the public treasury because they did not need it. These gentlemen, not satisfied with that experience, got another Governor General's warrant in the month of August, one day before Parliament met, as freely granted, for another million dollars to meet de-

partmental expenses. Well, I put this logically to sensible men. If you can by Governor General's warrant appropriate two million dollars for departmental salaries, why can you not appropriate twelve million dollars for the same purpose? What is the use of calling Parliament together in August to go through the form of appropriation? If you can appropriate two million dollars for departmental expenses, salaries of employees, expenditure as stated regular and foreseen as anything can be, why can you not appropriate a million dollars for public works? Why can you not appropriate half a million dollars for marine? Why can you not go through the whole list and make the whole $36,000,000 appropriation, and not go through the farce of calling Parliament together at all? But how the welkin would have resounded with the denunciations of this bold outrage, this unprincipled invasion of the constitution, this destruction of the very foundation of parliamentary government, if we had been elected to power and had done this. Maybe we would not have got a Governor General's warrant. But if we had, all the Grit newspapers of the country would to this day have been ringing the changes on this unparalleled conduct of an unprincipled Tory Government. Talk about wobblers. I see before me the boss wobbler of them all. In 1891, my genial and moderate friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who sits in front of me, had the honour of fulminating on this side of the House against the iniquity of Governor General's warrants. He brought up his motion, he attested to it by his speech, he was joined by his brother Liberals, and smoke and fire were visible in this Parliament for the two or three hours that the fulmination was going on. But the Governor General's warrant which was given then was but an infant in swaddling clothes compared with these giants of July and August. The Governor General's warrant then was a mild-mannered one for an expenditure which had not been foreseen, and which had not been foreseen through the fault probably of a superior officer, but not of the Minister or the Government. But the fact remained that it had not been foreseen. It was for Intercolonial Railway purposes, and the chief officer justified neglect by declaring that owing to the time the accounts came in, he did not know it would be wanted, and consequently the supply was not asked.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from Queen's is given to being very sceptical. He puts on, not the regulation look of affliction, which one of the voters of Queen's-Sunbury said the Liberals will have to put on after five o'clock to-night, but he puts on an air of infinite contempt and scepticism with regard to any statement that may be made by an opponent. I know what I state, and I am willing, when the proper time comes, to argue that question from the facts of the case. I say that never was a Governor General's warrant asked for by a Liberal-Conservative Government of the nature of these last two warrants. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) laid down the law, after he had read the Act. He said you can give a Governor General's warrant when some public work is damaged or destroyed by some event which could not have been foreseen and for which there is therefore no appropriation, and when it is requisite in the public interest that it should be rebuilt or repaired without delay. You can, he said, on occasions of great emergency, not foreseen or provided for, have recourse to Governor General's warrants; but for what was foreseen and recommended and asked for and then refused by Parliament, the flat of Parliament is against you, and a Governor General's warrant ought not to be used and cannot be used, under the law and the constitution, which govern responsible and parliamentary government. But our hon. friends easily forget in power the statements and the positions they took when out of power. I believe the Toronto "Globe" unfortunately had a homily, not long after the elections, on the difficulty which a party experiences when it comes into power, in keeping up to their promises and professions out of office. My hon. friend from South Oxford has unfortunately read that insinuating editorial and fallen from grace. I desire to say this, that if these hon. gentlemen who represent Liberalism, who are introducing a new era, who have commenced to supplant the functions and duties of Parliament, by Governor General's warrant, were as brave as they are bold and reckless, they would have kept on appropriating for six months and not have called us together at all. I like a brave man. Boldness, if it is to be successful with the people, must be accompanied with bravery. Once having commenced to assume the rights of Parliament and appropriate by Governor General's warrants, why did these gentlemen not stick to it, and why did they call us together to go through a mere form?

But, leaving that point for the moment—these gentlemen are going to ask us to vote supply. I notice that my hon. friend the leader of the Government has published far and wide his intention of introducing a new policy for the North-west. His principal newspapers have followed up his indication, and to-day the press and public mind is full of the new policy, the new departure, which, by the way, all say may cost a large amount of money, but if it opens up the North-west it is well worth the money they say, and it must be pursued. They will place their Estimates on the Table and ask us to vote them. Will they ask for supply

for the North-west? Will they ask us for supply for the Department of the Interior and the immigration branch, which must devise and carry out the policy, this new policy for the North-west? If they do, they must show us a Minister and his policy before they can expect to get an appropriation. Is Parliament going to be asked to vote an immense sum of money for the North-west for immigration and vote it to a man who is not known and for a policy which has not been developed? Why have not they a Minister of the Interior? They are a strong party, they have talents in abundance outside of their regular party following in the Dominion Parliament and inside of it also, according to their own assertion. Why all this delay as to the Minister of the Interior, who embodies or is to embody this new departure, and this lavish expenditure? Hon. gentlemen opposite must not feel that they have been taken at an advantage if, when they ask us for supply, this side of the House asks them for their Minister and their policy before it grants them that supply. Why have not they a Miuister of Interior? Is it that there is no man in the old parliamentary following sufficient for the place? Well, then, they can go outside. They have gone outside before, Oh, so often! My hon. friend spoke of the feeling of bitterness that exists by reason of disappointment on this side of the House. But there is bitterness elsewhere. Away down in the groves of Bothwell wanders disconsolate and forlorn an aged philosopher, who, through good and evil report followed—aye, who dominated—his party's policy, who was the bosom friend of the hon. leader of the Government, and who to-day takes refuge in his poetry and his philosophy from the canker and the bitterness of disappointed hope. A young and callow fledgling takes his place and fills the office that he should have had and leaves him to wander alone in bitterness and disappointment. And down by the resounding waves of the Guysboro' shore there may this very day be a-walking the ponderous form of one who thinks and thinks and thinks of the ingratitude of a leader and a party, a leader who made him his colleague and yoke-fellow in travelling from one end of this country to the other when fighting his battles, but who, when it came to dispensing the sweets of office, let him go idly by and passed on to a man untried and unknown in the field of Dominion party politics. And, Sir, there may be another, in fact there may be two others. There may be a gallant Colonel down in the county which I myself once represented and which he represents now—and of which representation he is very proud indeed. There may be another disappointed man there in the bard-like and prophetic-looking adherent of the party who for twenty-five years has fought their battles in and out of Parliament, who has done yoeman service, and who has been passed over in favour of another unknown man in the field of Dominion politics, leaving him to wander disconsolately upon the shores of Lake Utopia looking for the fabled serpent which is said to inhabit its deep waters. But why have they not a man from the North-west? They had a standard-bearer, a right-hand supporter who stood by the side and upheld the arms of the hon. member who formerly represented L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), a bold and fitting work-fellow who fell as my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) fell in the battle of the 23rd of June, but who has not enjoyed the good fortune that my hon. friend has enjoyed of being so absolutely necessary to his leader and so intimately connected with the affairs of that leader that a new constituency must be got for him willy-nilly—and though the people say: We do not want him, the people's judgment is nothing in Liberal estimation. You must have him, says the Premier, for I want to make him a member of my Ministry. The hon. member for Winnipeg is tortured to-day with disappointment, it may be with uncertainty——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The late member for Winnipeg (Mr. Joseph Martin).

Mr. FOSTER. The late member for Winnipeg—true. And he wonders whether the same reward for past services will be meted out to him as was meted out to the former member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Why is there not a Minister of the Interior? Is there another deal on? Is something waiting to be "fixed" before they can choose the man, and is there a consideration floating around to tempt ambition or cupidity? There must be some reason. The most important Minister in the new departure that the leader of the Government is to make is the Minister of the Interior, and yet no one is selected for that office. Why? My hon. friend is surely not at the end of his resources. Is not there another postmastership equal to that of Marsh Hill that might be given to some aspiring man to make a vacancy for the late member for Winnipeg? Could not you work up a preventive office somewhere to make a vacancy? Maybe you could do what the Minister from the province of New Brunswick (Mr. Blair) thought of doing and actually proposed to my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier)—a most original idea. After the election was over the choice for Minister from New Brunswick fell upon Mr. Blair. But Mr. Blair had no constituency. But to get one, Mr. Blair had his own peculiar notions. He illustrated a part of all the virtues of this Liberal Government, for he tried to get a seat by the persuasion of a member of a party opposite to himself, and at his nomination in Queen's, he told the assembled electorate that he might have got it, but the price was too high. So, finding these peculiar tactics unavailable, and the price too high, the hon. gentleman had

a proposition ready, a most original one—he declared it in a speech delivered three days before the revised report appeared in the St. John "Telegraph." And what was this original idea ? He said that, not being successful at once in getting a seat, he might go into the Senate for two or three months, and he had arranged with a friend in the Senate to loan him his seat for three months. And so this bright and shining light in this bright and shining Government, proposed to go into the renting of a senator's seat for three months in order to get a place in Parliament, when he found it difficult to get in by way of the Commons. Now, Sir, will some one loan a seat to some one in the North-west so that we could have a Minister of the Interior here ?

Well, my hon. friend goes on next, and says that he has no measures ; and here again he gives reasons where he better had given none, for the reasons do not seem to be sufficient. What are the reasons why no measures are to be brought down, as put in the mouth of the Governor General ? The first reason is this :

> It is impossible to lay before you at this session the public accounts for the past year, or indeed any of the reports usually submitted to Parliament. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that you will require to reassemble early in the ensuing year, it does not appear expedient to invite your attention to any measures beyond the passage of the supplies.

There are two reasons, one is that you cannot put on the Table of the House the Report of the Public Accounts for the year 1895-96, and that therefore you cannot put any measures before the House. Sir, the absence of the Public Accounts might be a reason for not passing the Estimates under certain circumstances ; but it is no reason for not passing these Estimates if these Estimates are simply those that should have been passed in March and April last, Estimates which followed the accounts of the preceding year, and which were put upon the Table. But, Sir, I put it to this House and to the country whether it is any reason for not bringing down legislation, that the Public Accounts for 1895-96 are not on the Table. The fact that the reports of the departments are not on the Table of the House, is no reason, and never was. The only objection that was ever made from the Opposition side of the House on account of the reports not being down, was that we should not pass the Estimates of a department until we knew what the department had done for the preceding year, but it was not urged as a reason for deferring one single measure if there were any measures of importance. Why did not the hon. gentleman treat this House and the country fairly, and say : We do not think it is expedient, under the circumstances, to have any legislation this year, and we are not going to have any ;—but not giving a reason which is no reason, a reason which never has been given before, and would not be valid if it were given. But why have they no legislation ? They want the reports and the Public Accounts. What for ? Do they need the Reports and the Public Accounts in order, for instance, to put legislation upon the statute-book which will give them power, in a legal and parliamentary way, to open negotiations with the Cabinet at Washington for a reciprocity treaty ? What reports are necessary for that ? Why is not that introduced ? If authority is necessary, why is not a legal measure taken in order to bring that question to the front, and to push it forward ? For the hon. leader of the Government said, in 1890, in 1894, in 1895, aye, and in 1896, that when they came into power, on that day a commission should go to Washington in order to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States of America. Why has not that been put in motion ? Was it a condition absolutely necessary to carrying that out, that the reports should be brought down ? But, Sir, there was something else that could have been done ; they might have brought in a measure for reducing the salary of the Governor General. My hon. friend, the Postmaster General of the new Cabinet (Mr. Mulock)—who is not now in his place, who is camping elsewhere—on two different occasions introduced a Bill into this House, argued for it, pushed it forward, and it was supported by numerous Liberals in the House—a Bill for reducing the salary of the Governor General from $50,000 to $35,000. Has my hon. friend forgotten his zeal of two years ago ? Where is the measure which one of the most important members in the Cabinet, should now, if he keeps his promises and professions of two and three years ago, have in a forward state for the consideration of this House ? Or where is that other measure that the Postmaster General, that my hon. friend from Queen's, that other hon. gentlemen sitting in the Ministerial benches, and behind the Ministerial benches, declared was a measure of imminent necessity, a measure to reduce the expenses of the departments of Government, and to curtail the departments of Government ? Have they forgotten that ? Aye, to such an extent, Sir, that instead of proceeding on the plane of curtailing the number of Cabinet offices and curtailing the salaries, they have added to the number of the full Cabinet Ministers, and they have raised the salaries of those who formerly were Controllers, and did not have the full salary of Cabinet Ministers. Do I say they have raised it ? No, they have done worse. It has been a commonly accepted theory that until you get the consent of Parliament you cannot appropriate money, and should not appropriate it even by promise ; but before my hon. friend got the consent of Parliament, or put a measure before Parliament, he invited gentlemen to go into his

Cabinet, saying, I only give you $5,000 now and a Controllership, but you shall have $7,000 and a full Ministership if you will come into my Cabinet. They have come in, or are trying to come in, and this promise must be implemented. Parliament has not been consulted at all. Why is there not a measure for carrying out this promise ? Does my hon. friend propose to do this by Governor General's warrant as well ? He might just as well as pay the salaries of employees and officers of the Government by Governor General's warrants. Where, Sir, is that measure which hon. gentlemen have been for ten years declaring was needed by this country, a franchise measure ? No report was necessary to be laid on the Table in order to have that measure before the House. Why is it not here ? Where is that ninth and last plank in the platform of the Liberal convention of 1893, which declared that it was incumbent upon, and would be the duty of, the Liberal party when they came into power, to test the feelings of Canada on prohibition by a plebiscite of all the provinces ? On the strength of that promise, resolutions were passed, conferences sent notes of congratulation ; the Montreal "Witness" was elevated almost to the seventh heaven, and an era of coming elucidation of one of the most vexed questions in public life to-day, was heralded with the advent of that party to power. They are in power. It does not require blue-books to be down to make provision for a plebiscite. Why is there not a measure before the House to carry out that great and last promise in the platform of the Liberal party ? Then, Sir, why is there not, above all, a tariff measure ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That laugh is very indicative. I tell you what it sounds to me like : "Ha, ha, ha, you were fools enough to think that we were going to revise the tariff." If there is any translation for that laugh, that is the translation in plain English. Well, I acknowledge that you very likely have fooled us, as you have fooled a great many people in the Dominion. You went about for eighteen years fulminating against the iniquity of a protective system, and declaring in favour of free trade, declaring in favour of a revenue tariff which should have no vestige of protection in it. You nurtured the young men in your party upon that sort of pabulum. Your papers were flooded with it from Vancouver to Cape Breton. On the hustings, in your caucusses, and in your club meetings—everywhere you indoctrinated your people with that theory. You are face to face with your promises now. You said that when you came into power you would do so and so. You are in power. Will you execute the mandate ; will you put into execution what you promised, or is it that those promises and faint hearts have met together and so the promises lag in fulfilment to-day ? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there could be nothing stronger in the history of Parliament, there has been nothing stronger than the doctrine laid down with explicitness by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with respect to the enormity of protection, its deleterious effects to the country and the imminent and urgent necessity of getting it out of the country as soon as possible. Shall I refresh the hon. gentleman's memory ? Yesterday, in answer to a question asked by my hon. friend beside me, the leader of the Government said he could not remember exactly what he said ; he did not deny that the statement quoted expressed his opinion, as did the article in the Chicago "Record." Let me refresh the hon. gentleman's memory. At Brantford in 1890, August 20, the hon. gentleman said :

> I propose that we should follow England's example and open our ports to the products of the world.

At Winnipeg, in 1894, he said :

> The task of the Liberals of the province of Manitoba, the task of the Liberals of this province in particular, has been to prove to the world and to our countrymen the benefits which are to be derived from the principles of free trade. I came before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of freedom of trade. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage, yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage.

At Montreal he said :

> Upon that question I need not tell you that we stand at the very antipodes of the Conservative party. The Conservative party believe in protection. All their hope is in protection. The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines such as exist in Great Britain, and their immediate object is a revenue tariff—a tariff to be derived from customs, but which will levy no duties, except for the purposes of revenue.
>
> I have told you that our object is to have a customs tariff for revenue only.
>
> Upon the question of protection there can be no compromise.
>
> We stand here against protection, and in favour of a customs tariff based upon the principles of revenue and nothing else.
>
> The system of protection has been the bane and curse of Canada.
>
> The Liberal party believe in free trade on the broad lines such as exist in Great Britain.

At Brantford, in 1894, the hon. gentleman said :

> Is there any man to say that he would not be content to open the Canadian market to the American manufacturers if in return he obtained access to the American market for his products.

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is represented as stating :

> Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous protective system by free trade, revenue tariff, or continental free trade.

And again:

Sir, they demand our policy. Well, Sir, they shall have our policy, and here I believe I speak for my hon. friends beside me. Our policy is death to protection and war to the knife to corruption.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because in the hon. gentleman's opinion protection and corruption are indissolubly bound together.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," he adheres to that declaration. If the hon. gentleman does not put a knife into protection he is harbouring protection and corruption. The hon. gentleman further says:

We strike and will strike for liberty and freedom from this system of protective taxation.

Why does he not strike? Why are these slaves left for nine long months to be downtrodden by the monopolists of protection, and the hon. gentleman refuse to strike? The hon. gentleman says:

And I tell the hon. gentlemen that we will not rest until the slavery that they have imposed upon us has become a thing of the past, and until Canadians are as free as Canadians ought to be, free to make the most they can of the opportunities God has given them.

And there the hon. gentleman rests; there he is going to rest for nine months. The only difference is that he does not rest in the same seat he declared he was about to occupy. The hon. member for South Oxford said:

There is no Canadian manufacturer who need be afraid to face the competition of the world. Our policy is death to protection.

At Pembroke, in 1890, the hon. gentleman said:

A small ring and clique of combiners and protected manufacturers, who as I have told you, have been permitted for years past to make a prey and plunder of the people of Canada.

At Meaford the hon. gentleman said:

I stand by the declaration I have made that protection is nothing more nor less than deliberate legalized and organized robbery, and, more than that, if you do not stamp it out it is the very high road to political slavery and industrial slavery afterward.

Need I read more? Are not these statements as strong as the English language can make them? Is not this the pabulum on which they have been feeding the party until it has grown strong enough to put them in power. Now, why do they not carry out their promises? Why wait for nine months? This is August; they will wait, they say, until early in the year. They cannot get a tariff measure through this House before April, May, June or July of next year. Why should the country wait for these men's convenience? Why is it being "bled white," as the favourite phrase goes—why are the people being ground in slavery, as the leader of the Government declares? Surely hon. gentlemen opposite are bound, yes, bound by their past teaching and by every tenet of honourable party politics to lose not a single moment in putting their principles into operation and dealing the death blow to protection. But the leader of the Government has a reason now why we should go slowly. He says a change would cause a bad disturbance in the country. Did he not know that two, three or four years ago? The hon. gentleman who was leader of the Opposition, and is now leader of the Government, declares that to deal a death blow to protection would cause a severe disturbance, and it will not be done now, but nine months hence. Not only so, but this blow must not be dealt all at once, the work must be done gradually; meanwhile, the country is to remain nine months in this horrible slavery, which is described as worse than that formerly prevailing in the southern states. The hon. gentleman says that vested interests have grown up. He had to wait until last night's discussion to find that out. He does not appear to have known all these years that there were vested interests; and yet has not this crusade been begun and carried out with a full knowledge that there were vested interests at stake, and with a full determination to destroy these vested interests and cause a commercial disturbance which would ultimately prove as they declared for the good of the country, as it would cause the downfall of a bad system. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) says: But you cannot, for instance, take the duty off coal. He said, it must come off; it is a raw material, and seated right alongside of his friend (Mr. Fielding), he did not deny that last night. He said: The duty on coal must come off. Well, what was the hon. gentleman's excuse for not taking it off. It was: that because if you touch one there it deleteriously affects a great many other interests. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) tell me what will be deleteriously affected, outside of the coal industry, if coal is made free of duty? I do not think he will find any such industry. The makers of iron would like to have coal free. They would not be deleteriously affected by it. The men who run mills would like to have coal free, if they can get it; for it would not deleteriously affect their industry. I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite: Cannot you do now what you have been declaring year after year ought to be done, and what you have been specifying year after year should be done. There has not been a year from 1879 down until now, that hon. gentlemen leading the Opposition then, and now on the Treasury benches, have not gone into details, and by resolution, every one of them

voting for it in most cases, defined article after article, that ought to be reduced in duty, or that ought to have the duty entirely taken off. If you were ready for that in 1879, ready for it in 1882, ready for it in 1885, ready for it in 1890, ready for it in 1894, why are you not ready for it now? You were ready for it when you were in opposition, but you are not ready for it now when the responsibilities of office are on you. You were dealing in words then, you have to act now, and there is every difference between words and acts. Do my hon. friends opposite wish me to specify. Why, Sir, in 1879, Mr. Fiset—he is here in the House now supporting the gentlemen who are in the Government—and has that hon. gentleman any reason why what he thought ought to be done in 1879 should not be done now right off-hand? He moved:

That the 15 cents per bushel duty on wheat be struck off, and that wheat be transferred to the free list.

The leader of the government in the province of Quebec, if I mistake not, was the mover or the seconder of a resolution which declared for free wheat and free agricultural products. If the mind of the hon. gentleman was made up to this, and if he believed it right years ago, and is disposed to be the same enemy to protection to-day as he was then, what is to prevent him taking the duty off wheat? What interest outside of the wheat growing industry would be deleteriously affected? None. On the contrary, according to his own theory, we would get cheaper flour. The hon. gentleman's reason is no reason, but is a mere subterfuge.

Well, Sir, I find that Mr. Charlton, about the same time moved—and that hon. gentleman is now a member of this House:

That wheat, coal and pig iron be placed upon the free list.

And all the Liberals voted yea and said "Amen." Sir, that was in 1879, and if in 1879, wheat, and coal, and pig iron, should have been placed upon the free list, what is to prevent their being placed on the free list now, and placed on it at once? What, but the fact, that these gentlemen were in opposition then and they are in power to-day. Mr. Vallée moved a little later:

That wheat-flour imported into this country be placed on the free list.

And all the Liberals voted for it. If they were right then why do they not carry that out now? On the 30th March, 1882, Mr. Laurier moved:

That the duties on coal, coke, and breadstuffs be repealed and that these articles be made free.

Forty-seven Liberals voted for that, and 120 Conservatives voted against it, and yet my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) after fourteen years, and professing that he holds the same opinion, and denouncing the bondage of protection, is not ready to implement, now that he is in power, what he vociferously demanded in 1882 when he was out of power. In 1886, Mr. Mitchell moved the same motion, and Mr. Laurier and all the Liberals voted "yea." In 1893 a motion was moved:

That no sufficient reason has been adduced or exists requiring investigation, respecting the foregoing facts which are notorious, nor justifying delay in the passage of remedial legislation which is imperative.

The remedial legislation, to wit, being:

A reduction of duties upon the necessaries of life.

That was a motion moved by Mr. McCarthy and voted for by Mr. Laurier and the Liberal party. But, now they say we want investigation. In 1893 there was no investigation needed according to them, and no delay was justifiable for the thing ought to be done and done at once. Well, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) now in the Government, a few years ago moved:

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

For that the Liberals all voted. They believed that it was right then, that the time was ripe, that no delay was necessary and that it should be done off-hand. Why do they not carry it out to-day when they are in power? Any way, what becomes of my hon. friend's excuse that you must have investigation, and that if you do this it would cause disturbance, and that you must be very careful as to when you proceed with it. The trouble is, Sir, as I have said before, that their large promises have been too much for them. Their heart is faint within them when they come to the time of action, and they are simply marking time to gain their breath, to get over the by-elections, offending nobody as far as possible, and after that they will see what they will do.

Now, if there is a change of heart, if the hon. gentlemen have experienced a change of heart, will not they be manly and honourable enough to confess it? It must be a change of heart, or else they stand open to the imputation of going back on their policy. If it is a change of heart they have experienced, let them tell us anyway. I hold that it is incontrovertible, that in the case of the great business interests of this country which have been modelled for 18 years upon a certain tariff and revenue system, in which there is unbounded capital for Canada, and in which the labour of this country is vitally interested; I say this position is incontrovertible: that if you refuse to act at once, after having used these weapons and infused uncertainty and fear into the business interests of this country, if you refuse

to act, and yet make a delay of nine months; the least thing that you could do, the thing that the country demands of you and which your duty should prompt you to do, is, to indicate the principle upon which you propose to revise the tariff. A gentleman said to the leader of a government: I am engaged in a manufacturing industry; I manufacture this year for my sales of twelve or fifteen months hence: If you are going to revise the tariff and scale down the duties on my products, I will not manufacture; I want you at least to tell me what principle you are going to adopt, so that I may accommodate my business and my capital to it. What answer has been given? What answer would be given, if that question were put to my hon. friend? If millions of capital put that question to him, what would he answer? His duty is to tell those men and to advise that capital whether he is going to revise the tariff keeping a sufficient protection, or whether he is going to revise it on the basis of free trade and a tariff for revenue only. It is simple robbery not to do that. It is unfair and unjust to the interests of labour and capital alike. Surely the hon. gentleman does not go about whispering into private ears: "Don't you be afraid, I will not hurt your industry." Surely he will come to this House, the high court of Parliament, the people's representation, and take them into his confidence, and tell them what they are to tell their constituents, what they are to report back to the country. The hon. gentleman cannot do less than that. It is the duty of this Opposition to try and get that enunciation from this Government. I think we would fail in our duties if we left the precincts of this House and went back to our constituents without being able to tell them at least the principle on which hon. gentlemen propose to proceed. Now, Sir, the Manitoba school question has been brought up. I have little to say about that at the present time. I have simply to say this, that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition gave what I consider to be a very strong and a very fair statement of the canvasses upon that question, and of the Janus-like policy of my hon. friends opposite upon it. The only reply to it which my hon. friend gave was in standing up, as the leader of a Government and a statesman, and raising the accusation and the cry of race and creed prejudice against my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Everybody in this country who has followed the course of the last contest knows exactly the truth of the statements that were made; aye, and gentlemen sitting very close to the Premier know who raised the cry of race and creed then. The Toronto "Globe" itself knows who raised it, when it declares, as it did not long ago, that the question was not now as to whether a remedial Bill should be passed or not, but whether the hierarchy should rule this country or not. These two statements went into different portions of the country—one facing in the line of no coercion, that is, no remedial legislation here, come what might; the other facing in the line of the rights of the minority in Manitoba being granted, by the province if it would grant them, through this Parliament if the province would not grant them. It was on these two diverse cries that my hon. friend conducted his campaign and gained something of his success. Now, Sir, so far as I am concerned, I am going to await the pleasure of my hon. friend. He has made the statement for the information of the House, after having made it in the newspapers, that a conference has been held, and that the matter is practically settled or under way of settlement; and the Toronto "Globe," the organ of my hon. friend, speaking by authority yesterday, affirms that it is practically settled on all points. I thought we were to have an investigation. I thought there was to be a great commission, with Sir Oliver Mowat at its head and ever so many more with him, to get information that neither the Government nor the members of Parliament nor anybody else possessed, but for which they were thirsting, and without which it was altogether and absolutely impossible to come to any agreement. Yet, with no commission, no investigation, no evidence further than what we have had, the hon. gentleman comes before the House and the country now and says the matter is practically settled. Well, I have this statement to make, that if the Manitoba school question is practically settled by an agreement between the Manitoba government and my hon. friend's Government opposite, and settled to the satisfaction of the minority, giving the minority their rights under the constitution—if the question is settled in that way, it will be settled to the eternal and everlasting disgrace of party politics in this Dominion of Canada. What do I mean by that? Not that I would be sorry to find it settled; but if the Manitoba government settle the question in affiliation with my hon. friend opposite, they will settle it on the basis which they refused to the former Government, thus publishing to the world that the two had been acting in secret concert, and had kept up the contest for party purposes. Time will tell, Sir, whether the question will be settled in that way or not; and when the hon. gentleman brings down the settlement it will be time enough to take that matter up and discuss it further. Until that time comes, I do not propose to have anything more to say upon it. Now, Sir, I come to the final point which I wish to take up, that is, this new evangel of the new Liberal Government comprising all the talents and all the virtues. They have begun; let us see whether they have begun well or not. They vaunt the principles of Liberalism. My hon. friend is fond of repeating the phrase until I suppose he believes it, that

he is a Liberal of the old Liberal school, of the old English school. He holds to Liberal principles, he vaunts them, he makes them his creed, he elevates them for his worship. When this new Liberal Ministry, based on these old, sound doctrines of Liberalism, come in and commence their administration, we on this side of the House must be excused if we ask them to live up to the high plane of their professions and their ideals; and so, with a great deal of curiosity, we watch their progress. What is it so far? The first thing they do is to go back on the old Liberal principle of economy—economy in governmental machinery—and raise the salaries of two members of the Government, and make them full-fledged Ministers of the Crown without reducing the number in any other direction. That is their first act. Their second is to interfere with the processes of the courts of law in what I believe to be a most unjustifiable manner. The principle is one which every one must admit, that the Government, whatever power it may possess, must keep its hands off the courts of law whilst the processes of law are going on. Once a suit is instituted in a court, the Government of this country must stand back until the court has had its say; and when the court has given its decision, there is the prerogative of the Government that may be invoked for pardon or the lessening of the penalty. But, I repeat, that while the suit is before the courts, no Government has the right to step in and steal from the person who made the indictment, the fruits of his indictment, under the full and regular course of law. We have to-day on the statutes of Parliament what is known as the Independence of Parliament Act. What is it for? It is there in order that every man who sits in this House shall be independent of the Government, as far as salary and emoluments are concerned. If I hold an office from the Crown, if I am receiving a salary from the Crown, and am elected, that election is void, so far as giving me a seat in this House is concerned. The Independence of Parliament Act is for that purpose, and no other. But how have these hon. gentlemen used it? When they wished to dispossess a man of his seat and put another in his place, they invoked a device fastened upon that law, but not an organic portion of it, and which was never meant to be an organic portion of it. They invoked the device of the Chiltern Hundreds, and said: We will get you out of your seat by giving you the appearance of an office. And they gave an office to the member for Queen's, N.S., in order to make a place for the Minister of Finance. That is not so bad, but Mr. King was elected in the province of New Brunswick, on the 23rd of June, as the representative of Sunbury and Queen's, for the next term of Parliament. In due course, an election petition was filed against him, and the required deposit of a thousand dollars was made. The petitioner thus brought the matter into court, he thus demanded that the evidence be heard and judgment given, and that, should he prove his case, the penalty provided be inflicted, namely, that the seat be voided and the whole cost of the prosecution fall against the man whose seat was voided. While that suit was before the courts, this Liberal Government stepped in and took Mr. King out of court, and, so far as that penalty was concerned, made him a free man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No, look at the law.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not a lawyer, but I will leave it to the judgment of the House which has carefully followed what I have said. I say that, so far as the penalty is concerned, namely, that the seat should be voided and that the party whose seat was voided, should pay the costs of the suit caused by his corrupt and dishonourable practices; as far as that is concerned, the Government have taken the case out of court, and robbed the petitioner of his due, under the Corrupt Practices Act. The postmastership of Marsh Hill at $100 a year was given to Mr. King, and by that very fact the processes of the court were stopped. I leave it to the lawyers to argue what processes still remain, what penalties of another sort may be sued for, whether disqualification may be asked for; but if the processes of the court have not been interfered with, what follows? It follows that we might yet pursue that petition, and if the evidence be sufficient, void the seat; and then where does the second man who follows in the meantime stand with reference to the law? That is a question which I leave to lawyers. It is a nice question, but my view of it has been given. I say that nothing like it has ever been done by any previous Government in this country. I charge my hon. friends with interference with courts of law for party purposes, and I say that the verdict of this country will, when the people think the matter over, be against hon. gentlemen opposite. If you can take one man who has been petitioned against out of the courts, you can take every one of them. There are more post offices of $10 per year, and one can be given to every Liberal member protested against, and every Liberal member can, by the same process, be taken out of the court, and avoid all the costs and disgrace that attaches to the loss of his seat, and receive instead a Government office. Every Liberal member protested against can thus avoid all the dishonour, and save his pocket and reputation by having the Government interfere with the law courts.

With regard to the Governor General's warrants, the course taken is a totally new departure. It is a departure not contemplated by the constitution. It is a depart-

ure against the right of the Commons to decide beforehand what each appropriation shall be and how it must be spent. My hon. friend, at the inauguration of his Government, is committing a grave mistake, which will follow him and discredit his administration all through. He may some time, when political exigency makes it necessary —and political exigencies may be very pressing with him some of these days—refuse to call Parliament together for six months or a year, and secure his appropriations by means of Governor General's warrants. Sir, from this time out, while my hon. friend leads this Government, I shall never feel safe that they will not take that same advantage to meet party exigencies and tide themselves over a difficulty. If they can do it in one case, they can do it in another.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You were never safer in your life than now.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, when I look at my hon. friend who is speaking, I feel perfectly safe.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will protect you.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed that these hon. gentlemen were in favour of protection; the hon. gentleman acknowledges it. But there is another and graver point yet. A new era has certainly been ushered in as regards authoritative announcements of policy. We have before us the Speech from the Throne, and we have in the public press a speech from the man in front of the Throne. The Speech from the Throne gives us absolutely no information. The speech outside the Throne takes up a line of international policy of most extensive proportions and of the greatest gravity to this country to-day and for all future years. My hon. friend is following the bad example of his colleague who sits behind him (Mr. Tarte), who has inaugurated the interesting procedure of going to his department and looking through his papers in order to get hold of certain facts, and then, under the signature of "J. Israel Tarte," sending them to a newspaper which he edits, and which is looked upon as his own organ. That he may do, but he will find it more dangerous to himself and his colleagues than to the Opposition. But the matter to which I am now about to refer is of a different colour entirely. Here is the leader of the Government, who comes in with what he calls a strong Ministry, who declares that he hopes to remain in power for fifteen or eighteen years, who hopes to build up a strong and able Government to control the affairs of this country. But he is hardly warm in his seat before he rushes into a question of national and international gravity which might well appal the strongest and oldest and most experienced statesmen that Canada has ever had. He pleads that he opens his heart, that he is candid and honest. Well, a man may open his heart too widely, and be altogether too candid and honest in diplomatic particulars. What has he done? First, as leader of the Government, he declares to the world that he hopes, under his administration, for a renewal of neighbourly relations with the United States. What does my hon. friend mean by that? If he means anything, he means that neighbourly relations have been interrupted between the United States and Canada, and that under his administration he hopes to renew them. Well, Sir, the speech of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) last night was a complete answer to that. You cannot go through the annals of the last ten or eleven years without seeing that Canada, though she has stood by her rights, and has been upheld by Britain in her interpretation of those rights, has done it with a consistency, with an urbanity, and with a steady courtesy, which has won the admiration of the people of the United States and the hearty commendation of the British Government itself, as expressed in the despatches. And to say, because we have rights, and maintained them and maintained them strongly, that we are guilty of endangering the relations between ourselves and another power, is to say that you must give up all rights if the power against which you urge them refuses or is loath to acknowledge them, and if there is liability of friction if they be urged. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has simply carried out in this, what he unfortunately stated in Boston in 1891, when he declared that the conduct of Britain towards the United States in the war of 1860-66 was such as should bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of the people of Britain. He has not forgotten the sentiment that he expressed then, and he has carried it out in this correspondence with the Chicago "Record." But when all these arguments and all these despatches, and all this correspondence culminated in 1888, when the treaty was formed, as my hon. friend said, the highest authority in the United States bore testimony to the honourable and reasonable settlement that was made, and from that day to this the United States have had no fault to find with the administration by Canada of these fisheries. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman goes on then to declare that his policy on the question of the fisheries is a policy of give and take. And, to bring it down to a fine point, he announces his policy to be this: Free ports, free fishing, and free fish markets. That is what he proposes. He proposes to give to the United States, free access to our fisheries within the three-mile limit, free access to our ports in spite of the treaty of 1818, and a free market for their fish, if they will do the same by us. What did he and his party say in 1888? The result of the negotiations in 1888 came to this—that a delimitation of the waters of Canada was to be made, preserving the

three-mile limit, and preserving the large bays; that this delimitation having been made, United States fishing vessels should have access to our ports for the purposes of their occupation, to get supplies and to trade in supplies alone. There was to be no fishing, there was to be no commerce. And in addition, there was the proviso that as soon as the United States gave free markets for our fish we would give free markets for their fish, and when that was accomplished, the full scope of the treaty would be covered. Contrast that with my hon. friend's proposition. And yet at that time, Sir, every Liberal paper in Canada had headlines announcing a base and ignominious surrender. The Toronto "Globe" declared that we had betrayed Canada. In this House the same criticism was made, and yet that was but a mild experiment as compared with what my hon. friend proposes. When you propose to allow the United States fishermen within our three-mile limit, and within our ports to conduct the operations of fishing and commerce, you propose to go a long way; and that change will never be made until this House has carefully looked into the matter, and has found what the compensating advantages are. Why, Sir, the old treaty did not go that far, and we got out of it $5,000,000 further compensation. And yet my hon. friend, as leader of the Government, cavalierly proposes, and sends his proposal to the people of the United States, by way of the Chicago "Record," that far greater privileges shall be granted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). To which treaty does the hon. gentleman refer when he speaks of the "old" treaty?

Mr. FOSTER. The treaty under which the award of 1875 was made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You do not mean the treaty of 1854?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You called it the "old" treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. The one I have been describing——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the "young" treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the "young" treaty is the treaty of 1888. The leader of the Government goes further yet. He takes up the canal question, and on the authority of the leader of the Government and as though by the advice of and consent of his Government and his party, he declares for—what? For a joint deepening and completion of the canals from the head of the lakes to Montreal, and for the joint control of them after they are built. And, what is still worse, when brought to book, he defends himself by a representation which turns out to be a misrepresentation. Has the hon. gentleman the document from which he read last night?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have not. It is in the "Hansard" office.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I shall be obliged to quote it from memory. The statement the hon. gentleman made was this: That in that interview he was only following out the policy of the late Government. Then he read the Order in Council appointing the deep waterways commission in order to back up that statement, and it didn't back it up. I challenge him to rise and repeat that statement now, after he has read that Order in Council. Will the hon. gentleman say that in making that statement of policy he is only following the policy laid down by the late Government in the Order in Council? The hon. gentleman will not say so. But he said so last night. Unfortunately for him, he read the document, and that document goes into "Hansard," and is a sufficient answer to his statement. The policy of the late Government went no further than this: To appoint a joint commission on the deep waterways, to inquire into the whole matter, but to go not one single step further, nor was there the least indication of what would be the policy of the Government when the report was brought in. Has my hon. friend received that report? Does he know what the findings of that commission are? Have they told him what expense will be incurred? Has he got their opinions as to how joint control is to be arranged? No, Sir. The hon. gentleman wanted investigation and evidence in the Manitoba school question. He does not want any evidence in this case. Without consultation with his council, without waiting for a report, without a scintilla of information, he pledges himself, and pledges his party, and so far as he can, he pledges this country, to a joint building of these waterways, and a joint control of them with the United States. Fifty or seventy-five million dollars would be our share at least. Has his Council decided to do it? Are we prepared to vote that? For what purpose? To give facilities to 25 farmers of the United States where it would give them to one of our own. And what is more, Sir, he takes the dangerous initial step of allowing a control of vital waterways to be given to a great nation twenty times as powerful as we are, with all the initial complications which may result therefrom. Sir, the instincts of Canada are for a future of her own. She will develop her own property; and I say that no self respecting people with a future, or with the high record of progress and of advancement we have now made, can remain a people and give joint control to a rival and more powerful nation in the vital waterways of that coun-

try. Now, what has been done by my hon. friend? He has announced his policy. If any negotiations take place, he is the man who will carry on those negotiations, and from this time forward when he goes to Washington, that pledge will be there to face him as the pledge of a man who is the leader of the Government; and if we go, that will be there to face us as the pledge of a man who was the leader of a Canadian government. It is most unfortunate, it is most unprecedented, and the hon. gentleman will find that he cannot play ducks and drakes with these great interests of the country and hope to escape the scathing condemnation of the people.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have often had occasion in former times to admire the great histrionic talents of my hon. friend, but I do not know that I ever admired them more than I have done to-day on hearing him address the House under circumstances which might, perhaps, have been difficult for a less accomplished actor. In the first place, I propose to deal with one or two remarks he made in the opening of his speech, and which appeared to me, I am sorry to say, to involve a serious slur on the distinguished leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for—what is his present county?

An hon. MEMBER. York.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Oh, York.

Mr. FOSTER. Your memory ought to be good, for you have exercised it enough.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. member for York was pleased to tell us that among the claims on the confidence of the Liberal-Conservative party which the leader of the Opposition enjoys, was this, that it was possible for him to have been still enjoying the sweets of a high and lucrative office if he had not chosen to come across here. Now, Sir, what an insinuation does that convey? Had not the hon. leader of the Opposition come across here, the member for York insinuates that they would have been still on this side of the House, and consequently the hon. gentleman would have been able still to enjoy the sweets of his high and lucrative office. There is no other possible construction; because I think he knows that, under existing circumstances, the sense of propriety of the leader of the Opposition would not have led him to continue in that high and lucrative office had he been there; and therefore it is perfectly clear that the opinion of my hon. friend from York is that if the hon. gentleman had stuck to his office in England, these gentlemen would have stuck to their offices here.

Sir, it is made a very grave ground of complaint against my hon. friend beside me, that he has rallied to his cause three, if not four, of the most distinguished statesmen in Canada, men who have proved their ability by the length of time during which they have successfully administered the affairs of Ontario, of New Brunswick, and of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend in that, as in many other things, has shown that he is able on occasion to arise above precedent, and his party has shown that they, too, are able to rise above precedent; and that when the best men can be got for any office, they will be welcomed, from whatever quarter they come. But, Sir, did the hon. gentleman make no attempts on their side to obtain the services of men who had at one time, at any rate, been premiers of important provinces? Why, I think the present Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec could tell a tale of distressful appeals, and vain appeals, made to him by hon. gentlemen opposite. But Mr. Chapleau was gifted with great political sagacity. He read the signs of the times. Perhaps he remembered how the hon. gentlemen in times past had treated him, and while he was not sorry to see them on their knees to him, still he was not disposed to come down from his high and lucrative office, or comfortable office at any rate, for the purpose of relieving these worthy gentlemen in their distress. The hon. member for York said, and said correctly, that there is every difference between words and acts; and sorry am I to say that a gentleman who can indulge in words so lofty, should sometimes descend to acts so small. My hon. friend beside me gave to hon. gentlemen opposite the other evening three causes why those gentlemen had justly forfeited the confidence of the people of this country. So far as I recollect, those causes were these: They had refused to inaugurate any substantial or useful reforms in their tariff; they had been shown, not once but a hundred times over, to have been guilty of such corruption and such extravagance as have rarely disgraced the annals of any country; certainly never before disgraced ours; and they had displayed both cowardice and incapacity in dealing with an extremely delicate and difficult question which, in the hands of my hon. friend, I hope will soon be settled to the satisfaction of all parties. Good reasons, excellent reasons, why the people of Canada should withdraw their confidence from those hon. gentlemen. But, Sir, there was a fourth reason which my hon. friend did not give, but which I may recall to the attention of the members of this House, namely, the disgust which all honest men of every sort and profession throughout Canada, Conservative and Reformer alike, felt at the act of treachery with which the last session of the last Parliament of Canada was heralded in. That, Sir, as hon. gentlemen right well know, was one among many reasons why the Conservative party of Canada, or a very great many of them,

withdrew their confidence from those hon. gentlemen. What could they think of a government which went to the last election having within their ranks seven gentlemen who had betrayed their former colleagues and their former leader, and having carefully expurgated from their ranks every man who had been faithful to his salt ? Sir, what could my hon. friend, Sir A. P. Caron, from Three Rivers, say if circumstances permitted him to give his candid opinion of these hon. gentlemen ? Sir, I observe that the leader of the Opposition, in a candid moment, confessed that the result in the province of Quebec had been a great disappointment to him. Doubtless it was a great disappointment to him. I do not wonder. The hon. gentleman also told the House that he had been, for an ordinary lifetime, a member of the legislature, some four and forty years, and in all that long experience, so far as my recollection serves me—and the member for York (Mr. Foster) says it is generally tolerably accurate—this was the first occasion when he made the mistake of prefering the saints to the sinners. This was the first time the hon. gentleman ever trusted to spiritual weapons instead of to the arm of flesh. If we are to believe the hon. gentleman's statement last night, I can well believe he will never do it again. But, Sir, like the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), the hon. gentleman is capable of extracting great comfort from the electoral returns. We do not grudge it to him. I remember long ago, I think in the days of the South Sea bubble, a company was formed for the purpose of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers, but I never heard it paid any dividends. If the hon. gentleman and his friends really want the facts, I, being of an arithmetical turn of mind, can comply with his wish. The hon. gentleman was good enough to declare that they had a majority —heaven save the mark—of 19,000, no less, over the vote polled for the Liberal party at the last elections. Sir, I find that that majority, and more too, is wholly and exclusively obtained from my own province of Ontario. There the Conservative party had a majority, as they say, of 25,000 strong. How does the House suppose this majority is obtained ? The majority is obtained in part by claiming for themselves all the votes recorded in favour of a well-known member of this House against whom the leader of the Opposition set up a candidate of his own ; hon. gentlemen opposite claim the 4,000 or 5,000 votes accorded to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I think my hon. friend will admit, being a candid-minded man, that a very large proportion of these representative votes of Liberals who most decidedly preferred him to the candidate of the hon. gentleman opposite. But that was not all ; and here I come on a piece of truly excellent calculation. Sir, I find that in West Toronto, all told, 10,200 votes, or thereabouts, appear to have been polled by both parties, and of those so polled, hon. gentlemen opposite claimed 10,517. I can understand that the wisdom of the legislature may give one voter two votes, but I do not think that either by the wisdom or power of the legislature the hon. gentleman will be able to turn a man who may have two votes into two individuals ; it is reserved to those who compile Conservative majorities to do that. I will give hon. gentlemen opposite a fact or two. The hon. leader of the Opposition was good enough to say that we sat here representing a minority, forsooth. The hon. gentleman arrived at that conclusion, so far as Ontario is concerned, by the trifling process of eliminating about 66,000 votes, all of which were cast at all events against the late Government, because he right well knows that the votes which were recorded for the Patron candidates, and for the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) who has just resigned his second seat, were most decidedly cast in opposition to the late Conservative Government. But here is an interesting fact, and as the hon. gentleman opposite is fond of these things, I will give it to him. There were 73 cases in Ontario in which Conservatives and Liberals stood opposed ; 73 cases in which the two parties came in direct collision. What was the result ? In those counties, the total Conservative vote was 149,350, and the total Liberal vote was 161,000, so where the Liberals and the Conservatives stood opposed in 73 constituencies, we had a majority of 12,000 votes. It is true there were 19 constituencies in which either Conservatives or Liberals put up no candidates. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell the House that in those nineteen constituencies, or rather in seventeen constituencies, in which the Liberals, for good reasons of state, did not put up candidates, the Liberal party had vanished into thin air? Why, in 1891, in those seventeen constituencies (and I have the returns under my hand), the Liberal party polled well nigh 30,000 votes, and we would have polled more in 1896. If first you will deduct the Liberal vote in West York placed to the credit of the Conservative party, and place to the credit of the Conservative party the actual number of Conservative votes polled in West Toronto, and not the imaginary number which goes into the count in the memorandum I hold in my hand, and give us credit, I do not say for the vote we would have polled, but for the vote actually polled in the last election, the majority in our favour will be more like 15,000 than 5,000 ; and if we add together all the votes polled throughout Ontario against the Government, there were something like 227,000 votes polled against them, as compared with 191,000 votes, which they claimed, but which they did not poll. Sir, I would hardly have wasted time on this matter, because I think there are very few such tyros in political affairs as not to

know what calculations of that kind mean and are worth, but for the fact that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) saw fit to re-echo the words of his chief with respect to this matter. I am sure he is welcome to all the comfort he can extract from it, but which all the same does not, in the slightest degree, affect the fact that my hon. friend sits here with a majority of thirty-five or forty behind him, and the hon. gentleman opposite in a like minority, and that is giving the leader of the Opposition credit for the alliance which I am told was recently effected with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who is now, I take it, if all tales be true, the true head of the party, in place of its nominal one. One word more. Sir, that result in Ontario, let me add, was attained in the face of a gerrymander which cost, in all human probability, at least eight or ten seats at the last general elections, as it has done on many occasions before. That result was attained in spite of a Franchise Act, under which thousands of men who never should have a vote in this country were brought in, greatly to our detriment and at no small expense to hon. gentlemen opposite. But there is one curious little matter to which the hon. gentleman did not allude. I think it would be nearly correct to say that hon. gentlemen opposite have some 42 or 43 seats in Ontario, and my hon. friend beside me is likely to receive the support of 48 or 49 members from that province, if the hon. leader of the Opposition desires to know. But there is one somewhat curious fact. Of the fifty seats on the Reform side, including their friends who think with them in these matters, not even malice itself has been able to formulate against one of them a charge of holding his seat by corrupt practices.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. While on the other side of the House, out of forty-two or forty-three, or whatever the number may be, one man out of every three stands impeached before the tribunals of the country as guilty of gross corruption and bribery. When, I ask, in the annals of Parliament, was it ever known that fifty men had succeeded in gaining their seats on either side of the House from one province, and not a soul could be found to lay a charge against them ?

Now, Sir, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), aye, and the hon. leader of the Opposition, attacked—and they have a perfect right to attack, if they think proper to do so—they attacked the use which my hon. friend beside me was compelled to make of His Excellency's warrants. Sir, I do not withdraw one single syllable of the statements that I made in 1891 as to the improper use then made by hon. gentlemen opposite of the Governor General's warrants. I withdraw nothing. I adhere to the statements I made then ; but, Sir, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was perfectly accurate in quoting me then, I demand, on my part, that the hon. gentleman should show that there is any possible parallelism between the case which existed then and the case which exists now. Sir, what did I condemn ? What I condemned was this : I condemned the case of men who being in a Government and having the power of making provision, deliberately and of gross carelessness, as my hon. friend stated, neglected to make provision for clear and imminent expenditures, and preferred to take the course of issuing a Governor General's warrant. What is our case, Sir ? Our case is this : Our case is that we succeeded a Government whose misconduct had brought about a state of things utterly unparalleled in Canadian history. Sir, my case is this : that the hon. gentlemen, in holding the last session of the last Parliament, utterly violated the entire spirit of our constitution. They offended against our unwritten law. They offended against usage, against common sense and against precedent. They did what they had not the right to do. I say, Sir, that morally, if not in a strictly technical legal sense, they had no business whatever to hold Parliament together for one moment after five years had elapsed. I never acquiesced in the doctrine, and I do not acquiesce in it now, that except in some extraordinary emergency such as never existed in their case, Parliament should be kept together for more than five years ; and I take issue in the strongest possible language with the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman, that he had a right to ask, or that we had a right to pass estimates for six months, or for three months, and put them into the hands of a Government which we knew we could not trust, a Government which did not even pretend to represent the country, a Government which was elected on lists eight years old, and which of necessity could by no possibility pretend to represent more than a fraction of the people. I say, Sir, that we could not be called upon to put into their hands the power of remaining in office, long after the confidence of the people had been withdrawn from them. Sir, I recollect perfectly well the doctrines which were not unfrequently enunciated by the late Sir John A. Macdonald. Whatever else he may have been he was at any rate a good tactician, and an old and skilled parliamentarian. Over and over again, I have heard him—and I daresay many hon. gentlemen opposite have heard him—declaring that under no consideration would he be a party to sitting in a parliament, if he led it, which should be compelled to remain in session until such time as it dissolved by efflux of time. For that he had a good reason. I will tell hon.

gentlemen opposite what, in my judgment, they should have done. They might have felt themselves bound, under the circumstances, to have met in January, not for the purpose of hatching treason against their leader and colleague, but for the purpose of redeeming their pledge and telling us what they were going to do with the province of Manitoba. But, Sir, having met us in January, having found—as if they possessed one grain of common sense they must have seen and known—having seen that it was utterly impossible for them to hope to pass a Remedial Bill, or to hope to pass the Estimates either, it was their bounden duty to have dissolved in March at latest. It was their bounden duty to have gone to the country in April. It was their special duty to have seen to it that Parliament should meet at a sufficiently early period in May or June, so as to avoid this complication, and to have given time for those who possessed the confidence of the people to bring down proper Estimates for the year 1896-97. Sir, it was by reason of their gross violation of the usages of the constitution, by reason of their indecent clinging to office, by reason of their paltry intrigues, by reason of their cowardly and incapable handling of the Manitoba question, that it became necessary for us, under the circumstances which the hon. gentleman knows of, to obtain these Governor General's warrants, and to procure the means of carrying on the Government of this country. I would like to know, Sir, what the hon. gentleman would have us do? Would the hon. gentleman have desired that we who have grave responsibilities on our hands, would he have it that the Government of Canada, which has to conduct extensive business in railways and on canals, and which has to maintain a permanent force; would he have desired that we should have refused to pay our railway employees, or our canal employees, or the members of our permanent force, or even the poor clerks in these offices. Was that what he would have desired? And does he pretend to charge it as a crime against us that we provided, under those circumstances, for the carrying on of the public services, and avoided great injury to the various great interests which would have been hampered had we refused to ask for a Governor General's warrant. I dare say, if my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) had chosen to dodge this issue, he could have obtained from some of the banks which deal with the Government and which receive the public moneys; he could have obtained in a roundabout and in a surreptitious way as much money as he obtained by Governor General's warrant. But, Sir, considering the question fully, we thought that this was a cowardly way of dealing with the difficulty. We thought it was our duty to face it boldly, and I have authority quite as good, from a legal point of view, as any that sits behind the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster), for saying that what we did was well within the scope of the Act, and that it did come within the words "a grant of sums of money which had not been foreseen or provided for by Parliament." I will grant, Sir, that in all human probability it never entered into the consideration of the framers of that Act, or of any other Canadian Act, that ever there would be a Government or a Parliament so lost to good sense and propriety, that they would continue to sit in office until Parliament dissolved by efflux of time. Sir, they were the leaders of the only Canadian Parliament that ever did it, and I trust most devotedly that they will prove to be the last. Now, Sir, I say that so far as that goes, the hon. gentleman is responsible. He is specially responsible, and his colleagues are likewise responsible, for all the evil consequences or bad precedents that may have arisen in this matter. I say more, Sir, that he has no right to hold us responsible for anything in the Governor General's warrant unless he is able to show that we have used them for a purpose which we could fairly have dispensed with. Now, when he talked of our having asked for a million dollars and only spent $600,000, the hon. gentleman was as well aware as I am, that our Auditor General, as a matter of course, is not in the habit of passing all the cheques that are sent to him unless full investigation has been made. I have no doubt, and the hon. gentleman himself has no doubt, that the full sum that was asked will be expended, and will be properly employed in the payment of the various services that have been incurred.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will say that the note appended to the return brought down gives the reason exactly as I have stated it, namely, that the estimates of the departments were greater than the requirements.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think they will be found to be greater than the requirements when all the accounts come in. The hon. gentleman, as an old Minister of Finance, can well understand that there are every quarter a number of contracts—take for illustration the post office contracts—which have to be met, and he knows very well that in every case some considerable length of time must elapse, and does elapse after these sums have been asked for and checked out, before the Auditor General is perfectly satisfied with the validity of the payment. He knows that that is a matter of common occurrence. You have only to look at our annual statement of receipts and expenditure to see that month after month the expenditure appears to lag far behind the receipts, for the reason I have stated, and it is scarcely possible for the Auditor General, with all the dili-

gence that can be used, to be at once satisfied as to the propriety of these payments. In that and in nothing else will be found a fair and sufficient reason for the discrepancy to which I have alluded. But when the hon. gentleman reads us on this side of the House a lecture because we refused to grant the supplies he asked for, all I have to tell him is that if ever there was an occasion on which our clearest duty was to refuse to grant supplies, it was in the session that terminated on the 23rd of April last. We had, I repeat, as clear presumptive evidence as was ever given or could be given, that hon. gentlemen opposite did not represent in any sense or shape the people of the country. For that reason we were justified; and, what is more, English precedent fully maintained us, as the hon. gentleman well knows, in refusing to comply with his request.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage that it is well not to prophesy unless you know, and I think my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) would have done as well not to intimate to us that he had just returned from a county and a contest in which a certain hon. member of this Government was fighting for his life. It will give him pleasure, I do not doubt, to know that his old-time acquaintance, if he did fight for his life, made a good fight for it, for the latest returns handed to me by the telegraph office show a net majority for the Hon. Mr. Blair of 550. It cannot be an instance of French domination, but I am afraid it is an instance of maritime domination, that my poor friend, Mr. Paterson, has to be content in North Grey with a paltry 413. This, Sir, will give our friends opposite the opportunity of doing a little revising of their calculation of majorities.

And now, Sir, there remain, so far as I am aware, three charges preferred severally by my hon. friend from York and by the hon. leader of the Opposition to be disposed of. With one of these I have dealt in part. These hon. gentlemen contend that we had no right, no matter what the exigencies of the state might be, to have recourse to the provision in the statute for the issue of a Governor General's warrant. They were both greatly exercised as to the shuffling policy pursued by my hon. friend with regard to Manitoba—as to which, as I see that my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is in his place, I shall have something more to say before I close this speech. In the next place, they are still more exercised because we do not instantly bring down a tariff to change every item of something like the thousand separate taxes which they put on in the course of the last few years. Sir, the hon. member for York took it upon himself to declare—I took down his words—that there was no need for us to call Parliament together, because, forsooth, by the free use of Governor General's warrants we might continue to administer the affairs of this country pretty much as long as we pleased. Sir, we do not so read our duty to the country, and I say that this Government did its duty in both respects. This Government is charged with seeing that the commonwealth take no injury in their hands, and in pursuance of their duty they assumed the responsibility, for which they are prepared to answer to this Parliament whenever hon. gentlemen choose to challenge us, to advise His Excellency to issue warrants for necessary purposes, and necessary purposes alone, such as the needs of the country imperatively required. Sir, that was our duty, in the first place; but it was our duty, in the second place, the moment that was done, not to lose one hour in calling Parliament together, and in explaining to them the reasons why we had ventured so to advise His Excellency. Sir, this whole question lies in a nutshell, and the hon. gentleman knows it well. The question is not, as he would have it, whether or not it was advisable under ordinary circumstances to issue these warrants. The question is this: had the late Government a right to hold the House together until the very last legal instant? And on that question I say, as I said before, that usage, precedent and common sense are all alike dead against hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, the late Government had no right whatever under the circumstances to keep Parliament in session till so late a period that it was impossible to appeal to the people, impossible to have an election, and impossible for the new Parliament to meet in time to vote the supplies. Above all, under the circumstances, they had not the least right to ask to be trusted with the expenditure of the supplies for the future year. They had in no sense the right to say that they represented the people of Canada. As I pointed out during the course of last session time and time again—and no man on that side of the House pretended to answer my argument—that Parliament was elected on lists eight years old, and it was a physical impossibility, therefore, that it could represent the people of Canada. More than that, the whole current of the by-elections then, like the whole current of the by-elections now—and there had been a very considerable number of them, as the hon. gentlemen well know, during the few months that preceded the close of the late Parliament—went to show, in the clearest possible manner, that if hon. gentlemen opposite had ever possessed the confidence of the country, they had long since forfeited it. That being so, these gentlemen having stood on their extreme legal right in keep-

ing Parliament together until it was dissolved by the flux of time, their duty was plain and clear, their bounded duty was to have dissolved the late Parliament in good time. Their duty was to have dissolved Parliament at such date that the elections could have been held in time to enable the new Parliament to have voted the supplies for the fiscal year. They refused to do that, for reasons best known to themselves, and which I need not discuss now. They compelled us to invoke the only means known to the constitution, in order to prevent grave injury being done to great public interests from one end of the Dominion to the other. I challenge the hon. leader of the Opposition, I challenge his lieutenants to show that we have expended under the Governor General's warrant, one cent or one penny more than we were compelled to expend for the purposes of the public service. Nor have we spent one cent or one penny more than those hon. gentlemen themselves declared to Parliament was necessary for the public service. We have acted absolutely and entirely within the estimates for which those hon. gentlemen were responsible, which they laid on the Table of Parliament, which they introduced here by a Message from His Excellency, signed by himself. It does not lie in their mouths, who created this necessity, to censure us because, under the necessity that had been created, we acted entirely within the lines they laid down. We took upon ourselves, with a due sense of the responsibility, and after having obtained the best legal advice within our reach, to act on what we conceived to be the true intent and spirit of the Audit Act with regard to just such cases, and just such expenditures as have now been laid before you. More, Sir, the country was well aware of what we were doing. The country knew perfectly well—and it was no fault of the hon. gentleman if it did not—what we had done in refusing to assist in passing the Estimates which these hon. gentlemen had brought down. The country emphatically endorsed our action. The people endorsed it before and have endorsed it since. The country understood just as well as we did, the country's instincts were, as they generally are, perfectly right, and it understood the great peril which would have ensued had we placed in the hands of men who had forfeited the confidence of the people, the power of sitting here for a year, which they would have possessed, had we voted these Estimates as they requested.

Now I come to another interesting question. I come to the charge solemnly preferred by these consistent gentlemen, solemnly preferred by the leader of the Opposition, solemnly preferred by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) against my hon. friend—the charge that he has shuffled in his policy with respect to Manitoba. On what is that charge based? Why, it is based on this, that my hon. friend has not seen fit, up to the present time, to issue a commission for the purpose of investigating the state of things in Manitoba. Now, let me ask, under what conditions did my hon. friend propose to issue this commission? For what end, and for what purpose was it to be issued? Again and again, it is in the recollection of this honourable House, and at any rate of those members who sat here before, my hon. friend declared that his policy was conciliation and negotiation. Only in the event of conciliation and negotiation failing would it be necessary to issue a commission for the purpose of ascertaining on what terms the two communities could agree. But, I repeat, that if there was one charge more than another which my hon. friend brought against the late Government, and rightly and properly brought against them, it was the charge that they had acted discourteously and arbitrarily towards Manitoba, that they had not attempted to consult the Manitoba government, that they had rushed to the extreme remedy which the law gave, without the common courtesy of hearing what the government of Manitoba might have to adduce. Have they forgotten that my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy), who acted as the counsel for Manitoba, pleaded before them in vain for a delay of a week or ten days in order to enable the members of the Manitoba government to come down and be heard in person? Have they forgotten the indecent haste with which they rushed into that controversy, and have they forgotten that it was on those grounds, as much as on any other, that my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) condemned their action? But what was those gentlemen's policy? Ours, they say, was a Janus, a double-faced policy, but what of the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition? What of the policy of his trusted friend and whip (Mr. Taylor), whom I now have the pleasure of seeing in his place. My hon. friend beside me last night—the hon. member for Leeds not being present at that time—took occasion to quote from the late ministerial papers, the organs of those hon. gentlemen, a certain remarkable statement made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), to whom I now give the opportunity, if he pleases, of withdrawing or modifying it, if he has anything to say. The statement which my hon. friend then made was that the hon. member for Leeds declared to the electors of North Grey that he had been sent up there to announce that remedial legislation was no more a part of the Conservative policy or platform. He announced further that he had been sent up there to announce that if they voted for Mr. Paterson, they voted for Quebec domination. Now, I would like to know if those newspaper reports fairly and correctly represent the declaration made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would just like to ask the hon. gentleman from what paper he

read these statements. I have failed to see them ; but to put myself right before this House and the country, I just wish to say this, that I made no statement in North Grey or elsewhere that I had been sent up there by my leader to make any announcement. My hon. leader asked me to meet him in Toronto on Friday. When I got to Toronto, I received a telegram from him stating that he could not be there to meet a deputation from Owen Sound. The deputation invited me to go up and be present at the nomination. I was there, but my leader did not know that I had gone. As to French domination, while there I did make a statement to this effect. I said that, so far as the Manitoba School question was concerned, it was now for hon. gentlemen opposite to deal with it, that the country had pronounced against it, so far as the Conservative party was concerned, and that it was not our policy further than to hand it over to our successors in office to deal with. I made no statement for myself or anybody else, and the only reference I made to French domination was this : I said that the present leader of the Government, in apportioning the portfolios had, I thought, dealt unfairly with the province of Ontario. In the Government of to-day, Ontario had five seats and Quebec had seven. I said that in the late Government, we had one of the large spending departments, the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has proceeded for a considerable time entirely out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman has charged me with making a certain statement, as reported in the newspapers. I want to say that if the newspapers have reported me as saying otherwise than what I am now saying, they have misreported me. I have not read them. I want now to state what I did say about French domination,and if my state ment be wrong, let the hon. member criticise it. The "Globe" misrepresented me, and, in speaking there on the second occasion, I challenged the "Globe" or anybody else to contradict the statement. And I challenge gentlemen opposite now to deny that statement. In the late Government we had the Department of Railways and Canals, one of the largest spending departments. That was taken away from us and was given to the Maritime provinces. We had the Department of Agriculture, and, as Ontario is the largest agricultural province in the Dominion, I think she was entitled to it. But that was taken away from us and was given to Quebec. Now we have four representatives—the Minister of Justice, who has not a spending department, two of the tax collectors, the Controller of Customs and the Postmaster General who sells postage stamps, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce who has not a spending department. The province of Quebec have six members of the Cabinet and one member of the Government without a seat in the Cabinet. I thought Quebec had more than its fair share and I said so. The statement I made as to the numbers was correct, and my hon. friend cannot contradict it. I did not say anything more about French domination than that. I thought the hon. leader of the Government had dealt unfairly with the province of Ontario, and I think so still.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Here, Sir, is what the hon. gentleman is reported to have said, and I leave it to him, of course accepting what he has stated, to give any requisite corrections :

Mr. Taylor said that the circumstances of this campaign were different from the last, as the Remedial Bill was no longer a part of the Conservatives' policy. Sir Charles Tupper had sent word by him to this effect to the electors of North Grey, that good feeling had now been restored between Sir Charles and N. Clarke Wallace——

Does that extend to the other members of the late Government also ?

—and the other anti-remedial Conservatives. He said it was an insult to the intelligence of North Grey——

——Which the hon. gentleman will see they have resented——

—for Mr. Laurier to attempt to palm off in this riding a Minister who was defeated at home, and who did not own a cent here. A vote for Mr. Paterson would mean a vote for the domination of Quebec.

That, I am informed, is from the "Evening Journal" and it has appeared, I am assured, in a very large number of Conservative papers. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, will have influence enough to have any necessary corrections made.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the "Evening Journal" of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. And it appeared in many other newspapers as well. Well, Sir, it is satisfactory to find that the hon. leader of the Opposition and his whip can dwell together in harmony. We were afraid last night that the relations were likely to become a little strained, but it is satisfactory now to find that they understand each other. Sir, I think I am not going very far when I say that the plain truth of this whole matter, so far as the policy of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is concerned is that, with characteristic audacity, the hon. leader of the Opposition made a very bold bid for the Catholic vote throughout the Dominion. Unfortunately for him the Catholic vote was not for sale. I do not wonder at the disgust of the speculative purchaser to find that even so good a bid met with no response. Sir, the hon. gentleman is wroth and his valiant whip is wroth with the province of Quebec. And why ?

Because the people of Quebec have shown —to their everlasting honour be it said— that they have minds and wills of their own; because the people of Quebec rallied round their chosen leader, a man who does honour to them as well as to the whole community of Canada; because the people of Quebec chose to refuse to listen to sectional appeals, chose to show that in a great crisis in the history of this country they were determined to rise superior to all these appeals, and because they have on this occasion led the van of the Liberal movement to assert the right of the people to chose men whom they can trust and respect, for their leaders throughout this Dominion.

Now, Sir, with respect to the other charge preferred so energetically by the hon. member from York (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman demands why we, installed in office just one month ago, having but partly completed our Cabinet—to say the truth, not having quite completed our Cabinet—having, most of us, returned within ten days or a fortnight from our re-election after being sworn in as Ministers of the Crown, do not instantly bring down a tariff which is likely to affect, as he well knows, very numerous and important changes in the fiscal system of this country. Was ever a more childish criticism offered, was ever a more childish complaint made? And, Sir, it is doubly so in the case of the hon. member for York himself. Has he forgotten, has this House forgotten, how, two or three years ago when it became expedient to make some trifling changes in the existing tariff, that hon. gentleman and his two Controllers required to perambulate the whole Dominion for an entire year, required to hold conference with all sorts and conditions of men, and how after a whole year's work, though they did propose some changes, they practically accomplished nothing. The total result of the hon. gentleman's changes, I think, amounted to one-fortieth of one per cent of the whole tariff. And this is the gentleman who considers that we are acting without due respect to the House, without due regard to our own promises, without due regard to the interests of the country, forsooth, because we ask a mere four or five months before we proceed to deal with questions of the greatest magnitude and importance affecting every single living soul from one end of the country to the other. In a case like this I do not mean to excuse ourselves for delay. I say it is our duty to take time; I say it is the duty of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) and his colleagues to take all the time they require in order to produce a well-considered tariff suitable to the various needs of the people of this country. Why, Sir, in the first place the hon. gentleman himself a Finance Minister of many years' standing, will admit that my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Fielding) has a right to know, before he prepares his Budget, before he brings down his tariff speech and the changes it is proposed to make, what amount of money is needed for the wants of the country. And surely his colleagues, installed in office within the last ten or twelve days, may be allowed two or three months at least to prepare their Estimates, to see what savings can be effected, to ascertain what sum is actually required for the various departments over which they preside. More, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows, and every business man knows right well, that there is need of more time and more consideration when you are making reductions in the tariff than when you are making additions to it. When you make additions to a tariff, for the moment at any rate, you do not create any very great disturbance. You add, for the most part, to the value of the goods on the merchant's shelves. You may do a very great deal of mischief, as these gentlemen have done a very great deal of mischief. But that is of slow and gradual growth and increases year by year, I am sorry to say, but it does not involve any great immediate disturbance. The mischief, as I have stated, comes later. But, in the reverse case, to which I am now alluding, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, that however salutary the reductions affected may prove to be in the long run—as they will prove very salutary in the long run—I have never contended, no man on this side has ever contended, no man who knows anything of the business conditions of the country will contend that there is not for the moment a disturbance. And for that very reason there is double and treble need that the whole matter shall be considered fully, so that when my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) does bring down his tariff, it may be complete so that there may be no need of those incessant changes in the tariff or those incessant demands for change which have been made from time to time under the policy of gentlemen opposite. Sir, if the hon. gentleman knows, and I suppose he does, the huge number of taxes which he and his colleagues have heaped up on the people of this country—I think they amount in all to very close on a thousand different items—and he will understand, and ought not to complain, therefore, of our delay in bringing down a tariff. He will understand that it is absolutely and imperatively necessary that anybody who has charge of that complicated and difficult task, should have a reasonable time assigned to him. For my part I know something, as well as the hon. gentleman, of the temper of the people of this country; I know something at any rate of the way in which these matters are looked at by commercial and banking circles, and I do not see for my part, nor do I hear from those who are best qualified to speak with authority on that subject, any of these complaints, any of these fears, any of these alarms, of which the hon. gentleman has made himself the

mouthpiece and exponent to-night. Apparently the business community have more confidence than the hon. gentleman has in the present Government, and are well content to wait the reasonable leisure of this Government in dealing with this question. Now, Sir, to return for one moment to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman, as I have stated on many occasions, is a bold man, a very bold man, but I do not think he ever gave this House, or he ever gave the country, a greater specimen of his magnificent audacity than when he rose last night and solemnly claimed David A. Wells as an advocate of the fiscal policy which he and his friends introduced into Canada. Sir, I will recall his statement. He declared that under the ægis of the National Policy, Canada had passed successfully and triumphantly through a cyclone of disaster—if I recollect his words aright—which had tested the institutions of the United States to their very foundation; and he appealed to David A. Wells to testify to the truth of his statement, and most certainly, by inference, if not in so many words, did he allege that David A. Wells had declared in an article in the "Forum" that it was to its fiscal policy, to its National Policy, that Canada owed its exemption from this catastrophe which overtook the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. He is entirely misstating what occurred. I stated the opinion I held that Canada owed to the National Policy the position which Mr. Wells had so favourably contrasted with that of the United States, and I gave Mr. Wells's statement in his own words, as taken from the "Forum."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Exactly, as applied to the National Policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no; I did not say that Mr. Wells had any reference whatever to the National Policy, but I said that under the ægis of the National Policy the condition of Canada was such as to draw the following contrast from an eminent statistician in the United States, and I gave his words.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And implied, if words mean anything, that David A. Wells was his witness, and an advocate of the National Policy which had brought about these results.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman did not mean that, his quotation was utterly pointless. Sir, the fact of the matter, I suspect, is this, that twenty-four hours have elapsed since, and probably the hon. gentleman, seeing I had sent for the "Forum," has taken the trouble to look up the article which he had not read when he made the quotation. And I may observe that in reading a quotation from a scrap-book, it is a dangerous thing to take a chance sentence out of an article without knowing what that article is about, or without looking at the context. Now, I will tell the hon. gentleman what Mr. Wells was talking about, and what he was driving at. Here is the next preceding sentence used by Mr. Wells:

> In the first place the immediate and principal cause——
>
> Of the troubles in the United States, that is.
>
> —was beyond all question a distrust of the very foundation on which the whole superstructure of trade and credit of the country rests, namely, its currency.

What Mr. Wells referred to was the superiority of the Canadian banking system over that of the United States. That is what the sentence which is quoted from Mr. Wells means, that and nothing else. He will see that Mr. Wells condemns in the same manner that I have condemned, the ignorance of political economy which led the American people to imagine that they could make themselves rich by doubling and trebling their taxes.

However, Sir, it is not with Mr. Wells, or with any misquotations of Mr. Wells, that I desired more particularly to deal. I think those in this House, and they are many, who have perused Mr. Wells's works and treatises, know perfectly well that the last thing he is likely to say is to praise the protective system of Canada, unless, peradventure, he might say that the system of his own country was a trifle worse, which it is theoretically, although the hon. gentleman and his friends will do well to bear in mind that while the United States may have, as to other nations, a higher tariff than ourselves, they have within themselves a thing which modifies its evil influences enormously, and that is the most perfect system of free trade among the numerous states which compose that nation, which exists on the face of the earth. But, Sir, as I said, this was not after all the worst of the crimes which the hon. gentleman has laid to the charge of my hon. friend beside me. Sir, what is the Prime Minister's chiefest fault, and chiefest crime? What is that offence he has committed for which, according to the hon. member for York, there can be no forgiveness and no redemption in this world, nor yet in that which is to come? Why, Sir, I shudder to say it, the Prime Minister of Canada has dared to state that he for his part felt sincere good-will towards the people of the United States. He has further dared—treasonably, apparently, according to the hon. member for York—he has dared treasonably to hint at a policy which might, if carried out to a successful completion, bring great benefit to a great number of the people of both countries. Sir, these are the

grievous crimes, and the grievous errors my hon. friend has to answer for. But there is worse behind. Why, Sir, my hon. friend is so lost to all sense of propriety and shame that he dared to suggest that in other times hon. gentlemen opposite had not always been overfriendly towards the Government and people of the United States; and the leader of the Opposition charged him, with great emphasis, with having dared—I took down his words—to charge a great party with hostility to the United States, which he intimated was an extremely grave offence. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that I have heard an hon. gentleman, who may be nameless now, charge a still greater party than the party which he leads, with a still worse crime, with that of disloyalty to the Empire of which we form a part. I think that charge was made and repeated by him, and his organs, and his followers, from one end of the country to the other; and I have grave reason to know that he abused his place as High Commissioner in England to the detriment of the party which now controls the destinies of Canada. Sir, were it my disposition, it would be an extremely easy task for me—because I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of this country, with the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, and with the negotiations which have taken place between Canada and the United States for this many a day—it would be an easy task for me to substantiate, and much more than substantiate, all that my hon. friend hinted as to the very dubious relations which prevailed between them and the people of the United States for a good many years past. Sir, did I choose to recall the history of the negotiations at Washington, did I choose to recall the reception which was given to the propositions made thrice over in this House in 1888 and 1889 and 1890 by members of the Liberal party tending to the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, did I choose to ransack their press as hon. gentlemen opposite have ransacked ours, did I choose to collect together all the language of their leaders with respect to the institutions and people of the United States, I could present an array of evidence which would go extremely far to show how very mild and gentle was the statement made by my hon. friend. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not choose to do that. I am willing to let bygones be bygones in that respect. I do not think I would advance the interests of Canada at the present moment if I were to recall all the language that political exigencies induced those hon. gentlemen, and in particular induced the leader of the Opposition to use towards the Liberal party of Canada with respect to our desire to cultivate amity and good-will with the United States. Sir, I am going to point out to the hon. gentleman, I hope not altogether in vain, because I am aware that in his better days and in his better mood he himself has appreciated the situation, to some extent at least, the enormous importance and the enormous desirability of cultivating friendly relations with the United States. I have not forgotten, any more than has the hon. gentleman, the language which he used in this House when advocating the passage of the Fisheries Act, in 1888. I remember right well, as does the hon. gentleman, how, on that occasion, he pointed out in somewhat strong language, that the indiscretion of his colleagues had brought about a state of things between Canada and the United States, which, as he said himself, meant commercial war within twenty-four hours, and he went on to add, that from commercial war to actual war, the distance is but a step. Sir, I say there is a more excellent way. The friendship of the United States is most valuable to Canada, it is a thing to be striven for and cultivated by all fair and honourable means. I say more. I have said long and I have said it often, I have said it on the hustings, I have said it in this House, I have said it to English Cabinet ministers, I have said it in English pubpublic assemblies, and I shall not hesitate to repeat it wherever and in whatever situation I find myself, that the friendship of the United States is not only most valuable to Canada, but most valuable to the British Empire at large. I say the truest statesmanship which any Canadian statesman can show is, I repeat, to cultivate by all possible fair and honourable means, the friendship of our kinsmen, the people of the United States. No nobler task lies before us, and if that is all the charge that can be preferred against my hon. friend, it is one in which he may well glory, and his friends may glory too. The hon. gentleman denounces my hon. friend because his utterances seem to show a great desire to cultivate the good-will of the people of the United States. Pray, has the hon. gentleman read the recent utterances of a man who, I suppose, he will admit to be in titular rank higher than himself, the Prime Minister of England, Lord Salisbury, with respect to this same vexed and disputed Venezuelan question? Has he still more had his attention called to the very recent utterance of a very distinguished English visitor to America, the Chief Justice of England, Lord Russell? Why, Sir, the language used by Lord Russell is almost exactly in spirit, if not in letter, an echo of the words used by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), and I shall not hesitate to give the House an exact transcript of what Lord Russell said, speaking with authority, speaking practically as an envoy from the people of Great Britain to the people of the United States. Here is what Lord Russell thought fit to say:

> Mr. President, I began by speaking of the two great divisions—American and British—of that English-speaking world which you and I represent to-day, and with one more reference to them I end.

Who can doubt the influence they possess for ensuring the healthy progress and peace of mankind? But if this influence is to be fully felt, they must work together in cordial friendship, each people in its own sphere of action. If they have great power, they have also great responsibility. No cause they espouse can fail; no cause they oppose can triumph. The future is, in large part, theirs. They have the making of history in times that are to come. The greatest calamity that could befall would be strife which should divide them.

Let us pray that this shall never be. Let us pray that they, always self-respecting, each in honour upholding its own flag, safeguarding its own heritage of right and respecting the rights of others, each in its own way fulfilling its high national destiny, shall yet work in harmony for the progress and peace of the world.

Sir, these words are as eloquent as they are wise. I commend them to the careful consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, to the careful consideration of the people of Canada, the people of the United States, and the people of England, and I say that in spirit, if not in letter, these words represent exactly the sentiments to which my hon. friend gave utterance, and which hon. gentlemen opposite see fit so loudly to condemn.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Government in the course of his speech upon this question, favoured us with what he calls the three reasons for the victory of the Liberal party at the late general election. He said that the first reason was a fixed feeling that the fiscal policy of the late Government had failed to fulfil the expectations of the people; second, that the Government had been extravagant and corrupt; and, third, that instead of appealing to the better judgment of the people, we had appealed to sectional feelings. I shall, in a few minutes, add some further reasons of my own to account for the victory which the hon. gentleman and his party achieved, but, before doing so, I desire to refer to the three reasons which the hon. gentleman has given. So far as the first is concerned, that the fiscal policy of the late Government had failed to fulfil the expectations of the people, I desire to state before this House in the most positive manner from my own experience of the contest in the province of Quebec that such could not have been a reason for the success of the hon. gentleman opposite. The reason I give is this: That the success which the hon. gentleman obtained in the commercial centres of the province of Quebec was not obtained because of dissatisfaction with our fiscal policy, but because of the most distinct and positive pledge given, not only by the hon. gentleman himself, but by all his lieutenants and his assistants, publicly and privately, in season and out of season, day and night, that if he succeeded in being returned to power, the fiscal system of the country now existing would not be seriously disturbed or interfered with. How can the hon. gentleman, who day after day has been going around among the manufacturers and merchants of the city of Montreal whispering in their ears that they need not be afraid of him; how can he now have the audacity to stand up here before this new Parliament of Canada, and ascribe to the fiscal policy and its unpopularity the reason why he succeeded in the election. Why, Sir, one of the first steps he had to take when the battle commenced, was to put the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Sir Richard Cartwright) in leash. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Sir Richard Cartwright), because of the experience which the people of Canada had of him from 1873 to 1878, was the bete noir of every merchant and manufacturer in the Dominion of Canada. If they had not been satisfied, if they had not been thoroughly convinced that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) would not be Minister of Finance, and would not be in control of the fiscal policy of any new administration that would be formed, then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) never could have succeeded in carrying the country or in carrying the commercial centres in the province of Quebec. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was so effectually put in leash, that during this great struggle, when every public man in Canada but himself was on the platform and on the stump educating the people as to his particular views, that gentleman above all others, notwithstanding his great ability, was quietly enjoying the seclusion of his own private house and was not heard on a platform in the country. At the last moment, during the last two or three days of the contest, when it was thought safe to allow the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to speak, he went out and spoke in three or four of the adjoining counties, and the result was that in every constituency in which he spoke my hon. friends on this side of the House obtained a victory. Not only that, Sir; not only were the elections carried on the popularity of the fiscal policy, by the party opposite adopting it, and by their promising not to disturb it; but since the election the hon. the leader of the Government and his friends, have sought to prevent a financial crash and a repetition in Canada of the unfortunate financial crisis which took place in the United States, by promising emphatically that they would not interfere with the protective features of the tariff, and that in anything they did, they would proceed cautiously and not precipitately. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think with considerable reason says, it can hardly be expected that the Government should be ready at the present moment with a general tariff scheme. I admit that. I admit it if that general tariff scheme is to be in the nature of a protective scheme, but if their scheme is to be the removal of every vestige of protection, as the hon. gentleman has promised, if it is to be a free trade scheme, or a scheme of a tariff for revenue only, then what is the necessity for time or

for consideration ? A level duty of 20 per cent, or 22½ per cent or 25 per cent upon all articles irrespective of whether they are produced in the country or not, could be easily passed. One page of a Bill would carry into effect in the most perfect manner the ideas of tariff which the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has advocated, and I presume still advocates.

My hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) having referred to the fact that several gentlemen from the local governments had been brought in to the Federal Ministry to the exclusion of some old members of the late House who had been faithful supporters of the Liberal party, was answered by my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with this statement : that the hon. leader of the Government, if he could find better men than these old stagers, surely ought to be allowed to take them. Well, the hon. the leader of the Government thought he could find a better Finance Minister in the Premier of one of the provinces, and he took him, and I think it is an evidence that the little snubbing that the hon. gentleman from Oxford has had has improved his temper, when we find him so ready to confess that a better man was found to take the place expected.

But, surely something might be done with regard to the tariff this session. I will not occupy the time of the House in referring to the matters which my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) referred to, such as the duties on flour and coal. But there is one subject upon which the Government might at all events act with unanimity and with promptness. There is one article that we heard about on every platform in the Dominion, one tax which was referred to universally as being entirely without justification. I speak of the duty on coal oil. Pray, what is to prevent a short Bill being introduced at the present session to reduce, or to remove altogether, the duty upon coal oil. I think I can tell what will prevent it ? I think the two gentlemen who represent the county of Lambton will prevent it, and I venture to say that this free trade Government, this Government for a tariff for revenue only will never seriously interfere with the coal oil industry of the county of Lambton, either in this session or the next session. The hon. the leader of the Government gave as one reason for the result of the election, that sectional feelings had been appealed to by us, especially in the province of Quebec, and he told us that there had been an earthquake all over this broad Dominion, and that we had as yet failed to appreciate its causes. Sir, as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) showed conclusively to-day, that earthquake or landslide or whatever it might be termed, was confined to the single province of Quebec, and I believe that the extent of that landslide or earthquake, is the best possible explanation, and the best possible answer to the question as to who had appealed successfully to sectional feelings or racial considerations. Sir, the province of Quebec had been up to the present general elections, the bulwark of Conservatism. The province of Quebec before confederation was the stronghold of Sir George Etienne Cartier and of the Conservative party. The province of Quebec, ever since then, has been the banner Conservative province of the Dominion. Never has anything like a substantial majority been obtained before by the Liberal party in the province of Quebec. What do we find now ? We find not only the hon. gentleman's majority in the House, but more than his whole majority, coming from the province of Quebec. What has produced that tremendous change ? What has brought about that great revolution ? Was it appeals to racial and religious prejudices by us, who won only fifteen seats in the province of Quebec, or was it an appeal by the hon. gentleman, and more particularly by his friends and lieutenants in the province of Quebec ? Nothing could more clearly establish who has been guilty of these appeals than the result itself. Why, Sir what was the plan of campaign of the hon. gentleman and his friends in the province of Quebec ? The plan of campaign was this : First, to satisfy and to remove the religious scruples of the people of that province upon the question of the Manitoba schools. That was done by taking in one hand the mandament, which simply stated that candidates favouring remedial legislation were alone to receive support, and taking in the other hand a pledge of the most strong and binding description made by every candidate, that he would support a Remedial Bill, no matter who introduced it, or from which side of the House it emanated. Thus were the scruples of the people removed. Thus did the hon. gentleman and his lieutenants pave the way for the action of the clergy in his favour in the province of Quebec, and having secured that result, having secured the support of nearly all the Liberal clergymen—I am using the word Liberal in the sense of Rouge—then the appeal to national feeling was made upon a ground that was ripe for the harvest. Sir, the argument that carried the province of Quebec in the last two or three days may be summed up in the six words : "Hurrah for Laurier, one of ourselves." That was the potent argument, and that is the explanation of the extraordinary results which occurred in the province of Quebec.

But there were some other reasons besides this appeal to help to secure a French Canadian Prime Minister, and besides the promise that Sir Richard Cartwright should not be Finance Minister. There was another and a remarkably potent reason ; that was the most lavish, the most corrupt, the most abominable expenditure of money in the constituencies that has ever occurred in that province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. IVES. Why, Mr. Speaker, talk about sixteen to one in the United States; here was a case of ten thousand to one. Here was a case of making money cheaper than any silverite who follows Mr. Bryan ever dreamed of. Here was Confederate money bought at 15 cents a bushel, and used in all the counties of the Quebec district to purchase votes.

Mr. FOSTER. Used at its face value?

Mr. IVES. At its face value, and they could afford to give very large bribs. Nothing but fifties, I believe, were used on this occasion. But that is not all. There was a case in the province of Quebec where coupon tickets were adopted. The first coupon was for so much, which the voter was to get for voting for the candidate; the second was for so much if Mr. Laurier should be returned to power; and the third was for another five dollars if the candidate should become a member of Mr. Laurier's Cabinet. The coupon system was successfully adopted and carried out in one of the counties of the province of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. Where?

Mr. IVES. Give me a committee and I will show you that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. IVES. On this question of the Governor General's warrants, to which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred, I am glad that he did not undertake fully to justify the course which the Government has taken. He tried to get round the whole question by saying that the money was necessary—that not a cent of it was expended except for necessary purposes. He even went so far as to take for his justification the fact, which he alleged, that an estimate had been brought down by the late Government, and that nothing had been paid out except what had been recommended to the House by the late Government. But he failed, and I do not wonder that a gentleman of his parliamentary experience, a gentleman who held the position which he held in Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, should have failed completely to say squarely that he considered that these warrants had been legally issued—that they had been issued in accordance with the spirit or the letter of the law, or could possibly be justified. Sir, what are the conditions which, under the Audit Act, justify the issue of these warrants, and what is the general principle upon which public money is expended? Every one knows that the general principle upon which public money is expended is that not a dollar shall be paid out that has not been voted by the people's representatives in this House. If the Governor General and the Cabinet, and the leading members of the Opposition, or the whole Opposition, and the whole Senate added, were to concur in an expenditure, it would not be any the more legal. The principle underlying the whole matter is that the public expenditure is to be entirely within the control of the House of Commons of Canada. There is just one exception, and what is that exception? That exception is: first, that Governor General's warrants may be issued if Parliament is not in session, if the expenditure was unforeseen and not provided for.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Or not provided for.

Mr. IVES. And not provided for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman surely does not wish to misread that. Will he say which word is correct?

Mr. IVES. Not foreseen or provided for. That means that the expenditure must have been both unforeseen and not provided for. It would be senseless to say that it could be provided for if it had not been foreseen. Its having been foreseen does not authorize the Governor General's warrant to issue; it must be both unforeseen and unprovided for. It must also be urgently and immediately required. Now, it is true that Parliament was not in session; but it is also true—and this is a fact which my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) did not refer to—that Parliament was in session within forty-eight hours after the last Order in Council for a Governor General's warrant was obtained. Here is a case of a Governor General's warrant for a million of dollars being obtained by telegraph from His Excellency within forty-eight hours of the time that Parliament was to assemble. One-tenth of the whole controllable expenditure which is voted by this House, is disposed of by telegram forty-eight hours before the House met, and only a few hours before a special vote might have been obtained. What do we find? We find that those gentlemen who kept us in our seats on this side of the House hour after hour, day after day, lecturing us upon some little irregularities, actual or fancied, with regard to the expenditure of money, did, as one of their first official acts, take $2,000,000, one-fifth of the whole controllable expenditure of Parliament, out of the hands of Parliament altogether, and did this only a few hours before Parliament was to meet.

Let me say a few words with regard to the last matter to which the hon. gentleman referred, and I have done. It may be true, as the hon. gentleman says, that hostility to the United States is not desirable and that friendly relations between Canada and the United States are very desirable. I admit that. But the charge against the hon. leader of the Government is not that he is undertaking to bring about friendly re-

lations between Canada and the United States, but that he proposes to surrender, in order to obtain those friendly relations, a portion of the control of a great waterway through the Dominion of Canada, to a foreign country. That is the gravamen of the charge; and although hostility to the United States is one thing and a thing to be deplored, loyalty to Canadian interest is another thing, and a thing which above all others we must look after. If we cannot have reciprocal trade with the United States without discriminating against Great Britain, then we must not have reciprocal trade. If we cannot have the friendship of the United States and must have the hostility of the United States unless we surrender to them an important interest, an important property right, an important matter of management and government, which belong exclusively to ourselves, then I say that we cannot have those friendly relations and must get along without them. Fancy what would be the situation, if the United States enjoyed joint control over the St. Lawrence and the St. Lawrence Canals. Flowing from that would be the right to protect those canals, to police those canals, to manage them, to join in the appointment of officers in charge of them, to assist in the collection of tolls, if any were exacted, to divide those tolls in proportion to the population or the contributions to the cost, and to develop and improve the canals; and if any difficulty should arise between any foreign country and the United States or between England and the United States, we should have, as one of the first results of this arrangement, the United States taking possession of these canals, apparently for their own protection or the protection of their own property, and we should have a similar state of things here as exists in Egypt to-day, where Great Britain maintains a garrison and controls the government of that country.

Then, I repeat, that so far from the results of the last election having followed from our appealing to prejudice, they followed, as the result in the province of Quebec shows, from the national cry which was effectively raised in that province.

Mr. STENSON. I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, taking any part in this discussion, but I feel compelled to occupy the time of the House for a very few moments in replying to a statement which the hon. gentleman for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) has just made, and which I must qualify as a misstatement of a dangerous nature. The hon. gentleman said that the landslide which had taken place in the province of Quebec was caused by the sectional feeling that had been raised by the Liberal party and by that party securing the support of the clergy in that province. The Rouge clergy, the hon. gentleman said, but the hon. gentleman is well aware—no one in this House is better aware—that the Rouge clergy is far from being the majority of the clergy in that province. More than that, from my own personal experience in this contest, it was very far from being the action of the Rouge clergy that had any effect on the election, for in my county, in the two joint counties of Richmond and Wolfe, there is only one Rouge, if I may so call him, who is to be found in the clergy there, and that one had to keep very quiet, whereas the others, to the number of twelve, worked and worked actively, several of them, against me in favour of the Conservative candidate, the friend of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Sherbrooke is perfectly aware—and were it necessary I could tell him more than that—that not only did the ordinary clergymen work to his knowledge but more than the ordinary clergyman also worked. My county, Sir, contains about two-thirds French Canadians and Catholics and one-third English Protestants; and I can say this, that certainly if I have been elected to support the Liberal party, it was not through the influence of the clergy, it was not through the influence of the French Canadian Catholics that I was elected, but I was elected by the majority of the Protestant English vote. Nor did I—and I defy the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) or any one else to say the contrary—ever attempt to raise, during that contest, sectional, religious or national feeling. On the contrary, it was on the merits of the Liberal policy that the battle was fought in those counties. On that ground alone was it fought and on that alone did we conquer in those counties, which for eighteen years had been the subjects of the Conservative party. We have conquered this time because those Conservatives found that the late Government were no longer worthy of their confidence and that a change was required. Religious or sectional feeling had nothing at all to do with it. It was not through religious or sectional animosity to any one that I was elected, but because the people realized that the country had been misgoverned, and were confident that the new Government would administer public affairs better than its predecessors. I said I would not take up much of the time of the House, and I shall keep my promise, but I am forced to protest against not only the insinuation but the false assertion that was made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives), and which he must have known to be false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Be good enough to take back that expression.

Mr. STENSON. I take it back. I hope I will be excused, on account of my youth in the House and of my being carried away by the assertion made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, which I know to be not correct, and which I am perfectly aware the hon. member for Sherbrooke himself is satisfied was not exactly according to the facts.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, as a rule I would not speak on the Address, but, under the present circumstances, I think I should be doing a great injustice to the North-west Territories if I did not express the opinion which I know to be entertained there that this Address is an Address which was not to be expected, having regard to the promises and statements made by the candidates in support of the hon. gentleman who is now the head of the Government, and also having regard to the statements made by the hon. gentleman himself and by distinguished colleagues of his in the North-west Territories and elsewhere. I may say here, in passing, as it has come up in this debate, that I echo now what I said from my place when the hon. gentleman was leading the Opposition, that if the Liberal party was to come into power, no man could occupy the high position of Premier, no man could win that bright eminence, who would be more welcome to myself, if he will permit me to say so, or probably more welcome to the country, than the hon. gentleman. Having said that, Sir, I have to say, also, that when I recall the emphatic statements made by the hon. gentleman, and also the professions made time and again, and repeated in this debate, professions of a super ingenuousness of character, this Address is disappointing to those of us who have studied his speeches, and disappointing to the numbers throughout the North-west who, as I know, were influenced by promises made upon the hustings. The statement was made during the late election in the North-west Territories that should the hon. gentleman who is now at the head of the Government, come into power, the first thing he would do was to place agricultural implements on the free list. That was the statement made on every platform, and swallowed by the electors throughout the North-west Territories. And, as a consequence, I am in a position to say authoritatively, that hundreds of votes were cast for the candidates supporting the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. And what are we told now in this Address? We are told that that cannot be done at present. If it is the intention of the Government to place agricultural implements on the free list, and thus to meet the desire of the farmers of the North-west Territories, and carry out the promises made by the Liberal candidates and by the supporters of the Liberal candidates in the North-west Territories, why delay it? Can any reason be given for delay? The hon. gentleman who just preceded me has argued, and I think has argued fairly enough, that there is no reason whatever for delay if the intention is to give a revenue tariff. And, of course, the argument made as to the effect upon the country by other speakers is an argument that is irrefragable, patent and convincing to any sound understanding. But that to which I wish to call the attention of this House and the North-west Territories is this: That we had a fair and plain promise made that if the hon. gentleman was placed in power, agricultural implements would be placed upon the free list. Therefore, the hon. gentleman is not quite free from being obnoxious to some of the suggestions and aspersions that have been made as regards his own ingenuousness. He flung across the floor of this House, and so did some of the other hon. members, notably the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—flung at the leader of the Opposition a taunt of disingenuousness, and of using words for the purpose of concealing thought. But, Sir, having regard to a careful study of the speeches of the hon. gentleman, having regard to his statements concerning the tariff made, now in cities, now in counties, now in the North-west Territories, now in eastern Canada, having regard also to his statements upon the school question, I was forced, and forced most unwillingly—because I am an admirer of the hon. gentleman—to the conviction that no man ever studied more closely or brought to a finer degree of perfection, the art of cloaking the naked truth. I was forced to come to the conclusion that he was a political toilet-maker, a political costumer who had studied the art how by flounces of rhetoric and skilfully-contrived phrases to cloak defects and suggest beauties that did not exist. This political toilet-maker went to the North-west Territories. And what was the impression he gave when speaking in Winnipeg and elsewhere? Why, Sir, he gave the impression that the farmer of the North-west Territories was in a state of bondage, not perhaps so complete, to use his own language, as that in which the southern slaves were before emancipation, but essentially of the same kind. It is not merely the hon. gentleman who has given us that picture. I have here a picture drawn by the artist of the Reform party for the "Globe" newspaper, a gentleman of genius who at one time was an artist, but who now has devoted his brush to partisan purposes. He gave us a cartoon showing the farmer who is supposed to be typical of the farmers of the North-west Territories. This man is lying down, having fallen among thieves, like the man in the parable. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) comes to him as the good Samaritan, and is giving to him wine and applying oil to his wounds. But, as the Winnipeg "Free Press" said, the most logical thing to do would be first to knock off the gyves from his wrists, and the fetters from his ankles, and after that administer the wine of flowery rhetoric, and the oil of sunny phrases to the unfortunate and suffering man. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman need not complain, therefore, if we, coming from the North-west Territories, hold him to the description that he gave of the farmer of the North-west, because that description is given by the "Globe" news-

paper in this cartoon. I wish I could find it, because I should like to show it to the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Word painting will do.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I will do my best. The hon. gentleman is bending over the sufferer, he is bending over this man who has fallen among thieves, he is playing the good Samaritan. Why, Sir, of course the farmers of the North-west Territories who are in this state of bondage, expect him to play the good Samaritan in some way. But what do we find? We find when Parliament meets we are told that because the Public Accounts are not prepared, he cannot deal with the tariff. What connection have the Public Accounts with a revision of the tariff? What connection, above all, have the Public Accounts with the chief thing that it was necessary to do with regard to the North-west Territories in order to keep the promises of the hon. gentleman's candidates and their supporters, namely, to take off the duty on implements and admit them free? Here is the picture of the "Globe" "The North-west Territories farmers and the good Samaritan." But, Sir, when we look to the hon. gentleman to play the part of the good Samaritan, what part does he play? A man is suffering there, and the good Samaritan is asked over to break the fetters from his ankles, and take the gyves from his wrists, and give him the oil and wine of consolation. But the hon. gentleman having got into power, having reached the proud eminence of Premier of Canada, says, I will leave the poor fellow there for six, or seven, or eight months. He can lie there in his sufferings, I am not going now to break off his fetters, or take the gyves from his wrists, or to give him either the wine or the oil of consolation. Now, the hon. gentleman in doing that, I think, will lose nearly all the support he has received from the North-west Territories, apart from what might be called the strict, cast-iron Liberal support that may happen to be there and in Manitoba. Now, that I have seen what has taken place, I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman has taken that course, because it is perfectly clear that he is, perhaps, one of the most striking illustrations of the words of a great observer whom he himself is very fond of quoting. No man seems to have studied the English classics more than himself, he is fond of quoting Shakespeare, and he will remember how Brutus says, in one of the plays of which the hon. gentleman is a student, and from which he made a quotation in this debate:

> 'Tis a common proof that
> Lowliness is young Ambition's ladder,
> Whereto the climber-upward turns his face;
> But when he once obtains the upmost round,
> He then unto the ladder, turns his back,
> Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
> By which he did ascend.

Mr. DAVIN.

Sir, I object to have the promises to the farmers of the North-west Territories one of the rounds on that ladder on which he now looks with so much scorn. For my own part I do not care—it is a family matter, to use a phrase of his own—about the scorn with which he has treated the soldiers and followers who have fought by his side for ten or twelve years. I have nothing to do with that, but I admire him, and I wish I could learn from him the secret of the spell by which he has calmed down envy and curbed denied ambition. Sir, when I look over on hon. gentlemen opposite, and when I look at what my friend has done, I admire him. The hon. gentleman becomes Prime Minister, and I must say that he has done his best to give the country a strong Government. I give him credit for it. I say, however, that in doing that he has committed a party injustice—I say this in passing, because I have nothing to do with that—and it will have to justify itself to the party: but more than that, it will have to justify itself to this Parliament and to the country. What has he done? Here are men whose reputations are public property, men whose positions before the country are public property, men, such as the late member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), such as the member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), such as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister)—here are men with pretensions, men having made positions before the country, and men who fought hard for the hon. gentleman. There is the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), too, and the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). I say I admire the Prime Minister. He is fond also of quoting Greek dramatists, and he will remember that in one of the great plays of Æschylus, in the opening scene of Prometheus, Kratos, I think it is, who says that new power is always tyrannic. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is, I think, one of the most charmingly endowed men in Canada. He is a man with whom a beautiful urbanity is epidermic. When he was leading the Opposition here, he was always more a courtier than a leader. I won't say that he was a vassal of the party of which he is now become the tyrant; but the moment he became Prime Minister what does he do? He looks around and he tells the country: I have brought in the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) it is true; I have brought in the gentleman that one of the Conservative members called the Bengal tiger, but I have pared his claws, and I have drawn his teeth. I have left out the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), I left him out because I did not want to have an elephant on my hands. I have left out the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen); but I have brought in five or six perfectly new men to this House. Sir, I admire the

hon. gentleman's courage, but it is a dangerous experiment on so large a scale, and it will have to justify itself, you may be perfectly certain, to the party, and justify itself to the country as well. However, the reference to his party management is only in passing. What I object to is that, as part and parcel of apparently the same characteristic, he has come to power in consequence, partly, of promises in which the electors of the North-west are deeply concerned, and those promises, by the Address, are utterly disregarded. I wanted merely to make that one point—he has disregarded them, he has disregarded the promises made to the North-west Territories, and in doing that, he has taken a course which has already been eloquently pointed out to be a dangerous one. He tells us in vague language that he is going to make great changes by a revision of the tariff. The hon. member for South Oxford told us to-night that there were something like a thousand items on which taxes had been imposed, and the impression is given that vast changes are to take place, and six, or seven, or eight months will pass by, and what will be the result? I venture to say, Sir, that in consequence of this language, in every city in Canada industries will be paralyzed; I venture to say that in Montreal, in Hamilton, and in other great centres of industry, you will have men out of work, you will have distress. The hon. gentleman having recently come into power and being full of the pleasure of place, and the pleasure being new too, he may feel pretty easy in his mind at the present moment; but in my opinion he is only putting off the evil day when he will have to be definite, when at last he will be obliged to make a statement and take action that will be definite, when the First Minister can no longer go on floating on a sea of vacuous verbiage and the good sense of this country will no longer be swallowed up in a vortex of equivocation. The hon. gentleman will find that during this winter he will have to face men out of work, he will probably have to face distress and find he has incurred very grave responsibilities, as a consequence of which I look for a very speedy reaction. Let me say one word in regard to the subject which has been raised here as to race and religion. Sir, I consider that the man who in this country—I repeat what the head of the Government said so eloquently last night, and has stated many a time—or in any country where there are mixed races tries to raise religious and racial passions is an enemy to his country and to his kind. For my own part I would abhor taking any course or uttering a single sentiment of any kind that would excite racial or religious passions, and it matters nothing whatever to me that an hon. gentleman is of this or that race or worships at this or that shrine. I say it is petty, puerile and provincial; it is narrow in the extreme to raise the question in regard to any Canadian statesman as to whether he belongs to this or that race in this Dominion, or for that matter this or that race in the Empire. I hope the day is not very far distant when we can address Canada in the language in which in the early centuries of our era a Roman poet, himself of Gaulish origin, addressed Rome, which embodied for the world of that day the ideas of thoughtful and beneficent government:

Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam.

I hope that day will soon come when we will be able to say to ideal Canada as regards the races of which her people is made up: Thou hast made the different races one great race and one great nation. I could not forget when I heard the discussion raised in this connection that it was a man of foreign origin and foreign birth that gave to England what neither Greece nor Rome ever secured, the principle of representation; and I do not think we are likely to banish from the English Pantheon of English worthies Simon de Montfort because though he was an English patriot and statesman, yet he was French in origin, blood and name. I therefore take no stock in this sort of argument or in this kind of questions, only to observe that from whatever side any attempt comes to raise racial or religious prejudices it will have my condemnation and my abhorrence. Let me say here, however, and it is just to say it, that if it should turn out that in the late election the bare fact that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government is a French Canadian by birth operated in the minds of a large number of the electors as a force to turn their minds from the consideration of the ordinary arguments and thus weigh with a great mass of his fellow-countrymen, it would not be a fact for us to note. It would not be a fact for which to condemn the hon. gentleman, but it would be a fact, I repeat, for us to note, and it might be a very disagreeable fact, one we might have to consider to whatever party we might belong in thinking of the future of Canada and the problems we have to face. I must say that in various places out west the voting took a form that might justify the conclusion that that fact operated on certain minds and overcame every other consideration. The practical point with which we are face to face to-night is this: not that the hon. leader of the Government does not come forward with a large Budget of legislation, not that the hon. gentleman has given the House a meagre bill of fare, for I would not expect him to give us a large bill of fare, but that no immediate act is promised in regard to the tariff on which the hon. gentleman professed himself to be fully informed. During the discussion of the last two or three years the hon. gentleman has been talking as though he

thoroughly understood all about the tariff, and if he did not thoroughly understand it, the hon. gentleman who was at one time his first lieutenant, but who has had a stripe taken from his arm, the hon. member for South Oxford, professed thoroughly to understand it. The First Minister declared that an evil existed, and if he were called to office he would remedy it. When the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in 1893 brought forward a resolution intended to condemn the policy of the then government in sending the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), Mr. Angers and the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) throughout the country, and to express an opinion in favour of a revision of the tariff, the present leader of the Government used words to the effect that it was necessary to take action at once. My complaint is in relation to only one set of items, what are called agricultural implements. The hon. gentleman must know whether he intends or not to place them on the free list. If he does not, promises have been made which were either intended to delude the people or the policy has been changed ; if the hon. gentleman does not intend to carry out this promise, the people have been deceived, and if he does so intend, no reason that will commend itself to a statesman can be brought forward why they should not be placed on the free list now.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was certainly contrary to any intention on my part to undertake the onerous duty of addressing the House on this occasion, and I would not do so were it not for the fact that the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has taken upon himself to speak on behalf of the North-west Territories ; has taken upon himself so much on the basis of so little: has taken the whole Territories within his great grasp, and has attempted to speak for those Territories. When he has spoken contrary to what I know to be the facts, it is necessary, in my own justification merely, that I should take up the time of the House for a few minutes (and it will be but for a few minutes) in order to justify my own position in the House, and to set right the people of the Territories before the people of the rest of Canada in this matter.

By way of introduction, I may say that although a new member of this House, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is an old member, I may still claim some right to represent the ideas of the people of the North-west. I have the honour to represent a constituency, which, at the general elections of 1891 returned a Conservative candidate by about 1,800 majority, and which at the last general election returned myself in opposition to the late Government, by a majority of something like 800 votes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has just spoken, represents a constituency in which he has been declared elected not even by a majority of one. He is here on behalf of the smallest majority that I suppose has ever been recorded in the Dominion of Canada, namely, the casting vote of the returning officer, an official appointed by the late Government. If it could be possible to have a representative in this House who has less right to speak on behalf of the people of the North-west, I cannot conceive of him. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), and I will tell the House, that there is no feeling of disappointment in the constituency that I represent, at any rate—and it contains a great many more votes than the constituency of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) represents—there is no feeling of disappointment at the Address which has been delivered from the Throne. The election which was carried in my constituency for the Government, was not carried by any promises made by the leader of this Government in regard to a reduction of the duty on agricultural implements. I do not know what it may have been in the constituency of the hon. gentleman, or in other constituencies in the Territories, for I can only presume to speak for the constituency which I represent ; but I say that my constituency was carried not so much on the merits of the policy that was laid down by the leader of the present Government, as on the demerits of the administration of the late Government during the many years that it has governed that western country. It was a case of "turn the rascals out." It was a case in which the people of the North-west were put upon the defensive. They were compelled to fight, and they did their little share towards turning these gentlemen out of office. That was the principle upon which they voted in the last elections. I will say, further, that the people of the North-west—at least that section of them that I claim to represent—are sensible people, and they are not disappointed at the leader of this Government not doing what, in the first place, it would be unreasonable to expect of him, and what, in the second place, would be an impossibility. They do not expect a revision of the tariff at a moment's notice. But they do expect a revision of the tariff, and they expect a thorough revision. They expect a revision of the tariff that will be in their interest, and I have every confidence they will get that revision from the present Government, and that they will get it in good time. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has worked himself into a passion about the suffering that the people of the North-west will endure because the duty on agricultural implements is not removed at this session. I do not know that there is a demand, in my constituency, at any rate, to absolutely remove the duty on agricultural implements. There may or may not be, but, at all events, we look for a substantial reduction in all the duties that prejudicially affect us. I wish further to point this out, Sir: The agricultural season in that country

is very nearly over, the purchase of farm machinery for the season has been made, and the reduction of the duty which will take effect during the coming winter will be just as beneficial to the people of the North-west as if it were made now. I merely make that statement in order that the House may be thoroughly aware of the deep insight and the thorough knowledge which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has of the agricultural interests of the North-west. Now, having trespassed so much on the time of the House. I will merely say another word. It was not merely the question of the duty on agricultural implements which caused the change of feeling in the district of Alberta, amounting to something over 2,000 votes, comparing the two elections of 1891 and 1896. You cannot imagine that so small a cause would produce such a very considerable difference. There are other gyves and fetters binding down the settlers in the North-west, besides the matter of the tariff. There is the land policy of the late Government, and there is the railway policy of the late Government, and I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that these questions affect us in our part of the country, at any rate, even more than do the provisions of the tariff. And, although we were lying wounded by the roadside, and although we were bound and tied, we obtained no relief from the late Administration, and it was because we could see no prospect of any relief from that Government—it was for these reasons even more than because of our objection to the tariff that we voted against Conservative rule. We look to the new Government with just as much confidence in these particulars, as we look to them for relief in the matter of the tariff. We look for relief for the North-west in all matters that shall be for the benefit of the North-west. We look for a policy which shall be in the interests of the people of the North-west, and not a policy that shall be, as it has been, in the interest of monopolies there. The North-west for the people and not for the monopolies—that is the policy we voted on, and that is the policy we voted for. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has alluded to the disappointment that has taken hold of every person in the North-west, except the strongest party men. Well, I can tell him that I am not a strong party man, and he knows it. I can tell him that I am not bound to support the leader of the present Government, unless his policy is in the interests of the North-west. I can assure him, repeating what I said before, that the people of the North-west, being reasonable people, are willing to give the new Government a reasonable time to bring forward necessary reforms, and that our confidence in that Government is not shaken because they have shown good and sound judgment at the present time by refusing to act hastily for the purpose of making a little political capital. They are above that kind of business, and I for one, as a citizen of Canada, am proud of them that they are. Now, the hon. member alluded, I think to an unnecessary extent, as I think did also those speakers who preceded him on that side of the House, to the disappointed ambition of members on this side. They spoke of how this, that and the other member had worked hard in the interest of the party, and had not received any reward. These gentlemen are evidently measuring other people's corn in their half bushel. The gentlemen whose ideas of the requirements of Government rise no higher than the filling of places are no men to rule this country. They have ruled it too long, as is evident from this very position they take in regard to that matter. If they know nothing of government except the holding of office, then the less they know of government the better for this country, and thank goodness that they know so little of it now.

In regard to the last matter which the hon. member spoke of, the school question, I certainly agree with him as to the undesirability of arousing racial and religious prejudices. I do not know how long the hon. member will hold that position. I do not know whether, if a vote were taken on the matter at the present time, he would be found in his usual position of speaking one way and voting the other ; but I really fear that something like that might occur, for certainly what he has said here to-night does not accord with the circumstances connected with his own election campaign. As a matter of fact, every effort was made on behalf of the hon. gentleman in the line of religious and race prejudices ; and while we must, of course, give all credit to the clerk of the court who did the final act of electing the hon. gentleman, at the same time, there is no doubt—and he dare not deny it—that great credit is due to the gentlemen who did arouse, and who were imported into the constituency specially to arouse, race and religious prejudices on his behalf. We may say that it is, in the first place, to the action of that official, in the next place to the religious campaigners, and, in the third place, to the horde of Government officials holding places in his constituency, that the hon. gentleman owes his position in this House, and his claim to speak on behalf of the people of the North-west.

Mr. QUINN moved the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend is a new member, and I cannot, assuredly, refuse his demand. But it is only half-past ten, and if we are to have a conclusion to this debate, we shall have to sit later to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Brandon by the resignation of Dalton McCarthy, Esq. In accordance with chapter 13, section 5, subsection 2 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893.—(Mr. McLennan, Glengarry.)

Bill (No. 3) respecting the sale of railway return fare tickets.—(Mr. McLennan, Glengarry.)

Bill (No. 4) for the better protection of the employees of railway companies and others.—(Mr. Maclean.)

Bill (No. 5) to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. Taylor.)

RAILWAYS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure during the present session of Parliament authorizing the construction of the Belfast and Murray Harbour Railway and other proposed branch railways in the province of Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation on this or other matters of a kindred character this session; but the matter will receive ample consideration.

MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. BOYD asked,

Has the portfolio of the Minister of the Interior been offered to any one by the Hon. First Minister as yet ? If not, why not ? When is it proposed to fill this office ? What is the reason for the delay in filling it ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend is aware that these questions relate to matters which are now confidential. As soon as the appointment has been made, the House will be informed of it at once.

REFORM OF THE TARIFF.

Mr. TISDALE (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

Did the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say in a speech at Middleton in 1893, as reported in the "Morning Chronicle," Halifax: "The policy of the Liberal party, on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection." If so, is this the present policy of the Liberal party ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Not having seen the report of the speech for some years, I am not able to say anything as to the exact accuracy of the quotation. I may say, however, that I intended to refer, and think I did refer, to those duties which the ex-Finance Minister's speech referred to as having been levied for protective purposes and not for purposes of revenue. But if any persons are particularly anxious to know my exact views upon the whole question, I will refer them to my speech in full.

THE COAL DUTIES.

Mr. TISDALE (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

1. Did the First Minister receive a telegram reading as follows :—

Pictou, 18th June, 1896.

Hon. Wilfred Laurier, Montreal.

Conservative misrepresentations render it extremely important assurance should be given that coal interests would be guarded. Answer.

(Signed) E. M. MACDONALD.

And did the First Minister reply as follows :—

Black Lake, Quebec.

E. M. Macdonald, Pictou.

Policy to be followed as laid down in Liberal platform adopted at Ottawa convention. Coal interests will be carefully guarded.

(Signed) WILFRED LAURIER.

2. If these telegrams were sent and received, will the First Minister now definitely explain what is meant by the sentence, "Coal interests will be carefully guarded" ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Laurier received a telegram identical with the telegram now quoted, he sent an answer identical with the answer now quoted, and the First Minister now definitely explains that what was meant by this sentence, "Coal interests will be carefully guarded," was that at the proper time, coal interests would be guarded carefully.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. TISDALE (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

Is the following a fairly accurate report of a part of a speech of the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at Sussex, New Brunswick, in January last :—

"A 17 or 20 per cent tariff was high enough to give encouragement to any manufacturer; if it were not, the manufactures should go down. The present policy developed trusts and combines, notably the cotton, sugar, oil, cordage, iron and steel. The Liberals would declare eternal warfare against them——"

2. If yes, will the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say whether he is of the same opinion still? 3. If the above is not a fairly accurate report, will the Hon. the Minister say wherein the report misrepresents his views?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). My views on tariff reform were given at some length in a speech delivered in Sussex on the occasion to which the hon. gentleman refers. I do not think a quotation covering a single sentence in that speech is calculated to give a fair idea of my views. The hon. gentleman will find the whole speech very interesting and instructive. I invite his attention to it.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. TISDALE (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

Did the present the Honourable the Minister of Finance write as follows to the Halifax "Morning Chronicle" under date of 1st February, 1892:—

"Mr. Jones pointed out that at the Quebec Conference which was held in the fall of 1887, certain proposals were made respecting a readjustment of provincial subsidies and the granting of additional allowances, not to Quebec alone, but to all the provinces. These proposals were agreed to by delegates representing the Governments of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and were subsequently confirmed by large majorities in the Assemblies of the several provinces named. Mr. Laurier, after the publication of the scheme, said he regarded it as fair and reasonable, and that he would support it. As a representative of Nova Scotia, I thank him for the assurance and I look forward with pleasure to the early coming of a day when he will be in a position to fulfil his pledge, and thus place in the treasury of the province an additional allowance of $162,000 a year."

If yes, can he now say whether the present Government proposes to deal with the resolutions of the Quebec Conference at this session of Parliament, or whether a provision for the amount of the proposed allowances to the different provinces will be asked from this Parliament at the next session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I did write a letter to the Halifax "Chronicle" at the time mentioned, but the purpose of that letter is hardly made apparent by the quotation given in the hon. gentleman's question. The opponents of Mr. Laurier had represented that he (Mr. Laurier) had made a bargain with Mr. Mercier to give some special and undue favour, in the way of provincial subsidies, to the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Pictou, who has asked this question, had, in a public speech, given an implied, if not a direct endorsement to this charge. I felt that this was an unfair statement of Mr. Laurier's position, and I pointed out that Mr. Laurier's statement had not applied to the province of Quebec alone, but had relation to a project which, if carried out, would apply fairly to all the provinces of the Dominion. 2. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation at the present session respecting provincial subsidies, nor have the Government yet had this question under consideration with regard to any future legislation. From a Nova Scotian point of view, the subject is less important now than it was four years ago, inasmuch as since that time, under the wise legislation of a Liberal government, the finances of the province have been materially improved. But if the provinces raise the question, the matter can then be considered.

MARINE AND FISHERY OFFICERS.

Mr. TISDALE (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked,

(a.) When were the sub-agents of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Pictou, Nova Scotia, appointed?

(b.) In what manner were they appointed?

(c.) Have their services been dispensed with?

(d.) If so, upon what grounds, and what notice, if any, was given them that their services would no longer be required?

(e.) If a notice was given, what is the date of it and at what time? How much, if anything, was owing to the sub-agents by the department?

(f.) Has the amount been paid?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). (a.) Noonan and Davies were employed in connection with repairs to the "Northern Light" in 1878-79, and were advised 14th April, 1879, that they would be allowed 2½ per cent commission on their accounts; and on 11th July, 1879, advised that Minister had fixed allowance at 2½ per cent. (b.) Later the appointment was confirmed by Order in Council, 5th July, 1890, fixing salary at $400, and further increase of $50 by Order in Council, 20th January, 1894. (c.) Yes. (d.) The agent being a political partisan who actively interfered at the general election, the department, in the public interest, deemed that a new agent in whom it could have full confidence, should be appointed. (e.) Notified on 28th July, 1896. July salary still due, namely, $37.50. (f.) No funds out of which this can be paid.

THE FIRST MINISTER'S SPEECH AT SOHMER PARK, MONTREAL.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

Is the following a fairly accurate report of a part of a speech of the First Minister at Schmer Park, Montreal, February, 1895:—

"Protection is a fine thing only for a few monopolists. It mars the growth of all our great national industries. Now, I have been

asked, what are you going to do? We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely all the duties on raw materials."

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend, I am sure, is quite aware that the words which he has just quoted have been used by his leaders again and again without their taking the trouble, which he now takes, to ascertain their authenticity. I may tell him that I shall not be at all offended if he shows no more scruples on this matter than they did.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. TISDALE asked,

Does the Government contemplate making any administrative changes in the Royal Military College of Canada? Will the Government, before taking final action in this matter, explain to the House the grounds of any such intended changes and communicate all correspondence referring to the subject, together with the Commandant's report for the year ending 30th June, 1896, and any opinions he may have submitted in reply to references to him on the question?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston having resigned his position, his resignation has been accepted, and steps have been taken to replace him. Should any other change be required or become necessary, the matter will be duly considered by the Government. All correspondence on this subject was laid before the House last session and printed, except a supplementary report of the Board of Visitors, dated November 8, 1895, which appears to have been suppressed, and a report of the late commandant, dated 30th June, 1896, copies of both of which are being prepared and will be laid on the Table of the House.

FISHERY OVERSEER McBRIDE.

Mr. HAGGART asked,

1. Has Patrick McBride, Overseer of Fisheries for Prince County, been dismissed from the service?
2. If so, what charges were preferred against him, and who investigated them?
3. Has his successor been appointed, and what is his name?
4. Was Mr. McBride appointed by Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes. 2. He was dismissed with a view of increasing the efficiency of the service. 3. No. 4. Yes.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. HACKETT asked,

1. Have James Currie and Sylvain Wedge, trackmen on the Prince Edward Island Railway, been dismissed?
2. What charges were preferred against them, and who authorized their dismissal?
3. Have others been appointed in their places?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Both James Currie and Sylvain Wedge have been dismissed. They were not considered satisfactory men, beyond this no special charges were preferred against them. The superintendent was ordered by the general manager to dismiss them. Others have been appointed in their places.

SALE OF NEWSPAPERS, ETC., ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked,

Who has the contract for the sale of newspapers, &c., on the Intercolonial between Lévis and Campbellton? Was it granted under tender to the lowest tenderer? What is the price? When does it expire?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The Canada Railway News Company have the contract for the sale of newspapers, &c., on the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Campbellton. 2. The contract was not granted under tender to the lowest tenderer. It was granted under tender to the highest tenderer. 3. The price for the whole line, excepting between Truro and Sydney, is:

For the first year—Cash		$2,875 00
	Advertising	500 00
		$3,375 00
" second year—Cash		$2,975 00
	Advertising	500 00
		$3,475 00
" third year—Cash		$3,075 00
	Advertising	500 00
		$3,575 00

The contract expires on 1st April, 1899. The tender was accepted on 7th March, 1896. The contract is dated 24th March, 1896.

POINT CLARK LIGHT KEEPER.

Mr. CAMERON asked,

1. Have complaints been made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any other department, against Mr. Rae, the lighthouse-keeper at Point Clark?
2. What were the nature of such complaints?
3. Has any disposition been made thereof? If so, what? If not, why?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Mr. Noble, foreman of works, in December last reported that John Rae, from intoxication was not giving proper attention to light. 2. Absenting himself to attend a funeral, returned in a state of intoxication and unable to attend to his light. 3. No. Rae was allowed to

remain in charge of light, and in April last the foreman Noble reported that he found things very much improved, and Mr. Harty, the Inspector of Lights for that district, who has just returned, makes an excellent report of this station.

THE CONTROLLERS OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked,

Was any assurance given to the hon. the Controllers of Inland Revenue or of Customs, or to either of them, on behalf of the Government on taking office, respecting his position in the Government, and if so, what was it ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I think I answered that question the other day and I have no other answer to give now.

WRIT FOR SASKATCHEWAN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to take the opportunity of asking the hon. the First Minister whether the writ for Saskatchewan has yet been issued?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). We have not received the warrant of the Speaker. Perhaps I might be allowed to explain that the reason the warrant of the Speaker has not yet been issued is, that he has not been notified according to the forms of the statute.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. the Prime Minister is correct. The Speaker has received no notice of that vacancy, and he is powerless to act.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear. The proper notice should have been given.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask, whether the hon. the Minister of Finance has been able to lay on the Table yet, the supplementary documents about the Governor General's warrants—that is to say, the Order in Council and the Report of the Minister of Justice, if there be any.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I had hoped to produce them to-day, but I expect to be able to lay them on the Table of the House to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. And with regard to the ten days' statement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have placed the ten days' statement on the Table to-day, but perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Generally it has been sent in advance to the ex-Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I shall be very happy to have a copy sent him.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the first paragraph of the proposed motion of Mr. McInnes, for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, my first duty is to return my sincere thanks to the leader of the House for the courtesy which was shown me last evening by his consenting to the adjournment of the debate until this afternoon. As a matter of fact, my short experience as a member of this House causes me to believe that sitting in the cold shades of Opposition is not merely a figure of speech, since it has subjected me, as it has many other of the younger members, to not only the cold shades but the cold draughts of opposition, the consequence of which is—perhaps the House will not regret it as much as I do—that it will necessitate my being as brief as possible in what I have to say on the subject under discussion. My next duty, Sir, and another pleasant one, is to congratulate the House, and to congratulate especially my hon. friend the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) on the calm, temperate, courteous and eloquent address which he delivered in seconding the motion now before the House. We can appreciate this the more when we consider how difficult was the task, how small the subject upon which he had to speak. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) who had the honour of moving the Address, remarked "that good wine needs no push," but I think this House, judging from the address which he delivered and from the Speech from the Throne which was put into the lips of the representative of Her Majesty by the Prime Minister, will recognize that in this cause there was a good deal of push and very little wine either in quantity or quality. The only important matter mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, the only reason for which it is stated the members of this House have been called togther, is for the purpose of voting supplies for the current fiscal year. Now, in order that this House, and in order that the country may appreciate fully the circumstances under which Parliament was called together, and understand, too, the illogical position which the Government, to my mind at any rate, occupies, in calling this House for that sole purpose, it will be necessary, Sir, for me to refer to a time prior to the late general elections on the 23rd of June last. Before these elections were held, the hon. members will remember, a session of this Parliament had been called for the 16th day of July. It was not then contemplated by

the Ministry, I have no doubt, that they would not receive from the country a majority to support their ideas. It might have been hoped by the members of the present Government that they would receive a majority: but whether the majority was to have been Liberal or Conservative, this House had been called to meet on the 16th day of July last. We know that after the general elections the then leader of the Government, for some reason unexplained at the present moment, and for the explanation of which, unfortunately, we have not the papers relating to the circumstance on the Table, deemed it fit to send to the representative of Her Majesty his resignation as leader of the Government. Two courses were then open to the present leader of the House. The one was the true constitutional course to take. He knew at that time that there were no supplies voted for the fiscal year. He knew at that time that Parliament had been called for the 16th day of July. He knew that no constitutional means existed by which supplies could be given him for the purpose of carrying on the public affairs of the country. He knew all these things; and before him was the option, the constitutional option, consecrated by a precedent not very far to seek in England, of declining to accept the responsibility of calling for those supplies, but compelling the then Government to meet the House and ask for the supplies necessary to carry on the government of the country. But there was the other course—I will not say that it was an unconstitutional course, but it was a course which necessitated an unconstitutional proceeding. It was a course which necessitated the hon. leader of the Government adopting means other than those known to our constitution, for the purpose of providing the supplies necessary for carrying on the public affairs of the country. It was a course dictated possibly by that hunger for power which existed in the hearts and minds of my hon. friends opposite, a hunger which found no satiety during the last eighteen years, but which was on the brink of being satisfied the moment the hon. leader of the late Government placed his resignation in the hands of the Governor General. Then was repeated the incident which has been narrated in one of the novels which we have all read in our youth, written by Captain Marryat, in which he describes the first attempt of the inexperienced landsman to get into a hammock. The man does not succeed in getting into the hammock, but tumbles out on the other side. Will the hurried acceptance of power by the present Government at that time result in what Shakespeare termed the "vaulting ambition which o'erleaps itself," and which will eventually place hon. gentlemen opposite where they rightfully belong, on the benches of the Opposition?

Mr. LANDERKIN. He is getting hungry already.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to point out—and I think by the satisfaction apparent on the faces of hon. members that I have pointed out—what was the constitutional course that should have been adopted by the present Government when the late Prime Minister tendered his resignation to the Governor General. Ought not something to have been said in the Speech from the Throne concerning this matter? Ought not we to have been told why it was that the present Government refused to accept the constitutional method of compelling the previous Government to furnish supplies for the fiscal year? Would not this have properly formed one good sentence, at any rate, in the Speech from the Throne? But there is not one word of this. We are calmly asked to come together for the mere purpose of voting supplies, and placing the Government in a position to carry on the public affairs of the country. The position of the present Government in this respect reminds me of the position of the ambitious assistant who, in the management of a manufacturing concern, succeeds in supplanting the manager of that institution. For years he had been imposing upon his employer with stories attacking the honesty, the sobriety, and the intelligence of the late manager, and at last he succeeds in displacing him, and in being appointed to the position himself. He had been telling what he would do if he were manager—how he would change this and alter the operation of that, how he would economize in various directions, but no sooner is he placed in the saddle than he forgets all the promises he had made, and simply calls upon his employer to advance to him all the capital invested in the institution. I have no hesitation in saying that if such a thing had been perpetrated on any of the large manufacturers of the city for which I have the honour to sit, he would characterize it as a sort of confidence game, and would not respond as heartily as the Government expects this House to respond to the demand which is now made. Would it have been too much, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to have told the importers and the manufacturers of this country what its intention is as regards the tariff on goods which are imported from other countries, or are manufactured in this country? These gentlemen must be aware—and if they are not, they should learn it now—that at the present moment, or within a very few days, emissaries are going from the large importing houses of this country to Europe and to other foreign markets for the purpose of purchasing the supplies necessary for this country for the next year. They must know that these people are waiting anxiously for some message from the Government to inform them whether the goods they are to import are to be taxed less or more than they have been in the past. They must know that during the last few months the trade of this country has been paralyzed by the uncertainty

which has existed in the minds of both the merchants and the consumers as to what would be the result of the elections. They must know that the smaller merchants throughout the country have refused to purchase goods. They must know that even the consumers have refused to buy, hoping against hope that they might be able to buy cheaper after the change of tariff than they are at the present time. They must know, over and above all, that the employees of importing houses alone, to the number of thousands, have been dismissed, or have been obliged to accept a smaller remuneration for their labours than they received before the 23rd of June last. They must know that the manufacturing industries of this country have, within the last few months, been paralyzed with the uncertainty which has existed in the public mind as to the maintenance of the present tariff. They must know that many of these industries have been closed, they must know that thousands of people have been discharged from their employment, they must know the uncertainty that exists in the minds of the owners of these factories as to whether they will ever be able to open them again or not. They must know that the poor people of this Dominion are awaiting in fear and trembling, for one word from this Government to tell them whether in the future they are to receive employment in the manufacturing industries of their country, or whether they will be obliged to go to the United States to seek there the employment which only there could be obtained previous to 1878. In view of these facts, I do not think it would have been too much for the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) to have put in the mouth of His Excellency the announcement that this House had been called together either for the purpose of reducing or increasing the tariff upon goods which are imported and which could be manufactured in this country. Worse even than that, worse than the uncertainty which exists, we heard only yesterday from the hon. Minister who represents Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the excuse for this omission in the Speech from the Throne, that making reductions in the tariff is a much more serious matter and requires much more serious consideration than making additions to the tariff. Thus the note of warning has gone forth to the manufacturing industries of this country that the intention of the Government is to reduce the tariff on goods manufactured in Canada ; but there is no word of comfort given to the importer that the goods which are to be imported from other countries are to pay a lesser duty than was levied previous to the last election.

As to the means which were adopted by the Government for the purpose of avoiding the difficulty into which they were placed by assuming the reins of office without having had sufficient forethought to see that supplies had been voted to them by this House, there can be no doubt as to its unconstitutionality. Why should the excuse be offered, for example, that it is true the money was obtained but the whole of it was not expended. The obligation to call Parliament together for the purpose of granting supplies to the Crown was not put in the law merely for the purpose of preventing theft or the misappropriation of funds, but for the purpose of preventing the possibility of even the Crown itself obtaining funds without the consent of the sovereign people. This is the object of that constitutional provision. Now, once that provision is violated, the question to debate is not whether this money has been used rightly or wrongly. The question is not whether this money has been put to its proper use or been diverted to some other use, but the question is were proper constitutional means adopted for the purpose of obtaining the money, whether it was expended afterwards properly or improperly ? If we lose sight of that for one moment and allow ourselves to be led astray from the proper consideration of this constitutional question, the hour may come when we may find on the Treasury benches men less scrupulous than my hon. friend the leader of the Government, men more facile than the present representative of Her Majesty in this country, men who might consent to raise the money upon the warrants of the Governor General and the security and faith of the Government alone for the purpose of transferring the allegiance of this country even to the United States. Such a thing is possible, and keeping in view its possibility. I ask hon. members to be careful and not to consent to desecrate this principle by their votes in favour of the the province of Ontario.

Now, there is only one other subject referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and as it is one which affects probably more the province, a portion of which I have the honour to represent, than any other portion of this Dominion, I approach it with the greatest care. A good deal has been said about race and religion. It has been alleged, on one side and the other, and charged against hon. members, and charged against the leaders of the two parties, that the late election was fought on the cry of race and religion. Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking for the province of Quebec, with the sentiments of whose people I am somewhat familiar, speaking more particularly for that district of which I am the humble representative and which is composed largely of men differing from me in language, I have no hesitation in saying that the great constitutional question of the remedy to be afforded to the minority of Manitoba was overshadowed by another question in that province. It was overshadowed by the desire, the laudable ambition of a large and prosperous people to see directing the government of this country a representative of

their own race and their own religion. I have no hesitation in saying that that ambition, that that desire, more than outweighed any sympathy that may have existed, and that did undoubtedly exist in the minds and hearts of the people in favour of what is known as the Remedial Bill for the minority of the province of Manitoba. And I have this to say, too, for the French Canadian people of the province of Quebec, that they have possibly put before their idea of remedial legislation their idol of the moment. They believed in his integrity, they believed in his honesty, they believed that he would put upon the statute-book of this country a law that would ameliorate the condition of the minority in the province of Manitoba. Having perfect confidence in his ability to do so; having perfect confidence in his desire to do so, they almost as one man voted in favour of his candidates throughout the province. They did so on the principle—and there is no denying it, and the hon. First Minister cannot deny it—of giving to the people of our religion a proper religious training in their youth. They did it on the principle of extending to the province of Manitoba the same rights in education as are enjoyed by the people of the province of Quebec, which produced our Lafontaines, our Cartiers, our Dorions, our Chapleaus and our Laurier. They did it on the principle which gave to our province of Ontario our John Sandfield Macdonald and other noted statesmen of that province. They did it in the hope that that education would raise the people to a higher sphere intellectually and with the belief that a proper religious training had the effect of making people not narrow-minded but broad-minded. They did it in the hope that the suffering minority in the province of Manitoba would benefit by these things, and in absolute certainty that their rights would be recognized by that idol whom they had placed upon so high a pedestal. But I have this to say also: that, great as has been their faith, deep as has been their affection, great as has been their sacrifice to, and powerful as has been their effort in what they have done,—so great, so deep, so powerful, so terrible even, will be their revenge should that hon. gentleman prove recreant to the trust which has been placed in him, and not grant to these people in Manitoba that which they have a right to ask, and nothing less than which will satisfy them—the separate schools which are allowed in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario.

I do think, Sir, that the Prime Minister of this country ought to have taken this House and the country more into his confidence in the Speech which he put into the mouth of the representative of Her Majesty, and ought to have told us on what lines he proposed to change the tariff and generally to conduct public affairs. We have learned, not from the Speech from the Throne, but from other sources, what we may call the foreign policy of the Government. We find in one of the American newspapers an expression on the part of the Prime Minister of the greatest friendship—I might even go so far as to say the greatest loyalty—to the United States. But, although the hon. Prime Minister thought that he might confide to this correspondent of a foreign newspaper his foreign policy, he does not seem to have thought that he was bound to confide any part of his policy to the country or to this House which he has the honour of leading.

I listened with great pleasure to the citation made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) from the speech of Lord Russell at Saratoga a few days ago in which the noble lord spoke of the friendship which should exist between the two great English-speaking nations of the world and of the power that could be exercised by an alliance formed between these two nations. He showed how much such an alliance would make for the peace of the world and of the duties which were incumbent on the two nations and how impossible it would be to resist anything that might be advocated by them when thus united. But I do not see how the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce could quote that passage or any passage of Lord Russell's speech to the advantage of the position taken by the Government and by the Prime Minister in laying before a foreign country his foreign policy. I do not think that in that speech or in any other speech ever delivered by Lord Russell—whom I am proud to call a countryman of my own—he has ever uttered one word to the effect that England was prepared to sacrifice one iota of principle in order to retain peace with any other country. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find in any speech or writing of the noble lord any statement made that England was prepared to give up one foot of territory for the sake of maintaining peace with any other nation. And beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. Minister to find in the public records of Lord Russell, in any of his speeches or writings, any intimation that a privilege enjoyed either by any British subject or by Britain itself would be sacrificed for the purpose of maintaining peace with any other country. And yet this address of Lord Russell has been quoted for the purpose of showing that Canada ought to maintain most friendly relations with the United States. That is unquestionable; that is incontestable. No member either on this side of the House or on the other, and no sane Canadian outside of the House, I hope, would say that we should live in any other manner than in perfect peace and harmony with our brethren on the other side of line 45. But I utterly mistake the sentiment of this House, I utterly misunderstand the feeling of the people of this country if the proposed action of the hon. Prime Minister

would be endorsed by even a small minority of the people, thus permitting the handing over of our canals to the administration of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have anything more to say on this subject at this time. As I am a beginner in the House, I am certainly obliged to hon. members for listening with such courtesy to the remarks I have made. I have only to conclude with an expression of that sentiment expressed in the quotation made by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) in closing his speech, that whatever we may do in this House, however we may be divided on questions of politics, I am sure it is the hope and the desire of every member, from the leader of the House down to the humblest member of the Opposition, myself, that everything we contemplate, everything we do may be fulfilled in the one thought of union amongst our people.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, I claim the indulgence of this House for a few moments so that we on this side may not be taxed with discourtesy by allowing such an eloquent speech as that to which we have just listened, to go unnoticed. The chief complaint made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House appears to be that this Government, formed on the 13th July last as a result of the elections of the 23rd June, has not yet formulated its fiscal policy; and further, that this Government does not represent Canada, does not represent this broad Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but that this Government represents almost exclusively the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to have realized up to the present time—and surely if they entertained any doubts on that subject, these doubts must have been dispelled by the results of the elections yesterday—they do not appear to have realized the fact that this Government has come to stay; and also, that we do not intend to deal with such an important question as that of the fiscal policy of this country, in a hysterical manner. Serious consideration, calm reflection will be given to all the diverse interests: and after these interests have been considered, and after a conclusion has been reached, a character of permanency will be given to the tariff which will reassure the public mind, and give to the people of this country the assurance that our tariff will not henceforth be tinkered with on the eve of each general election as political exigencies may require. I think I may safely go further, and say that when this revision will have been accomplished it will be found that protection has been meted out, not only to the sugar barons, not only to the monopolists, not only to the frequenters of the Red Parlour, but also to the toilers in our fields, in our mines, in our forests and in our workshops; in one word, it will be found that Canada and Canadian interests have been carefully guarded without reference to class.

The late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), in well chosen words and delightfully incisive phrases, which in my judgment went far to show that he well bore the reputation he had acquired in this country of being a master of debate and also a master of the English language, referred to the demands that are being made upon this Government by some of its adherents for a share in the public patronage. The ex-Minister selected two cases, that of Mr. Forbes and that of Mr. King. He appears to have been surprised at their modest demands; he appears to have been unable to realize that those gentlemen could have been satisfied, the one with a salary of $100 a year, and the other with the munificent return of $10 a year. I can well understand that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are surprised at such a condition of things; I can quite well understand that they are not able to realize that men of that calibre should be content with so little; and I fully appreciate the fact that those gentlemen have not come up to the standard fixed by hon. gentlemen opposite when they gave preferment to their political friends. But I think I may fairly ask my hon. friend from York to remember that it is not the case, that it cannot be the case, that each and every one of us can have access to his country made easy by the use of such a magnificent structure as the Fredericton bridge. I would also ask the ex-Minister to remember that if by his side sits the leader of the Opposition, occupying a place that he fills with such acceptance to us all, it is because a vacancy had been created by the translation to a higher and let us hope a better sphere of a former member for Cape Breton. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, at some future time it may be necessary for us to ask—and I trust that we shall not ask in vain—how it came to pass that one of the judges of the highest court in the province of Quebec vacated his seat to become a member of the commission for the revision of the statutes so as to create a place for a former Minister of Public Works; also it may become our duty to inquire into other appointments that were prospectively made but that were not accomplished, and at some future time we may have to deal with that. Now, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) drew a comparison between the conduct of Sir Oliver Mowat, the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways, and that of Sir Charles Tupper. Now, I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am myself a bit of a hero worshipper; I admit that when I saw the hon. leader of the Opposition come down from his high place full of years and honours, and step manfully into the arena, I felt a certain degree of admiration for him. I must confess further that when I saw this venerable gentleman, if he will pardon my using this expression, bearing

so lightly his three-score years and ten, traverse this country from one end to the other, doing yeoman service for his party, I entertained a feeling of admiration for him. But it was suggested to me that in the year 1891 this veteran of political warfare, this veteran of political strife, this beacon light about which alone the shattered forces of the Conservative party could rally—it was suggested to me that in 1891 he had done almost the same thing; and then it occurred to me that possibly he also was fighting for the flesh pots, and that the atmosphere of London had a charm for him that he could not forget. In any event, I am not concerned to look for motives; but I think the leader of the Opposition will permit me to say that I at all events believe he has proved in the fights that have gone by that he is entitled to that chivalrous treatment which a foeman worthy of the steel of our leader, is entitled to receive. Now, Sir, why should Sir Oliver Mowat, the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance leave their positions? Did not Mr. Taillon, the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec leave his position, and what was the result? He got left. Mr. Angers and Mr. Desjardins followed in his steps, and what happened to them? They got left. But in so far as those two gentlemen are concerned, we may hereafter have to deal with the motives that prompted them in resigning their senatorships, and upon their resignations hangs a tail, or, to speak more correctly, to those resignations hung a tail. In any event the action of provincial ministers in entering the federal arnea has, I think, been fully justified by public opinion. If we take the case of Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, we find he was elected by acclamation, and in the province of Nova Scotia, all the by-elections have gone in favour of his party. If we take the case of Mr. Blair, public opinion appears also to have ratified his choice, and on that question there is no more competent authority than the ex-Minister of Finance, if rumour speaks truly of the role he played in the election.

I will now deal with the question of the Governor General's warrants, in respect of which complaint has been made against the Government. The practice and doctrine, I believe, to be that Parliament gives the Executive each year a certain amount of money to provide for the public wants. If, at the end of the fiscal year, the funds for the new year have not been provided, then Parliament must be assembled, and in the interval nothing can be done with regard to the finances. But cases may arise, exigencies may occur which require the intervention of an authority outside of Parliament. That intervention has been carefully guarded, and can only be exercised subject to certain conditions. Now, what does the Audit Act say? It says:

(b) If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required which shall be placed by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to a special account against which cheques may issue from time to time, in the usual form, as they are required.

That is to say, expenditure, unforeseen or unprovided for, urgently and immediately required for the public good. Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the expenditures necessitated by the working of our canal system and our railways, involving the performance of manual labour, are not matters of urgency? If, in order to enable those works to be carried on it is necessary to obtain public money, is not that a reason for the application of the provisions of the Audit Act? And is not the Government fully justified in applying for the issue of Governor General's warrants to secure the money to be used for such purpose? Was this expenditure unforeseen, was it unprovided for? That it was unprovided for is undoubted. That it was unforeseen, one is almost forced to conclude by the conduct of the late Government. Let us see what occurred. There was a session which ended in July, 1895. During the course of that session, funds for 1895-96 were provided. Then we had a session in the month of January, 1896. During the course of that session, called for a special purpose, for the purpose of dealing with the Manitoba school question, no Estimates were passed by this House. Consequently, for 1896-97 no supplies were provided. What condition of things have we got? Who is responsible for the fact that supplies were not passed, and was the Opposition of that day perfectly justified in preventing the passing of those Estimates? Let us see. We had a session called for 2nd January, 1896, for a specific purpose, for the purpose of dealing with the Manitoba school question. Why was that session not called at an earlier date, hon. gentlemen knew the condition of the public mind on the Manitoba school question, they knew that the latent passions and prejudices of the people had, in consequence of the manner in which they had dealt with that question, been aroused, and they could not legitimately hope in the short time between the opening of the session on January 2nd and April 25, when Parliament must lapse, to pass a complicated law on the school question. The Government called Parliament together on 2nd January for the purpose of considering and passing that legislation, and we find that when they met Parliament the Government

had many other questions to settle among themselves, and many difficulties to adjust, so that they did not bring the Bill down to the House before 22nd February, 1896, and did not ask the House to deal with it before 2nd March, very little more than a month before the expiration of Parliament by lapse of time. What have you further? You have a Government formed under conditions still fresh in the minds of the House. The Government formed in January, 1896, was organized as the result of a conflict such as the history of the country does not make mention. Again the fact was announced to the world that the Government was only a temporary one, and that so soon as Parliament was dissolved the intention was to form a new Government, which would go to the country at the elections and have control of the money granted in the Estimates. We have, therefore, this fact: The Opposition were expected to vote the Estimates to be given to a Government to be formed, which was not then in existence, but which was to be brought into existence after Parliament had expired; that is to say, a Government was to be brought into existence without the people having an opportunity to pronounce on the merits and demerits of its members, and without any control of Parliament being exercised. It was to a Government to be formed under those conditions, after the events that had transpired in January, that the then Opposition were expected to vote the supplies so that the Government might have them after the elections. For what purpose? Probably to enable the Government to remain in power for a year from that day, because it is apparent from what we know that on 7th July, fourteen days after the elections had taken place, the then Prime Minister had not realized that his Government had been defeated at the polls. If he had not realized it on that day, when would he have realized that fact if he had had the supplies for the year voted? More than that, if those hon. gentlemen really had any proper regard for the public service and for the public interest, and desired to do their whole duty towards the country, what might they have done. We all know they had prepared the public mind for elections in 1895; that the session of 1896 was convened for the purpose of dealing with the Manitoba school question; that at the end of that session we might have had the elections held immediately; that the public were prepared for them, that the two questions, the fiscal policy and the Manitoba school question, had been thoroughly debated and were then fully understood; and yet Parliament was allowed to expire in April, 1896. Why did not the Government have the elections in May, and summon Parliament in time to obtain the necessary supplies before 1st July, 1896? They did not wish to adopt that course, and perhaps before this session closes we will understand what the intention was at that time.

Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to the Manitoba school question, and among other things, he said:

> I entered upon this question, as I say, under the conviction that the Government of Canada were bound by every principle of right and justice and of statesmanship to carry out a policy which they believed to be for the maintenance of the law and the constitution of the country, as expounded by the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire.

Further, he went on to say:

> I entertained the belief, and I entertained it sincerely, that it would be a cause of deep resentment on the part of the great body of the Roman Catholics of this country if the Parliament of Canada refused to carry out the law and the constitution of the country, as expounded by the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire.

Why he should say that we should limit that deep resentment to the Roman Catholics of this country because the law and the constitution would not be carried out, I fail to understand. Sir, the law and the constitution of this country are as sacred to the Protestants as to the Catholics, and to the Catholics as to the Protestants. Then the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) further said:

> Under these circumstances, I say, I found that I attached much greater importance to this question——

And the question, Mr. Speaker, was respect for the law, respect for the constitution, respect for the judgment of the highest court of the Empire. He, the leader of the Opposition, discovered that he attached too much importance to that question: and why? Because he found that the elections in the province of Quebec went against him. Right had ceased to be right and justice had ceased to be justice: the constitution need not be interfered with, whatever may be the fate of the minority in Manitoba. And why? Because the people of the province of Quebec, asserting their right as free men, refused to sell these rights for a mess of pottage. And let me say one word more. What was the condition of this question of the Manitoba schools so far as our province was concerned? We know that this question was brought up to do duty for the Conservative party as far back as 1890. We from the province of Quebec know that that same question was made to do duty during the course of the Federal elections in 1891, and that then it had some effect upon the people of the province. I admit that they hesitatingly accepted the promises that were made, but still the people of our province were influenced by them in 1891. What occurred? The question then ceased apparently to be a factor in politics. It was put in the courts and after having dragged its weary way from one court to another, finally it was resuscitated on the eve of the election of 1896. But then the farce had ceased to draw; the people of

the province began to understand what it all meant, and they were, I say, justified in the conclusion that it had been treated by the late Government as a farce, and a ludicrous farce, from the outset. Let me explain myself. The judgment of the Privy Council was rendered in January or February, 1895. In March, 1895, the remedial order was passed. In April, 1895, Parliament was assembled, but was there anything said about this question? Was it dealt with then? Not at all. Nothing was done until the eve of the prorogation in July, 1895, when we had what we may call the first "bolt." Then what occurred? We had the promise of a second session in the month of January, 1896. The House was called on the 2nd of January of that year, and naturally the people from the province of Quebec expected that this matter would be dealt with then, but the second "bolt" came, and there was no Remedial Bill. It would be idle now to discuss the causes of the bolt, or to refer to it at any length, for the fact is so well and familiarly known throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion that I need not rehearse what took place, nor need I repeat the epithets which were exchanged between the parties to the "bolt." Further, on the 2nd of January, 1896, these gentlemen knew perfectly well that Parliament must be dissolved by the efflux of time in April of that year. They waited until the 27th of February to bring down their Bill, and it was the 2nd day of March before it came up for consideration before the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, what took place in the meantime? On the occasion of the first "bolt" a member of the Government made a speech in the Senate. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Angers, and he then said:

> What will be the position of the Dominion Government if they come before Parliament in January with such a declaration? The minority will have been put out of the fort, it will be standing out again in the open field, and the Government will be unable to determine the House to take action. That was my objection to that part of the declaration of the Government, and I offered the one which I have just read to you; but it was voted down. The declaration made by the Government admits of a doubt as to the actual jurisdiction of Parliament. The one that I offered granted a delay but raised no suspicion as to jurisdiction. I have read that declaration to show that I did not want to be hasty. However, my conviction is that between this day and the day that Parliament meets again, such an excitement will go over the country in opposition to the granting of remedial legislation that if the Government hesitates now, it will be then afraid.

That is what the Hon. Mr. Angers said when giving his ministerial explanations after leaving the Government, and when explaining the condition of things existing at the Council board when this matter was dealt with. He told us that such a wave of indignation would go through this country that it would be impossible for the Government to deal with this question, and he told us further that in any event they would be afraid to deal with it. These were the words pronounced in July, 1895, by the Hon. Mr. Angers. These were the words that were sent broadcast throughout the province of Quebec. These were the words that were known in every town and village and hamlet in that province; and these words were supplemented by articles which emanated from the Hon. Mr. Angers' friends, published in his organs which were known to be the mouthpieces of his opinions, and in which he indicated by name his colleagues, and said: So long as these gentlemen remain in the Government no remedial legislation will pass.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with these facts in the public mind, with these facts known in the province of Quebec, and in view of the subsequent conduct of the late Government, what conclusion were the people of the province of Quebec necessarily forced to, except that to which I pointed a few moments ago, namely, that the whole thing was a ridiculous farce, that this Remedial Bill was kept in abeyance for no other purpose than to serve as a cloak, for what I may call in a political sense, the iniquities of the late Government, so as to enable them to ride back into power, if possible, upon the wave of fanaticism and prejudice that they hoped to arouse. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives)—and I regret that he is not now in his seat—stated to the House last evening that in the province of Quebec the cry was: Hurrah for Laurier, one of our race. I believe that the hon. member from St. Anne's, Montreal (Mr. Quinn), re-echoed that sentiment to-day. Both these gentlemen must allow me to say that they are mistaken. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary history of my province proves that there is no province within the Dominion of Canada in which representative institutions are better understood, or in which the political pendulum oscillates more freely. In no province of the Dominion, Sir, are the words of Junius better understood: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Let me prove it. We had a federal election in 1874, and the result in the province of Quebec was forty-seven Ministerialists and eighteen Opposition. Then we had the local elections of May, 1878, and what was the result? The local election in May, 1878, gave to my hon. friend in front of me (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) a majority in the province of Quebec.

Mr. DUPONT. No.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, gave him such a majority as enabled him to carry on his affairs, and when he was wrongfully dismissed——

Mr. DUPONT. No.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. I am not going to bandy words across the floor

of the House about this. When he was wrongfully dismissed from office by reason of a corrupt bargain that will for ever disgrace the annals of parliamentary history in Canada, the electors gave him a majority of six; and that corrupt bargain had the effect of driving from public life every person who was a party to it, with the single exception of the man who is Prime Minister in the province of Quebec to-day. We had a federal election in September of the same year, and what was the result? The pendulum swung the other way; the Conservatives carried the day. In 1886 the Liberals again came into power in the province. In 1887 federal elections were held, and the Conservatives again had a majority. Now, here is the important point. In 1890 we had an election in the province, which gave the Liberals a large majority, and in 1892, two years afterwards, we had another election, when that majority was wiped out, and a majority of 33 was given the other way. Can I not say truthfully that the political pendulum in the province of Quebec oscillates between one party and the other? Can I not say that in our province eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that eternal vigilance, whether rightly or wrongly, has been exercised by the people? Now, if the recent election has resulted more favourably to this Government in our province than elsewhere, what was the determining cause? The determining cause, I venture to say, is that the people of our province were more audaciously deceived than the people of any other. They have been deceived on the school question, and in other respects they have been more audaciously deceived than the people of any other province. I will call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this fact, that the people of the province of Quebec have had the advantage of two object lessons. In the district of Quebec we had the Louise Embankment and the harbour improvements, well known to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). The other object lesson, which we had in the district of Montreal, was the Curran Bridge; and with these two object lessons before them, one can understand how the people of the province of Quebec went in the direction they did.

Now, let me look at the question of nationality. How has the province of Quebec as a whole acted in regard to that? You have had as Prime Minister of that province the Hon. Mr. Joly, a French Protestant, elected by a population of which 90 per cent was Catholic. More than that, you have as Premier in the province of Quebec at the present time an Irish Roman Catholic. These facts go to show the attitude of the province as a whole towards its public men, and how far the province as a whole considers these questions of nationality in meting out its political favours. But still more than that. From the condition of things existing in the province as a whole, let us come down to particular instances. Let us take Bonaventure, where certainly 75 per cent of the population is French Canadian and Roman Catholic. Whom did that county return to Parliament? My hon. friend Mr. Fauvel. Take Quebec West, and what do you find? You find that that constituency, containing almost a majority of French Canadians, and certainly a very great majority of Catholics, returned my friend the Hon. Mr. Dobell, who is a Protestant. Now, take the county of Portneuf, in which 90 per cent of the population is French Canadian and Catholic. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) spoke yesterday about the Rouge curés of the province of Quebec. If I wished to refer to the role played by certain gentlemen in the last elections, the opportunity is now afforded me; but I do not think it desirable or necessary under the circumstances to do so. But this good French Canadian and Catholic constituency of Portneuf returned my hon. friend, Sir Henri Joly, notwithstanding the appeals, which I may characterize as desperate, that were made against him by men high in authority. Then, take my humble self. I represent the county of Quebec, which was formerly represented for many years by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), and in which at least 90 or 95 per cent of the population is French Canadian and Catholic. I contested that county in the local election in 1890, and my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) can well recall certain allusions which were made to my nationality at that time; but those allusions did not materialize, for I was elected by a very large majority. In the last contest the same thing occurred again. The same allusions were made, but they did not materialize then either, and you see the result before you to-day. Under these circumstances, is it not fair for me to say that in our province nationality and religion play but a very small role? If the members of this House would only come down to our province, and see our people in their homes, and the steady, industrious, virtuous lives they lead, there is not a man in this House who would not feel for them the same affection which we who live amongst them entertain. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we have now done with all these questions of nationality and religion. I trust that in this House we, who are the chosen of the people, will, by precept and example, show that the avenues which lead to places of perferment and power are open to all, and that no man's religion or nationality ought to be used either as a barrier or as a stepping-stone. Let the only question be citizenship and capacity to do service to the State. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that the Prime Minister ought to be proud of the result he has obtained in the province of Quebec. If he had had his majority in the other provinces, I am quite sure—to borrow

an expression from the eloquent member for York (Mr. Foster)—that we would have heard the welkin ring to the tune of "He's got no power among his own people." But it seems to me it ought to be something for him to know that the province in which he has lived for over half a century, that the people among whom he has laboured and by whom he is best known, have given him a majority that we are proud to see in this House. It must be some comfort to him to feel that those who know him best love him and trust him the most.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to have spoken earlier in the debate. Questions of great and varied importance which have come up during the discussion have already been dealt with by hon. gentlemen on both sides; so that it is almost impossible for me at this period to discuss those questions without repeating what has already been said. In addressing myself, however, for a few moments to the attention of Parliament, I do so more particularly for the purpose of putting my views before the House and country upon some of the points which have been brought out during the discussion, but I must at the very outset, following in the wake of those who have spoken before me, offer my congratulations to the gentlemen who were charged with the duty of moving and seconding the Address—a duty difficult to perform the first time it becomes the duty of a young member to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. the mover (Mr. McInnes) expressed his views in a very forcible manner. It was quite evident that he brought to the House of Parliament that energy and determination which characterizes the far-famed western country. The hon. gentleman expressed his views in such a manner as to convince every member of this House that with further parliamentary experience he should lose no opportunity or representing the views of those who sent him here, in such a forcible manner as to bring conviction to his hearers. If I have one reproach to make to the hon. gentleman, it is that his energy pushed him so far that if what he has asked the leader of the Government to grant to his province were granted, the older portions of the Dominion and the more eastern provinces would be left out in the cold. The hon. gentleman demanded for his province nothing less than a mint, the payment of ten million dollars to be returned to his province which he claims that province has contributed in excess of what is received from the Dominion. He also asks for Cabinet representation. I hope, in the interests of the Dominion at large that all his demands will not be granted, but the hon. gentleman certainly has acquitted himself of the duty which he had to perform in a manner which did him credit.

When I now come to the seconder of the Address (Mr. Lemieux), I must say that during my extended parliamentary career, I have seldom heard a speech delivered in a more eloquent manner and spoken in more perfect and classical French—that language wherein the poet and the orator and the historian have found the channel to communicate their labours and their thoughts to the civilized world. I differ from the hon. gentleman upon some parts of his speech. For instance, I have noticed that within comparatively few years, some four or five years, hon. gentlemen belonging to the Liberal party in the province of Quebec have endeavoured to place upon the pages of their political history the names of those distinguished men whom we consider to have been the founders of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman in his speech referred to Lafontaine and to Morin and to Cartier as being connected with the party with which he is working to-day. Reading history as I read it, it becomes very difficult indeed for me to trace back to such men as the Morins and the Cartiers and the Lafontaines any connection with the old Liberal party or the party which has succeeded to it in the province of Quebec. I see that the leader of the Government, the Hon. Mr. Laurier, proclaimed in Quebec that Lafontaine was one of the greatest Canadians we ever had in that province. In that expression of opinion I am quite prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman, but I must say that those with whom he is in sympathy have not all spoken of Lafontaine in the terms used by him. In a speech which he made in the city of Quebec, on the 4th June, 1894, the Hon. Mr. Laurier, after quoting, amid the plaudits of the Liberals who composed his audience, the words used by Mr. Cartier on the union which confederation was likely to effect between the different races composing the Canadian people, he proceeded to use the following language, which with the permission of the House, I shall quote in the language in which it was delivered. Mr. Laurier said:

I am happy to find a Liberal meeting applauding such words. They are great, weighty, noble, generous words. It is the language of a man who also cared for the duties suggested to him by the special position in which his race stood. I am well aware, and do not forget, that the Liberals of Lower Canada dreaded confederation. I do not forget that Sir A. A. Dorion and the French Canadian Liberals feared that confederation would be the end of things, which we always consider as a sound inheritance; but Sir George Etienne Cartier had no such fear, and I, Dorion's disciple, pupil of Dorion's school, have no hesitation to say that my ideas in this respect are common with those of George Etienne Cartier, and not with those of Sir A. A. Dorion.

And some time later, on the occasion of the publication of Cartier's speech, he wrote that, of all the political leaders, he was the one who had "that clearest notion of the duties which the condition of the French race imposed upon him," and that he had "no superior outside of Lafontaine." Now,

it is ignoring our history to refuse to acknowledge the fierce and spiteful struggle of which Lafontaine, Morin and Cartier were the objects. Lafontaine went out of politics, disgusted with the outrages with which he was overwhelmed by the Liberals. Morin, his successor, was insulted, slandered, and abused by these same Liberals. Cartier, the continuator of their work, was crushed by the Liberals, and haunted with their enmity, even while lying in his grave. The party founded by Papineau cannot reckon Lafontaine and Morin among its authors. The party that had Dorion for its leader cannot declare itself connected with Cartier.

I refer to this utterance of the leader of the Government merely to show that the very men who, like Sir George Etienne Cartier and the others, were instrumental in founding confederation and who were attacked so violently at different periods by the old Liberal party of Quebec, are now recognized by the Liberal party as the great men, whose opinion, upon one of the most vital and important question which has ever arisen in the history of Canada, should have been taken instead of the opinions of such men, able as they were, as Sir Aimée Dorion and other Liberals. It required, indeed, all the eloquence and ingenuity of the hon. gentleman to build up such a speech as that he has made upon such a flimsy foundation as the Speech from the Throne. I must say that ever since I entered Parliament I have heard the taunt thrown across the House that the bill of fare in the Speech from the Throne was very scanty, that there was very little in the political programme which the Government was submitting to the representatives of the people. But I am sure it would be difficult to find in the history of Parliament, since confederation, at least, any precedent Speech from the Throne in which so very little was indicated to the people of the policy which the Government intended to follow. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Government hardly attempted to defend the charge made against the Administration of having given no intimation of his policy in the Speech given by His Excellency. But he stated that at this season of the year too generous a diet would be deleterious to a delicate stomach. Whether he considers that the Canadian stomach is too delicate to receive more than he has given them or not, it is hard for me to say. But I am quite sure of one thing, and that is that Canada will certainly run the risk of inanition instead of dying of surfeit if the hon. gentlemen stick to the homœopathic practice which they have followed on this occasion in distributing in the tiniest globulas the information which the people are entitled to. If the Speech is looked into, I think it will be found that it can be reduced to two items. The first is the reason given by the Government for calling Parliament at this inconvenient season. Well, Sir, I wish to ask any man of impartial mind. I will put it to any hon. gentleman on either side of the House, if it is not the fact that the reason why Parliament was called at this season of the year was that the gentlemen who are sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Government, during the last session of an expiring Parliament, had recourse to a system of obstruction, a parallel for which it is impossible to find in the history of any parliamentary assembly. Hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing that Parliament could not sit beyond a certain period of time and knowing that the Government had submitted to Parliament one of the most important questions which has ever come under the consideration of an assembly of this kind—the Manitoba school question—forgetting the duty which they owed to the country, determined by means of obstruction, to prevent the Estimates from being passed. The eloquent member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said that it was right to refuse to give supplies to a party who intended to change the Government existing at that time, and to form another. But every effort was made by the Government of the day to meet any objections that could be raised. It was proposed that the Estimates should be voted only for the Civil Service, if Parliament would agree to that; it was proposed that the Estimates should be voted only for six months, if Parliament would agree to that, or for three months if Parliament would agree to that. And if any of these reasonable propositions had been accepted, if gentlemen opposite had thought only of the interests of the country at large, and had forgotten party strife and party advantage for the time being, this session need not have been called, and the Canadian people would have been saved an expenditure of $10,000 a day, or $300,000 a month. Could these supplies have been used for any other purpose than that for which they were voted? Was it possible, under the rules of the constitution, and with an Auditor General in office, for the Government to apply Estimates otherwise than as Parliament directed? How, then, could any risk have been incurred by accepting one of the reasonable propositions which were then made? But they were all rejected, and it is for that reason that we are called together at this inconvenient season, and at a very large expense which will have to be explained to the people of Canada—and I think that when the time comes for the people to consider the reasons why they have been put to this very large expenditure, they will see that it was not the Conservative party who placed them in that position, but the hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury benches. There is another question which, from my standpoint, certainly should have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It is impossible, as we know, to change the fiscal policy of the country without causing widespread disturbance of industry. Within

a comparatively short period we have seen a great disturbance take place in the United States, through President Cleveland's changing the old protective policy which had obtained in that country and trying to interfere with the tariff which at that time existed. I think that the Speech from the Throne should at least have indicated—without going into details of policy or stating particular changes—the general lines upon which these changes were to be made. In the declarations made by hon. gentlemen opposite, from one end of the country to the other, it is plain that every possible fiscal policy has been accepted at one time and rejected at another time by the hon. gentlemen. We know of instances in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario, where manufacturers have reduced their establishments, and where intended investments have been held back until the policy of the Government was known. Sir, it is impossible not to realize that the great mass of the people of Canada are favourable to the National Policy; they are favourable to that policy because they have had an opportunity of judging of both systems. Who can forget the difference which exists between the Canada of 1874 and the Canada of to-day? Who can forget that under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, after the Liberal party came into power under Mr. Mackenzie in 1874, the trade of Canada, the industries of Canada, the credit of Canada at home and abroad, were on the verge of ruin? It is impossible to deny it. But when Sir John A. Macdonald, sitting on the Opposition benches with but a small following at his back, sounded a note of encouragement to the industries of Canada by propounding his National Policy, then we saw Canada revive, we saw new industries started, the credit of Canada improved, everything seemed to partake of new life, and it was properly called the National Policy because it was a policy which gave life to the nation; it was properly called the National Policy because its far-reaching effects on the future of Canada are felt even to-day to a greater extent than one could have expected when it was first inaugurated. Sir, we are told that the people of Canada, on the 23rd of June last, reversed their former verdict. I deny that in the province of Quebec from which I come, and in the great manufacturing centres of that province, the opinion of the people has changed as regards that policy. I should like an opportunity to test the question whether public opinion is still in favour of the National Policy, or whether it is favourable to free trade, or would go in for continental free trade, or go in for any other one of the shifting policies which, one after another, hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to get the people of Canada to accept. Sir, four times since 1874 the people of Canada have been called upon to pronounce upon the National Policy, and four times the people of Canada declared that that policy was suitable to the wants and to the requirements of this country. Free trade may be all right, and it might be proper to discuss the expediency of adopting free trade under such circumstances as it was adopted in England when, after England had been protected to a degree not reached by any other country in history, when England had been protected to such an extent that she required all the markets of the world in which to distribute her goods, then she went in for free trade. But having, as we do, alongside of us an enterprising, a rich and industrial people like the United States, it would be detrimental to the best interests of Canada to change our policy and to go back to the system under which Canada was nothing else but a slaughter market for the surplus of the manufactured goods of the United States. Sir, I think the people of Canada—and I do not now speak in any party spirit, should have been told in the Speech from the Throne, the lines upon which the Government proposed to make modifications in the tariff, and they should have been informed in what direction the changes were to be effected. Sir, if you go among the industrial population of Montreal, Hamilton, Toronto, or of any other industrial centre, you will find at this moment that there is stagnation, there is a want of activity, there is hesitation to invest in capital so as to increase the output of those manufactures as it would have increased if people were sure that this policy would not be reversed. Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words about a question which has agitated, not only my own native province, but the whole Dominion of Canada, a question which is now known to history as the Manitoba school question. Upon that question, at another time and in a different place, I have on more than one occasion stated my views, and I wish to state here to Parliament and to the country that I stand upon that question now where I stood as a member of the Administration of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. We have heard a great deal about that question having been used, on account of its importance, in a way that it ought not to have been used in the recent election. Sir, when we saw Sir Mackenzie Bowell, a strong Protestant gentleman, take his political life in his hands and fight the battle of the Manitoba minority, certainly his course did not indicate any fanaticism. When I saw the present leader of the Opposition fighting one of the most brilliant battles that any man has ever fought for a cause and for a principle, when I saw him at his time of life going from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and pleading that justice should be done to a Catholic minority, I was convinced that if fanaticism exists in Canada at all, as it does exist in every other country, it exists probably to a lesser degree in Canada than in any other country in the world. Now, what was the explanation of the fact

that Catholics and Protestants met on the same platform to fight on behalf of the minority? It is this, I never looked upon that question as a religious one. I looked upon it as a constitutional question, and we had the decision of the highest authority in the judgment of the highest tribunal in the British Empire, a tribunal far removed from our political strife, that under the constitution these people had been deprived of rights which should be restored to them. Sir, if I understand rightly the meaning of our federal compact, unless you can prove to the minorities, Catholic or Protestant, that that compact is comprehensive enough to protect their rights, I say confederation is a failure, and cannot meet the wants which it was devised to meet. I place my opinion upon record, that I fought on behalf of the minority of Manitoba because I thought it involved a question affecting the future of this country. I considered that what had occurred in Manitoba might take place in other provinces of the Dominion, and unless the people of Canada were satisfied that the provisions of the constitution would be applied impartially to every race and creed, to every province and portion of the Dominion, the people would lose confidence in the constitution and it would prove a failure; and I fear not to affirm that here. We know well that within a few years public opinion has been growing in favour of Imperialism, I mean in the sense of a closer union between the colonies and the mother country. I am an Imperialist to this extent, that I desire the closest possible union between the colonies and England. I know not what Providence has in store for Canada, but I sincerely hope that the connecting link between this Dominion and the Empire will ever be maintained. At no period of the world's history was a people more completely protected, or no country has developed more rapidly than Canada as a portion of the British Empire. It has not been necessary to spend the money of this country in maintaining a consular and diplomatic service, in building fleets to enforce our treaties, and without treaties we cannot expect to become a commercial nation. Under the British flag our commerce is respected the world over, and thus we are enabled to apply the resources of this Dominion to the construction of railways connecting the eastern portion of this country with the Pacific province, thereby opening new territories, and attracting capital from the old world for investment here. Lately I read a report on the development of Rossland in British Columbia, and if half of the progress reported is true, there is certainly a future for that province as regards mineral development that will prove unequalled. Mr. Speaker, I affirm that my position on the Manitoba school question is one based on the constitution under which I am proud to live. Any hon. member, be he Catholic or Protestant, who comes down to Quebec will see people of the two different races and different religions living side by side in peace and harmony, prepared to help each other when the time of trial comes. One day it may be a Protestant helping a Catholic and the next day a Catholic helping the Protestant; in fact, Quebec is a model in this respect not only for the other provinces of the Dominion but for any country where different races live side by side. It is a model province for the most perfect accord exists among its people and there the school system is understood so perfectly that it is impossible that any trouble should arise between the different religious elements. If the constitution recognizes, as it does, that certain educational rights had been granted to the minority of Manitoba, I shall not be satisfied until those which have been taken away are restored, and I should have been pleased to learn from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat on what lines he wishes to settle that very difficult question. Sir, it is important to the whole country to obtain this information. This question has been agitating the country too long already, and it seems to me that all the facts connected with the issue are perfectly well known, but I must admit that it is impossible to ascertain from the hon. gentleman's remarks on what possible lines hon. gentlemen opposite can be brought together to agree upon a line of policy. For instance, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) in his manifesto on the eve of the election, said:

> The removal of the Manitoba school question from federal politics would be a blessing, but we must wait awhile before we know whether the amicable settlement which Mr. Laurier promises will meet the demands (of Mr. Choquette).

In his recent manifesto the member for Montmagny declared:

> For a settlement of the question of the schools in a manner efficient and practical, and on the basis of recognizing and of making the local authorities of Manitoba recognize the rights and privileges of which those authorities have despoiled our co-religionists in their province.

If the question was settled according to the policy enunciated by that hon. gentleman, I should be quite satisfied; if the rights of which the Manitoba minority were deprived were restored to them, I should be perfectly happy. Satisfied as I was in regard to this policy, I read to-day in the Montreal "Gazette" a statement regarding a different policy, and with the permission of the House I will read a letter issued by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) which appears in that journal. It is as follows:—

> Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who had the unusual honour of being elected for two constituencies, North Simcoe and Brandon, Man., resigned the latter seat in the House of Commons to-day.

and elected to sit for the Ontario riding, with which his name has so long been connected. In a letter which he issued this evening to the electors of Brandon, Mr. McCarthy makes a statement of public interest regarding the school question. The letter is as follows :—

I have delayed determining for which of the constituencies I have been returned for I should sit, until, by usage of the Imperial Parliament (we have no settled practice, nor, as it happened, any precedent in Canada), the time has come that I ought to announce my selection. My nomination as a candidate for your division, and my election therefor, was, as I understood it, to manifest in the clearest possible way your settled opposition to Dominion interference with your school system ; and I have to consider whether in the interest of that cause, which I represented in the last Parliament and in the contest which has just been brought to a close, I should retain the seat to which you have done me the honour of electing me, or hold that for North Simcoe, for which, for nearly twenty years, I have been continuously returned.

Recent events have enabled me to reach a conclusion in this question without much difficulty. Did there appear to be a possibility of the coercion of Manitoba, my duty would probably have required me to remain one of Manitoba's members, but, happily, coercion is dead and the victory for the opponents of interference with Manitoba is complete and decisive, and, moreover, it is announced that negotiations are pending between the Government of the province and the new Administration here for a settlement of the question, which, there is no reason to doubt, is based on the principle of leaving the province absolutely free as to the management of its own school system. Whatever may be conceded by the province of her own free will, to be carried out by her own legislature, and so far as I have been able to ascertain by the terms of the negotiations now on foot, the province is not called upon to yield anything which does not leave the principle of national schools undisturbed, nor more than may reasonably be asked for by those who believe in religious education in our public schools. But, however that may be, it is clear that my usefulness as your member is gone when the question is removed from the arena of Dominion politics.

I ventured to say in my place in the House of Commons last session, when the leader of the House practically announced the withdrawal of the Remedial Bill, that the House had seen the last of the Remedial Bill at either that or any future session. Is it presumptuous to refer to the accuracy of this forecast ? Under these circumstances you will naturally expect that I should leave the constituency of Brandon free to be represented by one more conversant with your local requirements than I, a resident of Ontario, could possibly be, and who will in that view, and possibly in other respects, more fittingly represent you. While thus severing the short connection that has existed between us, I may be permitted to say that, as is not unnatural, I have been able to acquire more information and a greater insight than I hitherto was possessed of respecting the position and legislative and administrative wants of the province, which may, I trust, in the future, enable me to be of some service to it ; and I can assure you that, as the only poor recompense in my power for the honour you have conferred upon me in electing me, an outsider, and personally unknown to the vast majority of you, as your representative, it will be my duty as well as my pleasure to promote and further in every way that I can the political and material wants of the great province of which you form a part, and more especially those of the electoral division of Brandon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here are two very divergent statements made by two of the leading members supporting the present Liberal Government. One insists upon the school question being settled upon the basis of restoring schools to the minority. For one I agree to that extent, that the rights which were accorded to that minority under the constitution should be respected and should be restored. But on the other hand, we have quite an opposite view given. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) says : Did not I tell you all along that nothing would ever come out of the school question ; did I not tell you last session that it would not come before Parliament again ? And now, Mr. Speaker, when the gentlemen opposite, who through their obstruction prevented us from getting a vote beyond the second reading of the Bill, when they are in power, they have these two contending and antagonistic elements within their ranks. I say that the people of Canada had a right to have some intimation given them as to the lines upon which these negotiations were going on, and as to what was the policy of the present Government upon that question. Sir, I venture the opinion that until that question is settled, this unfortunate agitation will not be allayed. No man deplores more than I do such an agitation in a country like ours. Every patriotic man should try with all his energy to put an end to these irritating questions which divide race against race, and religion against religion, and which distract the attention of the people from the great problems which they have to solve for the advancement of their country. Now, Sir, I wish before concluding to say another word upon this other point. I have heard hon. gentlemen speak of the hon. the leader of the Government—some approving and others not appearing to approve of his selection as the Premier of Canada because of his coming from the province of Quebec. Sir, I think Canada has outgrown parish politics. For my part, I am proud to see, and the province of Quebec is proud to see, one of her French Canadian sons occupying the high position which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) occupies. Is it strange that a descendant of that race which opened up the whole of this North American continent to civilization and Christianity, and which has assisted so much in its development—is it strange, I ask, that a descendant of that race should occupy the highest position in the gift of the people of Canada ? But, Sir, I shall never select a man for any position because of his nationality, or because of his village, or the city or the town where he was born. If a French Canadian is deserving of this high

position, why should he not have it? I am glad, Sir, to say that in the present Premier of Canada, the province of Quebec is represented by one of her most gifted sons. Differing from him as I do on almost every political issue that has come before the House, I am yet prepared to say here, as I have stated on every occasion and before different audiences, that I am proud as a French Canadian to see Canada represented by a French Canadian Premier. But, Sir, that is not enough for me. Beside the fact of his talents, beside the fact of his origin, beside the fact of his being a man who is fully capable of representing us in every path of life, I want from him a policy that will help on our country. I want him to be equal to the long list of patriots who have contributed towards the progress and the building up of this country. I want him to come forward with measures which will develop our country. If he should do this, it will be a glorious day for the French Canadian race to be able to say that under a French Canadian Premier the country had continued to develop and improve. But, Sir, how fatal it would be to us if, on the contrary, history will have to record that under the reign of a French Canadian Premier the progress of Canada was retarded, and that we did not realize from him the great expectations that we had hoped for.

Mr. LISTER. Don't be afraid, you won't have to say that at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to take the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) on that subject, and it is because I am prepared to take his opinion that I should like to tell him what will satisfy me in the shape of a policy that will develop the country, so that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister), with his great influence over his leader, may induce the Premier to adopt it. I promise to tender whatever help I may be able to give to the hon. gentleman in accomplishing the end which I desire. For instance, Sir, because the Premier comes from the province of Quebec, I would not, as a Canadian, consent to see the great waterways of Canada handed over to a foreign country. I would not consent, as a Canadian, to allow the Americans, rich and powerful as they are, to come over here and pay a proportion of the cost of our public works. I think the national pride of Canada would be hurt by that, and I believe that the future of Canada would be jeopardized if we permitted such a transaction. Let us take our time if need be. If we can develop these great natural waterways which we have inherited, so as to transfer our produce through the great lakes to Liverpool, let us do it, and if need be let us take our time in doing it. If we are not rich enough, and if our population is too small to improve these waterways in a few years, let us take more time, but do not let us divide the bill of expenses between the Americans and ourselves. Sir, how is it possible that any public man in Canada could dream of sharing the fisheries—our greatest heritage—with any nation of the earth, except upon the condition of receiving full compensation for the great privilege accorded. Instead of such a policy as that, let us have a national policy. I am for friendship and amity with the United States. I admire the people of that country. I have many friends who live in the United States, and frequently it is my great pleasure to enjoy their hospitality, to admire their great national wealth, and to see the wonderful development of their industries; developed under a protective policy similar to the policy which the Conservative party has applied to Canada. But, Sir, I hope never shall we hear in the precincts of this Chamber, or outside either, a Canadian who would advocate the handing over of our fisheries or the sharing of our fisheries, with any other nation unless we get full value for that great privilege.

In that Speech, I should have liked also to see some announcement as to the intentions of this Government with reference to the question of a fast Atlantic service, the measure for which the late Government, the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the Government of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, fought so long and so successfully—a measure in regard to which they succeeded in inducing the Imperial Government to share the views of the Canadian Government, so far as to agree to contribute a very large subsidy from the Imperial treasury to help to establish that great service. I would like to hear the opinion of my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) on that important question, because I have heard it rumoured that he advocates a line of seventeen knots. We should have been informed in the Speech from the Throne what the policy of the Government is on that very important question. I quite understand that it would be unreasonable for us to ask the hon. gentlemen who have just come into office to lay down a programme so detailed as to be final and complete. I quite understand that even if that information were given to us, we on this side of the House ought not to delay the session in order to take up so important a measure; but we should know something about the policy of the Government in regard to it, so that Parliament would be in a position to give it full consideration in another session. But nothing is said in regard to it, and are we to run the risk of losing that Imperial subsidy which possibly may never be offered to us again. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition had a great deal to do with that important question when in England. It was due in great part to his energy if he succeeded in getting that Imperial subsidy. But are the British Government going to give a subsidy for a seventeen-knot line? Never. Why should

they ? We have a line of steamers at present which is not a seventeen-knot line, it is true; yet the difference between the present line and a seventeen-knot line would not be great enough to induce the Government of England to help to establish the new line by an Imperial grant ; because the object of that Government is to obtain a means of communication between the extreme east and Liverpool and London in the shortest possible time. It was part of the policy propounded by the late Government to have the steamers built under the supervision of the British Admiralty, and it was upon that condition that the Imperial Government were prepared to contribute a large sum of money towards their construction. Sir, I have but one word more to say. The hon. member who preceded me, the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Fitzpatrick), to justify the issue of the Governor General's warrants, instanced the railway service. Why, Sir, I remember the day when a resolution was moved in this House by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), condemning an expenditure of $300,000 which was required for the Intercolonial Railway, under a Governor General's warrant. So that upon that question, again, it seems to me the authorities differ. I desired, Mr. Speaker, in as short a speech as I could make to express my opinion more especially upon a question —the school question—with which my name has been identified. I fought the question from the beginning upon the grounds I have stated to the House, and I still adhere to the same grounds.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to claim your attention or that of the hon. members of this House. I had formed the project rather of listening to this, the first debate which I have witnessed in this House, in order to obtain information and to adopt some guidance for my conduct in the future, in so far as I might be called upon to take part in the debates of this honourable House. If I am induced to break that resolution, it is due to the silence of the hon. leader of this House (Mr. Laurier) upon a question which deeply interests the constituency I have the honour to represent. I feel, Sir, that it would scarcely be fair to those who have honoured me with their mandate for me to remain silent and not to join my voice to those of the many who have been heard before me in soliciting from the hon. leader of this House some categorical utterance regarding the fiscal policy of the party which he leads—some statement of the governing principle which will guide him and his colleagues in the examination of the tariff, which is the task they are to enter upon as soon as we separate. Permit me to tell you, Sir, and the hon. members of this House, that I represent a large constituency with two-fold interests—with great interests that can be secured, protected, and safeguarded by a few words, which it is my duty to-day to ask the hon. leader of the House to utter as soon as he can possibly do so. The constituency which I represent is contiguous to the city of Montreal, the metropolis of this Dominion. It lies to the north-west of that great city. As you leave the city limits and enter the constituency of Jacques Cartier, you find a large number of manufactories which extend far into the county, as far as Lachine. These manufactories have been encouraged by the sacrifices of the local municipalities in which they are established. But, Sir, there is something more. They have been built up and have prospered and are standing there to-day in virtue of the policy which has controlled the destinies of this country during the past eighteen years. I am not in a position now to say what is the capital invested in these large industrial enterprises, but I think I am safe in saying that millions have been invested in them by serious men who are anxious to know if the fiscal policy under which these enterprises have begun and have prospered is going to be continued, or, if modified, in what sense, in what direction is that modification going to tend. Of these vast sums of money invested in these enterprises, there is this view to be taken, namely, that the continuance and maintenance of them engrosses the care and attention of a large class which, I think, is entitled to the earnest consideration of this House and Government. I speak of the numberless workmen employed in the maintenance of those industries and in their operation. And let me tell you, Sir, that a more intelligent, a more diligent and a more thrifty class of people I have never met, although I have travelled much all over the world. Now, Sir, as you go west from that part of the constituency which is settled in the way I have indicated, you meet with a large agricultural population. That population has in its possession a farming country of the richest quality, and they have sought to carry out in their farming operations all the improvements which modern progress and science can suggest. That class is also deeply interested in the knowledge of what the fiscal policy which is about to be inaugurated is going to be—at least what is going to be its leading principle. Not only is that class interested in agricultural pursuits, but the properties upon which they live, being in the immediate vicinity of Montreal are undergoing a continual change. In other words, what is an agricultural property to-day, in view of the continual progress and enlargement of the city of Montreal and its extension in every direction, loses its agricultural aspect and obtains a

market value as town sites. This class, therefore, which is a numerous one in that constituency, is deeply interested in the progress of the city of Montreal, is deeply interested in the increase of its industries and in the maintenance of the industries which exist there already. Now, let me tell you, Sir, in a few words, in so far as our fiscal policy is concerned, what was the attitude of both parties in that constituency during the last contest. By explaining this, I think I will give you some justification for the request, which, on behalf of those I represent, I make to the hon. leader of the House, to give us some clear and categorical intimation of what his fiscal policy is going to be. Well, I believe that the contest in that constituency began at an earlier date than it did in most of the other constituencies of this Dominion. The issue, as far as the fiscal policy was concerned, was a clear one. My adversary and those who supported him, and who supported the hon. leader of this House, advocated openly the policy of a tariff for revenue only. There was, in their estimation, no other policy suitable to the present economic conditions of this Dominion. And they pointed out to the agricultural classes of that constituency that, under such a policy of tariff for revenue purely and solely, the taxes—that was the expression used—the heavy taxes which they were called upon to pay every time they purchased agricultural implements, would be abolished, and that in future, in the immediate future, they would have a right to expect that upon the purchase of these implements they would have no taxes whatever to pay. It was stated also, Sir, to these same classes that the agricultural depression which afflicted them as it afflicts most of the agricultural classes of this country and of other countries as well, would disappear completely, if they gave a favourable verdict to the party, then out of power, on the 23rd of June. We were told at every meeting that we would have a market for our agricultural produce, a paying market, a better one than we have at present. Well, Sir, on my side, it is needless for me to say, we advocated a different policy. We maintained that the fiscal system under which the industries which I have mentioned and the city of Montreal, in whose welfare our own is to such a great extent bound up, could only be maintained by the continuance of that policy which has been called the National Policy, the object of which is the protection of our industries and the development of our own natural resources. I believe, Sir, that in that part of the country the policy of a tariff for revenue only was not popular. At any rate it was condemned at the polls. But, Sir, while in my constituency the contest had assumed the character which I have indicated, I think I am right in saying that in several constituencies in the immediate vicinity, notably on the Island of Montreal, many of the supporters of the present Government, some of them unquestionably, were in favour of the maintenance of the policy of protection. In view of this state of things and the various utterances which from time to time have fallen from the lips of the hon. leader of the House, is it too much to ask that upon this, the first opportunity which is given him since assuming the reins of power, he should tell us in clear and unmistakable terms, not exactly what the details of his tariff will be—this would be a demand which, in my opinion, would be unfair—but, Sir, to tell what is going to be the guiding principle which he will adopt in working out the details of the tariff which he promises to lay before us within a short space of time? It seems to me there is nothing unreasonable in this demand; it seems to me, on the contrary, that it is only just, not only to those classes which I have the honour to represent here to-day but to the country at large. I feel convinced that there are many in the same position as my own constituency. It seems but fair, Sir, that to the country at large the hon. leader of the House should state now what is going to be his governing principle during the examination which he is about to make. That, at any rate is a demand which I feel justified in making; and I trust that, as soon as possible, and certainly before we separate, in the interest not only of those whom I represent, but, as I have said before, in the interests of the whole country, the hon. leader of the House will find it possible to give us clear information of what his principles are upon that most important subject. It has been urged that it is impossible upon so short a notice for the hon. leader of the Government and his colleagues to give us the information that we crave. But, Sir, I submit to you that the subject upon which we require him to enlighten us is one upon which he has been pondering for a very long time. It seems to me, Sir, that during the long period of time that the hon. leader of the House has spent in criticizing the acts of the late Government and its predecessors, he has had ample leisure to make up his mind upon this question, which is a simple one. Eighteen years ago, Sir, the hon. leader of this House began the task of examining which would be the most suitable fiscal policy for this young Dominion. Why, Sir, at that time I was a mere stripling. Since then I have practiced law for what seems to me to be a very long period of time, I have brought up a family; and I think that the elapsed years have been amply sufficient for the hon. leader of the House to have made up his mind not, as I have already stated, as to the full details of the tariff, but as to what will be the guiding principle of the policy which he will adopt in framing a tariff to replace the one he finds so much fault with. I can remember that in my constituency during that long, and, as it seemed to me,

interminable contest, it was urged on my behalf that the prospective Minister of Finance was the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and from past experience it was urged that the policy that had built up the city of Montreal and had so largely contributed to the aggrandisement and prosperity of my own constituency would be abandoned. Well, Sir, I have a distinct recollection that on many occasions it was publicly stated by my adversaries that there was no such danger. It was stated that the position of Minister of Finance would not be occupied by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but that another position was reserved to him to which his high abilities undoubtedly entitle him, that he was going to the United States, and that he would there negotiate a treaty which would afford a magnificent market for the agricultural classes of my constituency. But, Sir, what have we to-day? I heard yesterday the hon. member declare that there were hundreds of items in the tariff upon which he and his colleagues intended to lay hands. That statement will go forth side by side with the continued silence of the leader of the House, and I claim that that is not fair to my constituents, that it is not carrying out the pledges which were given at the time of the election. In view, therefore, of the circumstances which I have just indicated, it seems only right that I should not lose the opportunity which is afforded to me of asking the leader of this House, on behalf of the classes whom I represent, to state to us, categorically, that which he ought to be in a position to state, to wit, what his fiscal policy is, and what principles will guide him in the task which he is about to enter upon. No more than that will I ask, and it seems to me that not only those whom I represent, but the country at large, are entitled to some clear statement upon that subject. Now, Sir, there was another question extensively debated during the campaign which terminated on the 23rd June last, I refer to the Manitoba school question. I do not wish to take up the time of this House at any length upon that question, because I believe that it is right that, at the present juncture the hon. leader of this House should have an opportunity of settling that question, as he has promised to do. I will, however, say this, that during the election we were told that the measure which we were defending before the people of this country was totally inadequate and unsuitable, we were told that it afforded no adequate relief to the minority whose defense we had taken up; we were told, moreover, in the province of Quebec, and more particularly in my own constituency, that as soon as the elections were over, and that a strong hand would have been given to the leader of this House, a commission would issue to make a full and complete examination into the grievances from which the minority were suffering. That commission was to be addressed to the then leader of the Ontario government, who was extolled to us as a man who would, in the shortest possible space of time, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, see that every one of the grievances of that minority should be righted, and that they should obtain complete redress. In all, or nearly all, the constituencies of that province, candidates on both sides pledged themselves that if redress upon some terms or other was not immediately afforded, then unquestionably a Remedial Bill would be passed. It was urged by those who opposed us that the Remedial Bill which they would introduce would go a great deal further and be much more complete than the one which had been accepted as sufficient by the parties aggrieved. Now, what do we find to-day? That commission has not been issued, no inquiry into those grievances is set a-foot. There is another commission which has been withheld, and it seems to me that as there has been a Remedial Bill, that withheld commission may properly be called a curative commission, because it unquestionably possesses strong medicinal properties, judging from the going and coming which has resulted from the withholding of that commission up to the present moment. Be that as it may, I will say frankly that I belong to those who were of the opinion that the minority had a grievance, that that grievance had been sufficiently set forth, that we were sufficiently enlightened upon that grievance, not only by the discussion which had taken place, but by the judgment of the Privy Council, and that under the circumstances, with which most of the members of this House are familiar, there was no other possible means of redress, there was no other duty incumbent upon us, but the passage of that Bill. As I have already stated, I am anxious that the leader of this House should have a fair opportunity of obtaining, by means which are best known to himself, that redress which I deem the minority is entitled to, and which I trust they will obtain before long.

A few words more and I am done. It has been stated that the change which took place in my native province was due solely to a race cry. It seems to me, for I have had occasion to observe and study the state of public opinion in that province, that that is not a fair statement. There were other causes operating which resulted in the change of public opinion that occurred; and I am anxious, as being deeply attached not only to that province, but to the people who inhabit it, that it should not go abroad that the people of Quebec, having to choose purely and simply between a constitutional redress which was due to a minority in another province and the opportunity to place one of their own people in power, abandon-

ed and set aside the constitutional remedy which they should have supported, and were influenced purely and solely by a sectional cry. Many causes, in my opinion, two or three at least, besides that one, operated in my native province. I have no hesitation in saying that the business depression which has existed for some time not only in that province but in the whole country, contributed in some measure, in no small measure, to the change to which I have just adverted. It is undoubtedly the case that the depression which has existed not only in Quebec, and not only in this country but in other countries, operated as a factor, urging the people in that blind way which undoubtedly is followed under circumstances of that kind, and to vote or express their desire for some kind of change. I remember, Sir, in my own constituency an old French Canadian said to me : There are many speakers here to-night, but there is one who attends every meeting, whom you cannot keep away, and who is working steadily against you. And when I said : who is that speaker ? he said : It is Mr. Crisis. In other words, there was undoubtedly in my own province a feeling that business was bad and that a change would not make it worse, and that even possibly some beneficial result might be obtained by a change. But in furtherance of the object which I have in view, the vindication of my province from the accusation that the people voted blindly for one of their own race, I will say this, that even in regard to that great constitutional question which was so lengthily discussed during the election campaign, there was undoubtedly in the minds of the people of my province a feeling of doubt. There was a feeling of doubt, which I think it is easy to understand when all the circumstances are considered under which that question came before the people for solution during last spring. This question was discussed at length and formed a subject almost unique for discussion during the by-elections which took place in my province last autumn or in the early part of the winter. It must not be forgotten that upon those occasions the leaders of the party then in power solicited the support of the people upon the distinct understanding and promise that that question was going to be settled and that the Remedial Bill would be passed without a doubt at the then ensuing session of Parliament. Of course, the causes which led to the non-fulfilment of that pledge, which resulted in the failure to carry out that promise, are well known to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the members of this House ; but to the people at large it appeared strange, after the pledge given, that they were not carried out. It was difficult for them to understand why they should not have been carried out. Then, again, undoubtedly operating as a factor to contribute to that state of doubt in which the people of my province found themselves, there was the withdrawal at a critical moment by Mr. Angers from the then Ministry. It is to me clear that the non-passage of that Bill during the last session, the peculiar circumstances, not easily intelligible to everybody, which accompanied the non-passage of that Bill, the position taken up by certain members of this House, and the state of business and trade just on the eve of the elections, were elements which contributed, at all events in my province, to some extent, to the result which became known to us on the evening of 23rd June. But, Sir, I will not deny that operating with those causes there was also side by side with the pledges given by every candidate favourable to the advent to power of the hon. leader of this House, a feeling among the French Canadian people that everything considered they would have one of their own race to lead the Government of this country. Well, Sir, in view of the circumstances which I have indicated it will not be for me to blame them. It is a feeling which to me is intelligible. It is a feeling which I can understand and with which I can sympathize. But, at the same time, it seems to me that this confidence which they have placed in one of their own, invites him in a particular manner to the performance of his duty towards the electors of this country, and of his own province. I trust, Sir, that he will see fit without undue delay, to give us a clear, outspoken, and categorical exposé of what his policy is, not only in regard to trade matters but also in regard to that question which I have already spoken on. For my own part, Sir, I hope that we will hear very little during the present Parliament of race questions, for a great deal too much it seems to me has been said about these questions hitherto. I will not speak of French domination.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why ?

Mr. MONK. I do not believe that there is such a thing as French domination. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better not to speak of the inhabitants of my province as Frenchmen. There are no Frenchmen properly so called in my province. They are now British subjects, and, as has been very ably said by one of our past statesmen : they are British subjects speaking the French language. They are not Frenchmen properly so called. They are Canadians, and on the morrow of that eventful day, nearly 150 years ago, when they passed under British domination they were allowed to abandon this country and to return to the country of their birth. Many of them did so, but the descendants of those who remained here are loyal subjects to the British Crown. Their history from that period onwards is one which does them infinite credit. What they ask to-day, is merely, that they be recognized as forming part and parcel of this great Dominion, as being co-heirs in the inheritance of all these great constitutional

rights which belong to a free man who can proudly call himself a British subject. And, Sir, the people of Quebec, as has been pointed out this afternoon, are undoubtedly a broad-minded and generous people. Instances of this were given here by the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and these instances are remarkable. But, Sir, you must live among them, you must go down and see them, you must see them in the everyday relations of life; and you must be with them, in order to appreciate all the noble qualities they possess. And, in the midst of these racial cries which existed,—and which I trust will soon be hushed for ever—it is a satisfaction for me, and it goes some way to illustrate what was stated this afternoon, that as between me who am but half a Frenchman, and as between my opponent who was wholly one, they elected me in the last contest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I hear an hon. member ask me: who I am. I remember upon one occasion, an adversary saying to me at a public meeting: Look at this man, he is neither a Frenchman nor is he an Englishman; he is on the fence, and there he will remain for the balance of his life. Well, Sir, part of that statement was true. I am not an Englishman nor am I a Frenchman, but that gentleman to whom I refer omitted to state that I was a Canadian. It is due to that quality of mine that I am sitting in Parliament to-day. I felt it proper, Mr. Speaker, that I should express these feelings upon this occasion, when to many people the results obtained in Quebec seem unintelligible. I believe, Sir, that the causes which I have mentioned operated together. I believe that the electorate of that province are intelligent to the highest degree. They follow political events carefully, and to those causes together, and not to one only, is due the result of the elections in the province of Quebec. The population of the province of Quebec has my entire sympathy. I have lived with them all my life. It has been my good fortune to teach law in a university where I had occasion to meet hundreds of the French Canadian youth of my province. It is a pleasure for me to say, upon this the first occasion of my speaking in Parliament, that a more intelligent and brighter set of young men I have never met. They are anxious and desirous of becoming thoroughly acquainted with the working of that great constitutional system which it was my duty to inculcate to them. I see some of them here to-day, Sir, and not the least among them is a former pupil of mine, the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr MONK. Of a turbulent disposition he was, Sir, frolicsome, and possessed of a spirit of independence which the gentle hand of time has mollified, but not entirely eradicated. But I am happy to state that not a more brilliant pupil left the university than the hon. member to whom I have just referred.

Now, Sir, if the hon. leader of this House, for the reasons which I have indicated, has my sympathies so far, he must bear in mind, he who is so well read, what a great French orator stated, that there was but one step from the Capitol to the Tarpeian Rock; and if the hon. leader of this House fails to give to the country that satisfaction which, in the name of my own particular constituency, I have just demanded from him, if he falls into evil ways or strays into doubtful company, neither the race to which we both belong nor the language which we have learned upon our mothers' knees, nor the religion which we both profess, will save him from an adverse verdict when he comes before the people again.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of entering into this debate; but some remarks which have fallen from the last speaker, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), lead me to enter a protest as a humble member of the great manufacturing class of Canada. It is said that the manufacturers of this country are at the present time standing in a state of timidity and tremor as to what the Government intend to do with the tariff, and are demanding an explicit declaration on the part of the hon. leader of the Government as to what his policy in detail is, notwithstanding the fact that only two months have elapsed since he was placed in a position which would enable him in any case to make any statement as to the nature of that policy. Now, I desire to state that the manufacturers of this country are not an unreasonable class of men. I do not believe there is a single manufacturer in Canada to-day who has stated publicly that he desires a detailed statement in regard to the tariff, ahead of the time when the new Government might be reasonably expected to have their tariff ready to present to the country. A great part of the capital invested in industrial establishments in this country is owned by Liberals; and in the late election we found the city of Montreal, part of the city of Toronto, including a large portion of the manufacturing district, the city of Kingston, the city of Quebec, the city of Hamilton, the city of Charlottetown, the city of Halifax, and various other cities throughout the Dominion, deciding in favour of the Liberal policy of tariff reform. The manufacturers who so voted on that occasion are not an unreasonable class of men; they are a practical, hard-headed body of men, willing to do justice and to give British fair-play to the Government thus placed in power. Now, I do not intend to take up the time of this House on the present occasion. I do not propose to enter

into a discussion of all the questions that have entered into this debate; but I did feel as a manufacturer that it is unnecessary for the members of the Opposition and the Opposition press throughout the country to make such strenuous efforts to squeeze, as it were, a policy from the Government before they are practically able to give it. It is an unreasonable expectation; and I do not believe they have any right, knowing that the people of this country have decided in favour of the Liberal party, to make this demand. I know that the people of Canada to-day are not looking for such a statement, and are not expecting it before the coming session of Parliament. As a manufacturer myself, I have perfect confidence in the Government of the Hon. Mr. Laurier, and I believe they will so re-arrange the tariff that the business interests of this country will be thoroughly protected in its true sense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FROST. That is all right. There is no doubt about that. I could point you to scores of industries in this country to-day which are not protected by the so-called National Policy, which has failed in every particular from the time it was inaugurated down to the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name them.

Mr. FROST. There is not an industry in this country to-day—except a few that are monopolistic in their character and that have been especially fostered and looked after by the late Government—which is not languishing and in a state that requires immediate attention; and I am positive, from the declaration made by the Government, that attention will be given to those industries. I have every confidence as a manufacturer that when the tariff is brought down, it will be found to work advantageously, not only for the manufacturers, but for the consumers and all other classes of the community, and will do away with the depression which we have heard so much about in the last two or three years, and bring back prosperity to the country. For my part I repudiate the assertion that the manufacturers are over-eager for the tariff policy of the Government to be declared. They are willing to give fair-play to the Government and to await the proper time for them to bring down their tariff, knowing that it is going to be right. It was only two years ago that we were told that tariff reform was to be brought about by the hon. ex-Finance Minister, and what was the result? After he had made many changes in the tariff, which he claimed would effect a reduction of a million and a half of dollars in the revenue, we found that nearly every item in the tariff was put back in its original place, in consequence of the importunity of the followers of the Government; and the result was that we got no tariff reform at all. There was not a single mouldering branch lopped off—not one; and it now remains for the present Government to take that matter up and do justice, not only to the manufacturers, but to all the people of this country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House for a few moments while I offer a few remarks upon the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne which we are now asked to consider. My hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in giving the figures, this afternoon, of the results of the different elections in the province of Quebec, which have taken place since 1874, was rather consoling. He said that the political pendulum did move in the province of Quebec in such a way that at one time one party got into power and at another time another party got into power. That is consoling to us, for if at the last general election the Liberal party carried the province of Quebec with such a majority, it stands to reason, according to the historical sketch made this afternoon, that at the next general elections the province of Quebec will return an overwhelming majority of Conservative members. But my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General was a little out when he talked about the majority which my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) got in 1877. Why, Sir, after the elections of 1877, on the first motion which was made in the House upon the issue which had been before the people, namely, the constitutional question—the question whether or not the late Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had the right to dismiss his Ministers—my hon. friend, who was then First Minister of the province of Quebec, was left in a minority of two. After that, I must say he had a solid, undivided and indivisible majority—the majority given him by the vote of the Speaker of the House.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). During the whole session?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, during the whole session. While speaking of my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I cannot help but call the attention of the House to the joy which must have filled the heart of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) in seeing the hon. member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Fitzpatrick) obtain the position to which he has been called and which he occupies with so much distinction in this House. I believe that my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) was a little disappointed, however, when he saw that my hon. friend the Solicitor General did not get a Cabinet position, and I have heard it said—I do not know whether the rumour is true or not—that my hon. friend from Montmagny had actually got a round robin signed by the members of the district of Quebec asking that my hon.

friend the Solicitor General be appointed to a Cabinet position.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. You are not serious ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, of course I am not serious. It is the reverse that is absolutely true, as my hon. friend knows. But if my hon. friend from Montmagny was disappointed at seeing the Solicitor General in the place he now occupies, he must have some solace and consolation in the fact that the other day he was elected Chairman of the Debates Committee. If that is not sufficient consolation, I would ask my hon. friends on the other side, if I can give any gratuitous advice to them to tell my hon. friend from Montmagny, when he goes to them to-morrow with that dead meat scheme which he has put before his colleagues in the House, that they will take it into their most serious consideration.

I do not see here this evening my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). I am sorry I do not see him here, and I am sorry the hon. the leader of the House is not here, because I would like to call the attention of the hon. the leader of the House to the past services rendered his party by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre. For twenty-five long years has my hon. friend worked hard and well for his party, not only in the Dominion Parliament but also in the local legislature, and I am sorry to see that he has been left out in the cold. Among the many merits of the hon. member for Quebec Centre, I might draw attention to this shining one. It is said that at one time, when the purse of the Liberal party was very low, my hon. friend, by putting his name to certain promissory notes, which were afterwards taken up in the way we know, managed to raise the wind and got a certain sum of money for the political fund of the Liberal party in Quebec. But all the merits of my hon. friend from Quebec Centre have remained unacknowledged and he is not in the Administration. But for him as well as for my hon. friend from Montmagny there is also a solace, and that is the admission of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) into the Cabinet in the very seat which my hon. friend from Quebec Centre would have liked to occupy.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Who occupies your seat in the Quebec Government ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I must claim the indulgence of hon. members. I am but a young member in this House, unaccustomed to speak to a House of this kind, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will protect me. But, Sir, I remember full well, and my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) remembers those tender epistles which were written by the hon. member for Quebec Centre concerning my hon. friend from Quebec West, at the time when the member for Quebec Centre was mayor of Quebec and the hon. member for Quebec West was a harbour commissioner. I believe at that time my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) was endowed with a prophetic spirit, because he told my hon. friend from Quebec West, in those letters which were published in a Quebec newspaper that he would always feather his nest, no matter what happened, and the prediction has come true. There is something to me rather surprising in the fact that my hon. friend from Quebec West is now sitting alongside my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) and the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier). Why, Sir, I always knew my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) to be a dyed in the wool Tory. He was a Tory of the Tories, a Conservative of the Conservatives, an Imperial Federationist—he had all the virtues of the best Tory in the land. Why, up to the 23rd of June last, there was no sign whatever that my hon. friend had changed or repented of the course he had thought fit to follow until then. Why, we have heard in this House the denunciations of my hon. friends against what they call the scandals of the Conservative party, but my hon. friend from Quebec West stood by the Conservative party through all these scandals and was never scandalized. On that very day, the 23rd of June last, when it was heralded all through this country that the hon. leader of the House was to be Prime Minister of Canada in a very few days, one of my friends, who had been appointed a committee of one, waited on the hon. gentleman, and asked him to ride in the carriage which was to drive the leader of the House through the streets of Quebec in triumph. That committee of one obtained the answer that the hon. member for Quebec West would not ride with those men through the city of Quebec and through St. Roch. I might say that the electric light was not very strong that night and the light of the torches was dim, and probably the light that was thrown upon the leader of the House was such that the face of my hon. friend could not have stood out in that prominence he desired, and the next day the papers could not have heralded throughout the country that my hon. friend had driven through the streets of Quebec with the prospective Premier of Canada. But how has this change come about in my hon. friend from Quebec West ? I do not know whether it is true or not, but I heard the story that one afternoon when my hon. friend was riding, not on the road to Damascus, but on the Grande Allée towards his beautiful seat at Beaumanoir, the spirit met him and said : If you turn your coat on the other side you will see that it is trimmed with gold lace, and you will wear a cocked hat and sword, and probably at no distant day a star upon your breast, and we will have a new Sir Richard—we cannot have too many of them. Sir, the spirit moved him, and the metamorphosis was

completed. But my hon. friend will allow me to tell him that if honour and glory come to a man, the greater the glory and the honour, the more onerous are the duties and obligations imposed upon him towards the city and the district he represents. Now, there are matters which are not mentioned in the Address. Not many questions have been touched upon in this Address. There is one in particular which, to my mind, is of paramount interest to the city and district of Quebec which my hon. friend represents in the Cabinet. Let me take, for instance, this question of a fast line. My hon. friend was probably in the House the other day when this question was put to the Government:

1. What is the amount of the lowest tender for a fast steamship service between Canada and England? 2. From whom was the tender received? 3. Do the Government intend to award the contract to the parties who have made the said tender, and when?

And Sir Richard Cartwright answered:

Two tenders have been received, one from Messrs. Allan and the other from Mr. James Huddart. Neither of these tenders is in accordance with the specifications, and the Government propcses to make further investigations before final action in the matter.

Sir, to my mind that means that this question is shelved for a long time. Now, my hon. friend knows that for some years the citizens of the district and city of Quebec have thought this question of a fast line of paramount importance to them. They have thought that if they could get a fast Atlantic service between Liverpool and Quebec, it might tend to bring to the old capital of the province of Quebec a return of that prosperity which she enjoyed for some time. But, Sir, it is an open secret, it is rumoured in the city of Quebec, that my hon. friend is against the fast Atlantic service, that he is not in favour of a twenty-knot service, but he is in favour of a seventeen-knot service. I trust that he will re-assure this House, that he will re-assure his district and his constituency by telling us here this very evening that this is not correct, and that he is in favour of the fast line. Sir, if we are to have a service at all between Quebec and Liverpool, between Canada and England, we want the best that can be procured. Talk about a seventeen-knot service! Two years hence it would not be as good and as profitable to the district as the service we have now. It would not be able to compete with the fast lines whose steamers leave New York every day. And, as I have said, what we want, if anything, is the fastest and best line that we can get. Not only because it will develop the trade of this country, but because it will be one of the best advertisements we ever had, just as the Canadian Pacific Railway has been. To-day we are the highway by which the travel, traffic and trade between Great Britain and China and Great Britain and India pass, and if we have the fast Atlantic service it will be an advertisement of the same kind, and the best that Canada could ever have.

Now, Sir, there is another question which interests the citizens of Quebec, and which has interested them for a very long time. Ever since I first had anything to say in political matters, which is some time ago, I have always met my hon. friend in meetings in which the question of a bridge in front of Quebec or in its vicinity was discussed. My hon. friend, by his speeches and his writings, and by joining delegations time after time from Quebec to Ottawa to interview the Ministers, has tried to impress upon the Cabinet the necessity, at least, of contributing a good round sum toward the construction of this bridge. Was the hon. gentleman in Council when the answer to the question put by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) was decided upon? Can it be possible that my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) was sitting at the Council board when this answer was prepared. Here is the question that was put by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre, with the answer given to that question:

Mr. LANGELIER—Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a bridge in front of Quebec, or in the vicinity, to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to aid in the construction thereof by a subsidy or otherwise?

Mr. LAURIER—It is not the intention of the Government to build such a bridge. The Government have no application before them for aid in the construction thereof.

Surely it cannot be that the hon. gentleman was in his seat at the Council board when this answer was written, for the hon. gentleman knows full well that for the last ten or fifteen years a demand has been before the Government of the Dominion for aid, and for substantial aid, for the construction of this bridge in front of or in the vicinity of Quebec—not only one demand, not only one request, but dozens of requests, dozens of demands: my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) must have the record of these demands in his possession to-day.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Where is your old motto, "No bridge, no vote"?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I never said that—I deny it in toto.

Now, allow me to refer to the last paragraph of the Speech:

I hope that when you will have given the necessary attention to the consideration of the year's supplies, I may be able to relieve you from the duty of further attendance at this session of Parliament.

I take it, Sir, that this is a rather cavalier manner of dispensing with the services of

the legislators who have been convened for the session. There is only one conclusion that I can come to after reading that paragraph, and after noting what is contained in other parts of the speech, and it is this—that what we have said time and time again upon the hustings, and what our press has re-echoed through the country is absolutely true, and that is that the Liberal party has no policy, that it has no programme, that it has no platform upon which it can stand. We have the evidence of it in the Speech from the Throne, and the silence which has been maintained from the very beginning of the session by every member of the Administration upon this great question is still further proof of it. But what about the programme elaborated in 1893? It is well known that Liberals from all parts of the country were called to meet in this great city of Ottawa to elaborate a platform, and that platform was elaborated. The delegates to that convention discussed the policy of the Government of that day, and declared the remedy which they said should be given at that time to the country. Where is that remedy to-day? I do not want the hon. gentlemen to come before the House and state to us that they are going to change such and such an item in the tariff and to change it in such and such a way. Not at all. I understand that since they came into power they have not had sufficient time to go over the tariff item by item so as to be able to tell the House the result of their deliberations. But what I say, and I think I am at liberty to insist upon it, is that they should tell us the principle upon which they are going to work. What is it that we are to have?—is it to be commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade——

Mr. LISTER. Read the resolutions.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Which resolution—the resolution passed in 1893, or the resolutions passed after the speech made by the leader in Montreal in 1895? Why, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) would be at a loss himself to state to-day the principle upon which the changes are going to be made. But we have another programme, which was elaborated with great pomp and ceremony in Quebec in 1887. It will be within the memory of gentlemen in this House, and particularly of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), that in 1887, or the beginning of 1888, a great conclave of Liberals——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). And some Conservatives.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And one Conservative, Sir—and he had to say he did not represent there his province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was representing the Government of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We shall see, when I read the resolution, that it is not stated that Mr. Norquay represented his Government. The hon. Minister of Finance knows these matters much better than I do, of course, as he attended this conclave; but, as far as I remember, the fact is that Mr. Norquay was not there as representing his province officially. At all events, at that time this conclave was held, to elaborate a programme for this poor party, which had no platform and no programme. And this after the delegates had been notified months in advance to come with a programme, after having deliberated in their respective provinces. They did not go there unprepared. They came forward with an elaborated scheme, a scheme couched with great care in the resolutions which were adopted at that time, and which, from that day to this I have always understood formed an important plank in the platform of the party. It is a curious fact that there were present, Sir Oliver Mowat, a member of this Government, the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Minister of Finance, and representatives from the then Liberal Government of the province of Quebec. In their programme laid down in the resolutions which were adopted at that time, what did they say? First of all, you have a resolution about disallowance, that disallowance should not be practised as it was then, but that the power of disallowing at will all Acts passed by provincial legislatures should be withdrawn from the Governor in Council, and given only to Her Majesty in Council, as it was before. What has become of this plank in the platform? That has gone, like a great many other planks, and the platform is going also. Now, you have another plank in the platform, and probably that is gone, as to the constitutionality of the statutes, both federal and provincial. Could not something have been said in the Address about that? Could it not have been stated that that was one of the principles which were to be advocated, and upon which legislation was to be introduced and carried through this House? Then, again, you have the Senate. Why, the Senate was to be reformed altogether, the Senate was an institution no longer adapted to the spirit of the times, and we were to have a Senate elected by the people, or by the provinces. Has that plank gone from the platform also? But the principal plank was to increase the subsidies which were given to the provinces by the Dominion of Canada. Has that plank also gone? I say that even out of respect to those resolutions which had been adopted by the Quebec conference, by this plenary council of the Liberal chieftains of the whole party, it should have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that the Government adhered to that platform and to that programme which had been carried out at the Quebec conference. Not a word of all this; and the only reason I

can find why this is not stated, is that these gentlemen in the different provinces, speaking at different places and in different parts of the country, have different policies; but now that they have got together, they cannot agree upon one single policy, nor upon one single plank of that policy, nor upon one single principle of politics.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When will your convention be held?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Very soon; in time to beat you at the next general elections. Now, let me refer to the fifth paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which, to my mind, is a most important one:

> Immediate steps will be taken to effect the settlement of the Manitoba school question, and I have every confidence that when Parliament next assembles this important controversy will have been adjusted satisfactorily.

I am not going to weary the House at any length with this question, which has been fully debated, not only in the last session of the House, but also for many sessions. But it seems to me that I may call attention to the manner in which this question is treated in the Speech from the Throne, so as to show the divergence of opinion which exists between the views which were held by the hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, and the views they hold now that they sit on the Ministerial benches. This paragraph was supplemented by the declaration made by the leader of the House on the first day of the session, and also on the 20th inst. in his speech in this House, when he told us that the Attorney General of Manitoba had been invited to come down, how far we do not know, but to come down as far as Ottawa, at all events—and that a satisfactory settlement is in view, and further deponent saith not. That is all we know about the question, that is all we can gather, either from the Speech from the Throne or from the declarations of the hon. the leader of the House. Now, Sir, let us contrast this policy for a few moments and these declarations of the First Minister, with his declarations and his policy when he was in Opposition, and not only announced in this House, but also in the province of Quebec, and particularly in Quebec district. In 1894, I believe it was, I had not then the honour of being a member of this House, but, being a member of the Executive Council of my province, I had the honour of occupying a seat upon the floor of this House. At that time the school question came up, and I heard my hon. friend the leader of the House distinctly state here that if these schools were Protestant schools, and if Catholic children were obliged to go to these schools, it was an outrage against which he would protest, not only in this chamber, not only in every county, but in every district in the Dominion. Now, Sir, has he found out since Parliament met that these schools are not Protestant schools? We have not heard that any commission has been appointed to inquire into this matter. He must have found out, at all events, that there was a grievance, because if he had not found out that there was a grievance, he would not have invited the Attorney General to come down here to meet him in conference on this question, and to try and come to some settlement. But, Sir, during the elections it was stated, especially in the province of Quebec, it was stated as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mentioned a few minutes ago, it was stated all over the province, that as soon as the hon. gentleman became Premier he would appoint a commission to inquire into the grievances of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and he was to devise a way by which to settle this question and redress the grievances from which these people suffered. Now, it was held all through the province of Quebec that one of the principal reasons why we should accept this commission was that it was to be headed by Sir Oliver Mowat, who had been held up to us as the great defender of separate schools in the province of Ontario. But, Sir, what was the declaration of my hon. friend the leader of the Government in his own constituency in Quebec. Here again he advocated the appointment of this commission, he told the people that within six months he would settle this question by the appointment of a commission, headed by Sir Oliver Mowat. He said: I will try the sunny ways of peace. I will try conciliation. But he went a step further and said: If conciliation does not succeed in restoring to those people the rights which they have under the constitution, then I will take the means provided by the constitution, and will use those means to the utmost. Those were his declarations to his constituents in St. Rochs. Sir, these declarations of my hon. friend the leader of the House were implemented to a great extent by the declarations made by his supporters all through the province of Quebec. In almost every county in the province where the majority was Catholic, a pledge was distinctly given to the electors, the promise was absolutely made, that every man of them would vote for a Remedial Bill. That I may not be accused of exaggeration in this matter, let me call the attention of the House to what was said by my opponent in the county of Montmorency. My opponent, the Hon. Charles Langelier, is a bosom friend of the leader of the House, is one of his henchmen, a gentleman who has accompanied him in many meetings, speaking side by side with him upon the hustings in Quebec. Sir, what did Mr. Langelier write over his signature to the electors of the county of Montmorency?

> If I am elected, as I am sure I will be,——

There is many a slip between the cup and the lip.

—I solemnly promise to vote for an efficacious remedial law which will restore to the Catholic minority the rights and privileges which have been recognized as belonging to them by the Privy Council, the highest tribunal in the country.

And he went still further and gave a written pledge to every curé in the county that he would vote for a Remedial Bill which would be approved by the hierarchy of the province of Quebec. He was not the only one who did that. I can appeal to the hon. Solicitor General, who made the same declaration in his county; I can appeal also to the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), and to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers), and to a great many other hon. gentlemen who made the same promise and pledge over their signature to the electors of the province of Quebec. So, Sir, war was waged against the Conservative party on this ground, that the Remedial Bill, which had been introduced during the last session of Parliament, was not worth the paper on which it was written, that it was an unsatisfactory Bill, and among others the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) gave reasons why it was unsatisfactory. He declared that the Bill did not give Catholics the right to choose their own school books, that it did not give them one cent wherewith to run their schools. It was announced that if the hon. gentleman who now leads the House came into power, he would give the country such a Bill as would restore all the rights taken away from the Catholic minority in Manitoba in 1890, that the Bill would be framed precisely and clearly on the lines of the remedial order and of the judgment of the Privy Council. This statement was emphasized by this declaration: how can you rely more upon an English Protestant like Sir Charles Tupper than upon a French Canadian Catholic like Mr. Laurier. These were the statements and declarations with which we were met in Quebec, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite would like to have the country believe that we raised national and religious cries. The religious, national and racial cries were raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, not only on this question but on every question which touches religion and nationality, and they are first in seeking to sow the seeds of discord and disunion in Canada. Even in regard to the paltry matter of $3,000,000 to be expended for buying arms, on every hustings in the province of Quebec it was said: they have no money to give for Catholic schools in Manitoba, but they have money to buy arms with which to fight for Great Britain. Those are the hon. gentlemen who tell us on this side of the House that we raised religious and national cries, whereas the charge should rest on hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You never did anything for religion over there.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Those were the declarations made by my Liberal friends on the other side of the House when they were in opposition. But things have changed; they are there and we are here, and it seems to make all the difference in the world. Those were declarations made in opposition: but now that the responsibility of office weighs on the shoulders of the leader of the Government, now that he has the onerous duty of settling this question, he dare not come before this House and state his policy and the line upon which he is going to endeavour to make a settlement between the Catholic minority of Manitoba and the province of Manitoba. He hopes that this important controversy will be adjusted satisfactorily. But I ask, satisfactorily to whom? Settled satisfactorily to those who took away the rights of the minority in 1890, or satisfactorily to those who since 1890 have been fighting the fight of the constitution for the rights of those people which were taken away by the law of 1890? The hon. gentleman has been good enough to tell us that he could not satisfy everybody, that there is a certain class of people in this country that would not be satisfied with the settlement, and I believe he called those people the extremists. When this settlement comes to be known to the country the hon. gentleman will find there are many more extremists than he thinks exist at the present moment. We have been told that the Attorney General of the province of Manitoba came down to Ottawa to confer with the leader of the House and try to arrive at a compromise. But let me ask this House, who were the parties to this compromise? It seems to me whenever a compromise is to be effected the interested parties have to be present, and if they are not present, they must be represented by parties holding power of attorney and duly authorized to act. Who are the parties to the compromise which it is sought to bring about? Sir, the parties are the Attorney General of Manitoba and the Premier of the Dominion of Canada. And whom does the Attorney General of Manitoba represent in this matter? He represents not the Catholic minority but the government, which in 1890 wrested the rights of the Catholic minority from them, and has denied them their rights since. Whom does the leader of the Government represent in this matter? Can he show me in the Statute-book, in the constitution of this country one line which authorizes him to make a binding compromise in this matter, a compromise binding on any one, binding on the province of Manitoba, binding on the Dominion Government or binding on this Dominion Parliament? Upon whom, then, will the compromise be binding? Will it be binding on the Government of Canada or the Parliament of Canada, or on the legislature of Manitoba? Why, Sir, it is not even stated in the Speech from the Throne, it cannot be stated now that Manitoba will ever be

asked to pass an Act setting out that this compromise is binding on anybody. But even if a law were passed, it would be valid only for a time, only so long as it was not repealed. There is only one way indicated in the constitution by which this question can be finally settled, and it is the course adopted last session by the present leader of the Opposition. It has been said often, and it was repeated in this House yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that Manitoba in this matter has been treated with indecent haste. Nothing has been said, however, of the indecent haste with which the rights of the minority were taken away in 1890. But let this question be as it may, I say this: There was no indecent haste, and I speak from the book, in the proceedings which took place before the remedial order was issued or before the law was sought to be passed by this Parliament. Let me in a very few words and as rapidly as possible, for I do not wish unduly to occupy the time of the House at this late hour, go over in chronological order what passed before the Order was adopted by Council. After the law was declared valid in 1892, a communication was sent to the Government of Manitoba, saying that an appeal had been lodged with the Governor General in Council, asking that redress should be given the Manitoba minority. Now, Sir, just mark what took place then? Did the Governor General in Council decide immediately that their right of appeal existed and that these grievances should be redressed? Not at all. It was decided that this case should be argued before the Privy Council of Canada, and the province of Manitoba was invited to appear. Manitoba was further informed that the case would be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, and it was submitted. Afterwards it was submitted to the Privy Council in England, but in the meantime on 26th July, 1894, the Dominion Government sent a communication to Manitoba:

> Expressing the most earnest hope that the legislature of Manitoba may take into consideration at the earliest possible moment, the complaints which are set forth in this petition, and which are said to create dissatisfaction among the Roman Catholics, not only in Manitoba, but likewise throughout Canada, and may take speedy measures to give redress in all the matters in relation to which any well founded complaint or grievance be ascertained to exist.

And what was the answer of Manitoba to this communication. The answer was:

> The executive of the province see no reason for recommending the legislature to alter the principle of the legislation complained of.

And further, the judgment of the Privy Council was rendered in the month of January, 1895, and before any remedial order was mooted, and before any remedial order originated, the Manitoba Government said this, in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech at the opening of the legislature:

> Whether or not a demand will be made by the Federal Government that that Act shall be modified * * * it is not the intention of my Government to recede from its determination to uphold the present system.

And a resolution was passed in the legislature of Manitoba, saying:

> That this House will, by all constitutional means and to the utmost extent of its power, resist any steps which may be taken to attack the school system established by the Public School Act of 1890.

Sir, the remedial order was passed on the 20th March, 1895, and sent to Manitoba. A session of this Parliament was convened, and when the time arrived in the opinion of a great many, that a Remedial Bill should be brought before this House the Federal Government still held back, because they thought they could compromise the matter in some way, because they thought they could get these people in Manitoba to redress the grievances themselves, and so they sent the following communication to Manitoba in July, 1895:—

> It by no means follows that it is the duty of the Federal Government to insist that provincial legislation, to be mutually satisfactory, should follow the exact lines of this Order,—that is the Remedial Order. It is hoped, however, that a middle course will commend itself to the local authorities, that federal action may become unnecessary.

To this the Manitoba Government replied:

> It is therefore recommended that, so far as the Government of Manitoba is concerned, the proposal to establish a system of separate schools, in any form, be positively and definitely rejected.

That was the answer made by Manitoba to these frequent communications from the Government of the Dominion of Canada. That was not all. A special session of the Federal Parliament was convened for January, 1896, to pass this Remedial Bill, and the Government still held back. Instead of inviting the Attorney General or any other member of the legislature of Manitoba to come to Ottawa to meet them, they went so far towards conciliation as to send to Winnipeg three of the most distinguished members of the Parliament of Canada, Sir Donald Smith, Senator Desjardins, and the Hon. Mr. Dickey, then Minister of Justice. But still the government of Manitoba said they would do nothing in the matter, and that they would not even come to a compromise, or an agreement, or an understanding between the parties. But, Sir, we are now told that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is coming to some satisfactory settlement of the question. What does this mean? I take it that the Premier is on the horns of a dilemma. If this satisfactory settlement can be brought about; that is if separate schools are re-established, then the Premier stands convicted before this House and be-

fore the country of having been a party to a bargain, to say the least of it, the most extraordinary which has ever presented itself in the political history of this country—a bargain, Sir, by which religious strife, discord and dissensions have been raised and continued in this country for six long years; a bargain, Sir, by which, and in virtue of which, these people in Manitoba have been deprived for years of that which has been called their right by the Privy Council of the Empire. And for what reason? For the sole reason of assisting my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) and his colleagues to mount the Treasury benches.

Sir, if that is not the case—and from what has happened I do not believe it to have been the case, because of the following facts. Did you notice that the Attorney General of Manitoba was here for a few days? The hon. leader of the House announced on the first day of this session that a satisfactory settlement was in view. Did you further notice, Sir, that the hon. member, the father probably of all this strife in this country, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) resigned his seat for Brandon a few days afterwards, and came out with a letter in which he said: that what he improperly called coercion was dead, and that separate schools would never be restored to Manitoba? Therefore, I am inclined to the belief that it must be the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) not to give the Catholics of Manitoba their separate schools, and not to give them their rights which have been recognized to them by the remedial order of the Privy Council of Canada, and by the decision of the Privy Council of England. It seems to be the policy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), to make some compromise with his friends in Manitoba which would be satisfactory to nobody at all. Sir, if this is the case, then I say that the other horn of the dilemma is this: that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is recreant to the trust which has been imposed upon him by the people of the province of Quebec from whom he gets his majority. But, Mr. Speaker, in all this I see a graver question—a question which affects the future of this Dominion of Canada; a question which has already been alluded to by my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont) in a speech delivered in the year 1895. I was not then a member of this House, but I was an attentive listener to the speech of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Dupont) and a most remarkable speech it was. My hon. friend (Mr. Dupont) drew this picture to the House. He said: Now this is only the beginning of compromises and settlements of questions in which it is sought to promulgate the doctrine of non-interference with the provincial Acts in a sphere which concerns the Dominion and not the provinces. Sir, this doctrine of non-interference has had a trial in other countries, situated constitutionally as we are ourselves, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Dupont) remarked it was initiated in the United States much in the same way as it has originated in this Dominion. May it never have the same results in this Dominion, and may we not reap the sad harvest from the seeds which have been sown by my hon. friends on the other side of the House, in this important matter. I do not want to be misunderstood. As has been said many a time, this is not a question of separate schools. It is simply and solely a question of the constitution. I want the wrongs of my fellow-citizens in Manitoba redressed, not because these people are French, or not because they are Catholics, but because under the constitution they are entitled to these rights, and because the highest tribunal of the Empire has pronounced that they are entitled to these rights. The constitution of our country is the same constitution for every loyal subject of this land. The constitution is intended for every subject of this realm, and it is no disqualification that a citizen of Canada should be a Frenchman, or should be a Roman Catholic. That is the stand that I take, and that is what I contend for. Sir, I hope that upon this question, as upon all other questions that affect the constitution of this country, whatever may be my predelictions, or even my prejudices—for I must have some—I shall always be found in the front rank of the defenders of the constitution.

Mr. CHAUVIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to be shorter and to be surer in the few remarks I have to make, I beg the favour of this House to pronounce them in French. I suppose that, under that French domination which has been alluded to as existing, it will be allowed, even to a member of the Opposition, to speak in that language which is the language of the leading majority of this House. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the two main issues which have been debated during the last electoral campaign, are the tariff question and the Manitoba school question. I think I am quite in order in asking the Government of the day to emphatically declare to the House where they stand on those two questions, the more so as no mention is made of them in the Speech from the Throne. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) remarked the day before yesterday that he did not expect a revision of the tariff at a moment's notice, and that the duty on agricultural implements could be removed later on. No doubt the removal of the duty on agricultural implements could be put off, as it affects the interests of but one industry. Without sharing the opinion of the hon. member, I believe that, so far as the tariff revision is concerned, it might as well be put off to another session. It is, however, none the less true that, by reason of the silence of the Speech from the Throne on that question, the various policies exposed by the

Liberal party at different times are hanging like the sword of Damocles over the country. But as regards the Manitoba school question, I believe that it is not one of those questions which can be delayed to another session, without making heavier the burden of taxation on the shoulders of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, and without, at the same time, rendering unbearable the yoke under which they are groaning, in connection with a question of such paramount importance as that of education. Mr. Speaker, we are here by the will of the people; we are the delegates of our respective ridings, and our electors have a right to know from us what pledges the Dominion Government means to give to the downtrodden Catholic minority in Manitoba. The Speech from the Throne announces that the question is put off till the next session of Parliament; and in so doing, the Government seemingly adhere to their old policy, to the tactics resorted to by them when in the Opposition; they are still moving as it were, the six months' hoist. But, Sir, apart from the Speech from the Throne, we have a statement from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) to the effect that this important question was settled, but the silence of the Speech from the Throne on the same matter is ominous. It is far from containing all the wealth the Government lay claim to. Instead of the horn of plenty the hon. Premier (Mr. Laurier) promised to give us, during the late electoral campaign, the Government of the day, the Speech from the Throne gives us only Pandora's box. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it was through sheer modesty that the Government, while bragging of their wealth of the organ of their leader, have provided such a meagre bill of fare in the Speech from the Throne. They should have put in the mouth of His Excellency some announcement as to their political programme, so as to give us an insight into all the wealth of information and the treasures they lay claim to in connection with this Manitoba school question. If the settlement they are about to make of this question is to be satisfactory to the people of this country, why have not they taken this House and the country into their confidence? Let them make to this House an emphatical and unequivocal statement on this question. How can this House believe in the sincerity of the Government, when we see banded together the very men who formerly declared that they were unable to agree upon the solution of this same school question, and who, now declare that with a legerdemain, by simply exchanging salutations in the office of a Minister they have set at rest a question about which the Liberal party was at loggerheads for six years, and which, I confess, also did mischief among the Conservative party. Now, Sir, either there was a secret understanding between the Government of the day, the Opposition at the time, and the Manitoba government, or there was no understanding. If there was an understanding between the Manitoba government and the Liberal party when in the Opposition, in connection with the settlement of this question: and if such understanding was entered into so as to create an agitation throughout the country; in short, if it was understood that this agitation would cease only at the time when the Liberal party should come into power, I say, Sir, that this was a criminal plot entered into with a view to creating and fostering a most dangerous agitation in this country. Now, if there existed no such secret understanding between the Liberal party and the Liberal government of Manitoba, why then all this talk about conciliation and negotiations? and on what authority does the Prime Minister announce on the floor of this House that this question is settled with the provincial government? How can the leader of the Government tell us that the province of Manitoba has desisted from opposition, and that she is willing to grant more than she has ever promised to do. How happens it, Sir, that it was only necessary for Mr. Sifton to set his foot in the capital, to pay his respects to two or three Ministers, to enable him to go back to Manitoba and declare that the question was settled to the satisfaction of the interested parties in the province of Manitoba? We have a right to exact more from the present Government than we did from the defunct Cabinet, because the former promised more. If we have no right to exact more from them, we, at least have a right to exact as much, because of the promises made by them in connection with the settlement of the school question. If the Liberal party, when in the Opposition, could settle this question, a fortiori they can do so now that they are in power. The hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) is now in a position to give us a full and efficacious measure. He is now bound to introduce as efficacious a Bill as that framed by the late Government. As I said before, the hon. Premier is in duty bound to introduce a better measure than that of the late Government, because he has given to the people of this country pledges which bind him more strictly. The hon. Premier has told us of an earthquake, an upheaval which shook the whole of Canada and resulted in a revolution in the respective state of the political parties in this country. The hon. Prime Minister, no doubt, recollects that this cyclone swept over the province of Quebec, with the result that this province threw herself into his arms. I say that the province of Quebec threw herself into his arms and now she asks him to be faithful to the promises made to her people and to redeem his pledges; she claims with good reason the fulfilment of those pledges. In connection with the Manitoba school question, the position to which I committed myself, during the electoral struggle, before the electorate, was independent enought to enable me to tell

the hon. Prime Minister that if he introduces a measure calculated to do justice to the Manitoba Catholics, I shall cordially support it. And in so saying, I believe I am but re-echoing the declarations made by the hon. leader of the Opposition himself (Sir Charles Tupper) who, on the day following the elections of June last, also emphatically declared that the Prime Minister of the day would receive his most cordial and fair support in the settlement of this question. Moreover, I think I am but re-echoing and voicing the sentiment of those who, on this side of the House, preceded me in the debate and more particularly the feelings of the French speaking members from the province of Quebec, when I state that we are all proud to see a Catholic French Canadian Premier at the head of affairs in this country. But we shall be proud of that honour conferred on our race only inasmuch as the hon. Prime Minister will constitute himself the champion of the interests of the province of Quebec, and in so far as he will uphold the cause of the Manitoba minority, a cause which interests not only the province of Quebec, but the whole Dominion, inasmuch as it is the cause of fair-play and justice in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations on the important questions now being discussed by this honourable House, and as it is now nearly half-past ten o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that I cannot agree to his motion. I stated yesterday that we would have to sit to-night at least to the usual hour, half-past eleven.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks, it is not my intention to detain the House very long. In fact, I do not know that I should have addressed the House at all this evening had I not felt it a duty devolving upon me, as representing a very important portion of this country, to state my views on the important questions under discussion.

At the beginning of this discussion, the hon. mover of the Address spoke of the great resources of the province of British Columbia. As to the greatness of those resources there can be no doubt. They are well-known to the whole Dominion of Canada. The people of this great country, from the province of British Columbia on the Pacific to the island of Cape Breton on the Atlantic, all know perfectly well the great resources of the province of British Columbia. I was surprised, however, to find the hon. gentleman stating that he was pleased that a party were now in power in Canada who would accord to the people of that province more generous treatment than had been given to them by the late Government. He went on to say that the people of British Columbia were paying into the exchequer of Canada a very much larger amount than they were receiving therefrom. Now, I am not going to dispute the justice of the hon. gentleman's complaint; he may have a reason for that complaint; but it is a most difficult matter, indeed, for the representative of any province to state the exact amount paid into the exchequer of the Dominion by the people of that province. While we can calculate exactly the amount received therefrom, we cannot state exactly the amount paid in. But I say the province of British Columbia should be the last province to complain of having to pay in a larger amount than it receives from the Exchequer of Canada. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was undertaken by the Conservative party, opened up the resources of that great province. We know that the building of that railway was denounced at the time by the party who the hon. gentleman now says will accord to that province more generous treatment. The money required for the building of that railway was contributed by all the provinces of Canada. I come from a province down by the sea—in fact, it is a province surrounded by the sea—and the people of that island have not received any benefit direct or indirect from the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; yet they are to-day contributing their share to pay the interest on the money borrowed for the construction of that work. Now, I say it ill-becomes any representative of a province or a section of a province of this country to complain that a supposed amount is being paid into the exchequer by that province or section in excess of the amount received therefrom. All the provinces of this Dominion are contributing equally with the province of British Columbia. Sir, the building of that great railway afforded means of transit through the province of British Columbia as well as through the whole Dominion, from one ocean to the other, and the placing on the Pacific Ocean of a fast line of steamships is due to the enterprise and energy of the company that constructed that railway, making a highway from the east to the west for British traffic through the province of British Columbia, so that large quantities of goods which are consumed in other parts of the country are entered there. The hon. gentleman had very small reason indeed for his attack on the late Government for their treatment of the province of British Columbia. I remember, when I had the distinguished honour of being a member of this House some years ago, when a gentleman named Mr. Bunster came here from the province of British Columbia, and made a periodical complaint in this House as to how the interests of British Columbia were being neglected. At last his expectations were fulfilled. The Government of this country, led by the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, gave a contract for the building of a portion of the Canadian Pacific

Railway west of the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Bunster was highly delighted at what was done by the Government; but what was the action of the leader of the party who now sit on the Treasury benches? Mr. Blake, the most distinguished member of that party who sat in this House, during my time, at least, characterized the province of British Columbia as "a sea of mountains." He held up before this honourable House a map showing the province of British Columbia, and stated that the mountains were painted brown, and, Sir, the whole of British Columbia was painted brown. He was doing it up brown. But, owing to the great energy of the hon. gentleman who now leads this side of the House, the contract was carried through, and afterwards a company was formed for the building of the whole line of railway, in the face of the most strenuous opposition offered by the gentlemen who are now sitting on the Government side of the House. Was not this generous treatment for the province of British Columbia? No more generous treatment could have been given to any province. We were all glad of it, because we all felt that the solemn compact entered into should be carried out. It had been agreed that British Columbia should be brought into communication with the other provinces by the construction of a railway, and we all felt it incumbent on us, and in the interests of the Dominion, that this railway should be built. I want to show to the hon. gentleman who moved the Address that the party he is now supporting, and from which he expects most generous treatment, has always been opposed to the progress and prosperity of British Columbia. In proof of this, I shall give him, not my views, but the views of a gentleman who, in 1881, represented a constituency in that province, a gentleman of mature years and great experience, and who had then become the father of a fine boy, who has now the honour of sitting in this House as a representative of that distant province. I shall give the hon. gentleman the views of Mr. McInnes to show what Mr. McInnes expected from the then Opposition with regard to the province of British Columbia. In 1881 Mr. McInnes said:

> If it was not that British Columbia was a remarkably strong and vigorous child, the life would have been crushed out of her long ago by the treatment of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

He went on further to say:

> If it had not been for her great recuperative powers, she would have been crushed to death, and the member for West Durham would have been placed on his trial, not only for assault and battery, but for infanticide.

This was the opinion of Mr. McInnes with regard to the treatment which the province of British Columbia was then receiving from the gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches. Then he went on to refer to a statement made in 1879, when the National Policy was being introduced, by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He then quoted this extract from the hon. gentleman's speech:

> Who undertook the building of the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Railway? The Hon. Finance Minister (Sir Leonard Tilley) and his associates. Who undertook the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals but his hon. friends and his associates? Who undertook the Welland Canal but those hon. gentlemen? Who undertook the public works at Ottawa and the public buildings of the Dominion but his hon. friend and his associates? Who undertook the building of the Pacific Railway, the most destructive and ruinous of all? Who undertook to fix upon this Dominion that incubus of British Columbia, that cancer financially of British Columbia, that was eating into the vitals and entailing a heavy financial burden upon the country for all time to come? Who undertook that but the Hon. Finance Minister and his associates?

What kind of treatment, then, can the hon. member for Vancouver expect from the gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches who expressed themselves in that way at so late a period? Sir, it would have been no great trouble for the hon. gentleman, if he wished, to inform himself of what these gentlemen did in the past to have gone to the library and searched through the records, and he then would have become enlightened to such an extent that he would never have ventured to charge the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) with neglecting British Columbia, or ventured to expect from hon. gentlemen opposite better treatment.

Referring for a moment to the Speech from the Throne, I must say that I cannot see very much in it to comment upon. It contains so very little, and that little has been so much commented upon by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me that there is scarcely anything left for me to say. But the speech refers to one matter, and that is the tariff. We are promised that an investigation will be had into the workings of the tariff during recess, and that action will be taken at the next meeting of Parliament. I trust that nothing will be done to take off the duties on raw materials, as promised by the hon. leader of the Government. There are some articles of raw materials, at all events, which should be protected. While Prince Edward Island, which I have the honour to come from, is not a manufacturing island, while the people there are an agricultural people, and while a certain portion of them are engaged in fisheries yet we are interested in having certain mines and minerals in the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia protected. We know that since the inauguration of the National Policy a great industry has gone forward and flourished in the province of Nova Scotia. I refer to the coal mining industry. We know that in 1878 that indus-

try was in a languishing condition. The mines were then being closed up, the miners were being thrown out of employment, the greatest want was being felt by those people; but by the introduction of a protective duty, a stimulus was given that industry, and it went on increasing and prospering until now it has attained great importance. Around these mines, owing to the large output of coal through the encouragement given by the National Policy, towns have sprung up, and the people of Prince Edward Island find to-day in those towns and villages their best customers for their surplus market products. Around the coal mines and the iron mines and those manufacturing centres in the province of Nova Scotia, we find that we can sell our surplus products, our oats, our pork, our butter and cheese and other articles, while a few years ago no such market at all existed. Now, this is largely due to the imposition of the duty on coal, and I would therefore ask that, in the interests of the great portion of the lower provinces, nothing could be done to discourage those industries, but that instead every protection be given them. Speaking of protection, we know very well that oats are being sold at the seaboard in the city of Boston for about the same price as in the city of Halifax. Only remove the protection which the farmers have of 10 cents a bushel on their oats, and you would have the markets of the maritime provinces flooded with American oats, and take away from us the only means we have of disposing of our surplus products. Therefore, while you keep the duty on the raw material of coal and iron, you also need to keep it on the raw material of oats and pork and other products which come in from the south of us where they can be produced so much cheaper than we can produce them, bringing undue competition to bear against our farmers and driving us out of our own market. I have no objection whatever to a reciprocal treaty with the United States. I trust the hon. leader of the Government will be able to negotiate such a treaty. But, while they impose upon our products a heavy duty and thus shut us out of their markets it is only fair and just and right that the people of Canada should be protected in their own markets and the people to the south of the line kept out with their products.

I pass to another matter, which is not referred to in the Speech from the Throne, but which has been largely commented on here—the statement made by the leader of the House to the reporter of an American newspaper that certain important interests of the people of this country would be surrendered to the people of the United States. I want to say here, and I say it in all sincerity, that it would be a most serious thing for the people of the Maritime provinces if their valuable fisheries should be handed over to another country. This is the heritage of our people down by the sea and a great many of them gain their living from the wealth of these waters. It would be a suicidal course, a course unworthy of a statesman, a course that would not be approved by the people, but would be condemned by them at the first opportunity, to hand over these valuable resources to a foreign nation without any compensation whatever. Sir, we know the result of giving the use of these Atlantic fisheries in years past to the Americans. To-day we have thousands of people sailing over these waters looking for that most valuable fish, the mackerel. But that fish is not now to be found in these waters. Week after week and month after month our fishermen are out, returning often without any reward for their labour which should afford support for themselves and their families. What is the reason for this? It follows from the use of purse seines introduced in these waters by American fishermen. That engine of destruction has driven from our waters this valuable fish. Are we to hand over without compensation these fisheries which with proper protection must be such an inexhaustible source of wealth? I am glad to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his place, and I trust he will protect the interest of the people who have sent him here. But, as I have said, it would be a most unwise and unstatesmanlike thing to hand over these valuable fisheries to foreign control without receiving due compensation. I am not speaking now of the canals, to which I hear reference has been made; I confine my remarks for the present to the question of the fisheries.

It will not be necessary for me to refer at greater length to these matters of local interest. I come now to a question that was discussed on every platform from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the late contest. With us, I am glad to say, no race or religious cry was raised because of it. We discussed the question there calmly and fairly and with good sense, although it was a question that created a great deal of feeling all over this country. I refer to the Manitoba school question. We were led to believe, by the decision of the Privy Council, the highest judicial body in the Empire, that certain rights possessed by the minority in Manitoba were taken away by the provincial legislation of 1890. And we defended the action of the leader of the late Government and his colleagues. We believed that every step in the way of conciliation had been taken by the Government of the Dominion but that the Government of the province had shown that they had no desire to settle the question amicably or in a kindly and generous spirit, that they would insist upon having a public school system. Therefore, we could see no way out of the difficulty except by means of remedial legislation in this Parliament. The hon. leader of the House says

that the matter is now in a fair way of settlement. I, for one, trust that he will settle the question satisfactorily to the minority in Manitoba and as well as the majority of the people of Canada. But I fear, from the statement made by the hon. gentleman the other evening, that he does not expect to be able to accomplish this. He said he could not hope to please the extremists, who would insist upon the pound of flesh. There is no question of demanding the pound of flesh; it is a question of maintaining rights guaranteed under the constitution. He declared, in that eloquent manner for which he is noted, that there were people who would see their country bleeding at their feet and still insist upon their pound of flesh. What part of the country is bleeding to-day and has been bleeding for the last five or six years? The minority in Manitoba. They are asking for the maintenance of their rights. It is from that the pound of flesh has been taken, and the hon. gentleman will allow the present state of affairs to go on for six long months more instead of settling the question. If the hon. gentleman can settle this question, let him settle it now so that it may be at rest for ever, let him not go on concealing, as he has great ability to do his real ideas upon this subject—as his great countryman said, using words to conceal his thoughts. I do hope that this question may be amicably settled and settled in a manner that will bring peace and harmony in that country. For this Canada of ours is a good country and requires the attention of her statesmen for the development of her resources. If we are to prosper and progress, we cannot afford to dabble in race and religious differences. There should be concord and peace among all classes. Let the Englishman, the Scotchman, the Irishman, the Frenchman or the German and every other go to work like true Canadians, putting aside questions of race and religion, and unite in building up Canada into a country such as it should be made.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I wish to move the adjournment of the House, to which, I hope the hon. Premier will kindly condescend to give his assent, owing to the fact that one of the French stenographers is sick and incapacitated from doing his work.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). (Translation.) I regret exceedingly to be unable to accede to the desire of my hon. friend, because if we are anxious not to unnecessarily protract this session, it becomes our duty to proceed with the debate up to midnight, at least. Yesterday, we adjourned at half-past ten, and, under a rule of this House set up by the late Government during the previous sessions, a rule I approve of, we ought to continue sitting until half-past eleven at least, if not midnight.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The hon. members on the other side of the House, Sir, have, at the opening of the session, given expression to their satisfaction as well as to their surprise at finding themselves sitting on your right. As far as we on this side of the House are concerned, our surprise and our astonishment at this change has not been so considerable as that experienced by the hon. members who sit on your right. Long since, under the ordinary run of events, the hon. members who have sat for eighteen consecutive years as members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, should, in our opinion, have crossed the floor of this House and found themselves in the position they now occupy. I have no manner of doubt that, if, in 1887 and 1891, the Liberal party had professed, in connection with the fiscal and financial policy of the country, the same views they thought fit to advocate at the opening of the last electoral campaign, I doubt not, I say, but that the hon. gentlemen opposite would have, long since, reached the ministerial benches, a consummation so long and devoutly wished for by them. For many years past, the hon. gentlemen obstinately combated public opinion, entering into a hopeless contest with the leading manufacturers in the country, opposing the views of the great farming community, those of the important mercantile and commercial classes, but I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentlemen that had they yielded to the demands of those classes they would have long since crossed the floor of the House and reached the Treasury benches for so many years coveted by them. In order to compass that end, they had to modify their views and felt it necessary that their fiscal policy should receive its quietus It was not the platform of the Liberal party that came out victorious at the polls at the last general election, it was the Conservative programme. Wearied as was public opinion with the protracted continuance in office of the Conservative party, I believe I am warranted in saying that had the hon. gentlemen opposite gone to the country upon their old fiscal policy, instead of sitting where they now sit, they would be sitting here. The hon. First Minister himself, at several large meetings held in the commercial metropolis of Canada, endeavoured, many and many a time, to allay the fears of the manufacturers and of the merchants of the city of Montreal. In the course of the electoral campaign, his candidates, his political ensign-bearers during the last struggle, gave to the farming community the most emphatic and, at the same time, the most contradictory assurances, stating that the burden of taxation created by the Conservative Government when imposing high duties on manufactured products coming from foreign countries, would be lightened, because the Liberal Government, or the Liberal party had a secret policy, but that policy they have not yet unfolded neither before the House nor before the country. But in virtue of that secret policy, they were going, they said, to lighten the burden of taxation which pressed upon the farming community and,

at the same time, continue giving the same protection to the manufacturing industries. I have, Sir, taken a pretty active part in the last electoral contest: it was my privilege to address public meetings in various ridings in the province of Quebec, and to debate political issues with the hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury benches; and upon those several occasions, it was a surprise to me to hear the Liberal speakers abjuring and going back on their free trade policy, and giving, as I said, formal pledges to that effect to the farming community, to the working classes, as also to the manufacturing interests of great cities. I do not intend, Sir, for the moment, to pursue that matter any further than to say that, later on, I shall go into details which may prove very interesting for the hon. First Minister and to his friends, and especially to those who come from the province of Quebec.

When addressing the House the other day in those terms which we all admired, my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, gave expression to certain doubts as to the merit of the policy carried out by him with a view to the maintenance of the constitution in connection with the rights of minorities, whether Protestant or Catholic, English or French. My hon. friend confessed that he had greately overrated the importance attached by the Catholic population of Quebec to the rights of the Manitoba minority. My hon. friend may have been led into error, as to the wisdom of his own attitude, from the verdict given by the electorate of the province of Quebec. The hon. leader of the Opposition, indeed, who has made such a vigorous campaign through the length and breadth of the land, so as to strike with admiration and astonishment the whole electorate, from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island, my hon. friend, I say, could not, perhaps, get as full an insight as we did into the tactics of the Liberal party, into the strategy of their leader, and of his friends who, according as they addressed the electorate in cities or in rural constituencies, whether they had to deal with Catholics or Protestants, with French or English hearers, resorted to contradictory pledges and assurances, and to tactics which I shall not qualify as unfair, not to use an unparliamentary expression, but which I may say were open to suspicion, and not creditable to the hon. leader of the Government and to his friends.

Mr. Speaker, I intend first to address myself, in the few remarks I am about to make, to the tactics of the hon. gentlemen who will give their support during this Parliament to the hon. leader of the Government, both on the fiscal and financial policy, and on other issues debated during the last campaign; and I shall also deal with the way in which the Dominion Government should redress the grievances and right the wrongs of minorities, whenever provincial authorities overstep their jurisdiction and encroach upon the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by the constitution. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and the hon. gentlemen who took the floor before him, have all told the House about the pledges given by the Liberal chieftains and candidates in the province of Quebec. In the debate of yesterday, we have been told of the pledges given and of declarations made by the hon. gentlemen to the French Catholic electors of the province of Quebec, where the Liberal speakers declared before the people on the hustings that, should their leader come into power, the interests of the minority would be safe in his hands, and that their rights would be restored to them, in their entirety. Such were the declarations made and the pledges given by the hon. gentleman to further the Liberal cause and the success of the present Premier at the polls. I am surprised now to hear the hon. Premier talk of compromise. I am surprised to see his colleagues from the province of Quebec who, during the last electoral campaign evinced such a zeal in favour of the minority, telling the electors that the Remedial Bill introduced by the late Government was wholly inadequate, and that they would go a great deal further. I am surprised, I say, to see the same hon. gentlemen who proved themselves such obstructionists during the last session, preventing the Remedial Bill from passing into law, now sitting speechless, standing mute in their places. None of the hon. gentlemen dare say a word in reply to the serious charges brought down against them. None of them dare ask a word of explanation, not only from the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, but also from those who sit behind them, and who seem so averse to speaking about the pledges given by them to the electors, in order, no doubt, the more easily to forget them. As I just said, Sir, it was my privilege to address many public meetings in my native province, and, let me tell you what I saw and heard upon those several occasions. First, everywhere I heard the same language spoken in connection with the school question; everywhere, I heard the same pledges given to the electorate of the province of Quebec; everywhere, the people were told that the safety of the minority depended upon the coming into power of the hon. First Minister and his colleagues. Let me first read to the House some reports of the speeches delivered, taken, not from Tory newspapers from the province of Quebec, organs of the late Government, but from public sheets expressly founded by the hon. Premier and his friends, in order to propagate his political ideas and doctrines during the last electoral campaign. One of the hon. members from the province of Quebec, who was returned to this House on the 23rd June, the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet) gave to the French Catholic electors of his constituency the pledges I am about to read. Here is the report of the "Soir,"

a newspaper edited in the city of Montreal, in connection with the speech delivered before a large public meeting held in the county of Joliette by my hon. friend, the present member for that riding in the House of Commons. The article bears the date of the 17th June, 1896, and is headed "Large political meeting held at Joliette; the Liberal candidate in attendance." Let the hon. members opposite who would be tempted to charge the Conservative party and its followers with making a traffic of religion, listen to the edifying utterances of the hon. member for Joliette. I do not blame him for proclaiming aloud his creed and religion, but I say, Sir, that whenever Conservative candidates or speakers go from platform to platform in the province of Quebec making loud-mouthed professions of their nationality and creed, the Liberals never fail to arraign them on that score before the House and the country. The hon. member for Joliette spoke as follows:—

I am a Catholic and a French Canadian, and you, gentlemen, who know me, are aware that I have as much personal devotion as any one else to the interests of my race and religion. I shall always look upon as my first duty to vote for any measure calculated——

As you see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Joliette is hostile to any compromise, but will be satisfied with nothing more nor less than a measure calculated, as he says:

—to give redress to the grievances of our Manitoba compatriots, and will meet with the approbation of the bishops of this province.

Such was the language used by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet) when urging the electors of his constituency to give their support and their vote to the hon. Premier. Far be it from me to lay any blame on any member of this House for making public professions of his religious or national views; and in that respect, Sir, I think I am more liberal-minded than some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I shall not cast any blame on them for appealing to the national feelings of their compatriots, and for giving them pledges that should the hon. First Minister come into power, justice would be meted out to the Catholic minority in Manitoba, as surely as if the hon. leader of the Opposition of the day were put at the head of affairs. But I say it is unfair from the hon. gentlemen opposite to pretend that the hon. leader of the Opposition had not put before the country a well-defined programme. Quite different in that respect from that of the hon. Premier who had one platform for Ontario and another for Quebec, as evinced by the statements of his own organs, while the hon. leader of the Opposition had one and the same programme for the whole country, for Protestants as well as for Catholics. The hon. leader of the Government had not the same language for all his fellow-citizens from British Columbia down to Prince Edward Island. It is on record from the reports of his own organs that he had, when he spoke in Ontario a different policy from that propounded by him before his faithful electors in St. Rochs whose representative in the Commons he has now been for so many years. The "Soir" has been indiscreet, and since the elections are over, the hon. gentlemen are no doubt loath to hear it quoted. Many statements have been made in that organ which the hon. gentlemen opposite would rather had not been made. The hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet) does not stand solitary among the hon. members who have committed themselves to such statements as the one I have just read to the House. There are many other reports of political meetings, published by that paper, in which similar statements to the one referred to were reported as having been made by other Liberal stump speakers. Why, in the old parish of Varennes, in the county of Verchères, that paper has put on record the words fallen from the lips of an hon. member of the Government, no less a personage than the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion). The House will see whether the hon. gentleman has talked of a compromise, and in what language he addressed to the electors of that constituency, in order to obtain the 400 votes majority polled in his favour in that riding. He also was obliged to give a solemn pledge to his constituents, a pledge to have justice meted out to the down-trodden minority in Manitoba. Here is what the "Soir" published on the 11th June, 1896:

Meeting at Varennes; over two thousand people attend the meeting.

Therefore, as stated by that paper, the chief Government organ—and I doubt not it is quite within the mark in making that statement—there were two thousand people attending the meeting. Let us listen to the statement made by the hon. member for Verchères, now a member of the Government, when standing in presence of the French Canadian electors of that county, to induce some Conservative electors to poll their vote in his favour, and thus secure the signal triumph he has achieved over his opponent, the Hon. Mr. Taillon, whose candidature I was supporting. Here are the very words uttered by the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion):

I am here to make the declaration imposed upon me by my bishop in the mandement which has been read in all the churches of the province. That mandement presses upon the voters——

The House will see what a devoted and dutiful son of the church the hon. member proves to be:

—the duty of registering their vote only in favour of those candidates who shall take the solemn and formal pledge of supporting an adequate remedial law, restoring to the Catholic minority the rights which have been taken away from them.

Now, I invite the attention of the House to the following words of the same hon. gentleman :—

Now, gentlemen, I am here to publicly make in your presence the declaration imposed upon me by my bishop, and I now take before you a solemn pledge to that effect. I shall vote in favour of a remedial law, such as required by the bishops, an operative law restoring to the Catholics of Manitoba all the rights adjudicated upon by the Privy Council judgment, but, at the same time, I declare that I shall see to it that their rights and not crumbs be given back to them ; for the Catholics do not ask charity ; they are not mendicants ; they claim their own rights.

Now, the " Soir " further says :

This solemn declaration was greeted by prolonged applause.

Such, Sir, were the statements made by the hon. member who has since been taken into the Cabinet of the hon. Premier ; such are the emphatic and solemn pledges given by the hon. member as recorded by the newspaper mentioned. But, Sir, the " Soir " does not stand a solitary witness in the case ; I also did hear, upon several occasions, the hon. gentleman make as emphatic and as positive declarations as those reported by the organ of the First Minister. I hear the plaudits of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I doubt not but that the hon. gentlemen are delighted over the fact that I should now put on record before the House the statements made by them during the electoral campaign. They appear, however, to have quite forgotten those statements. Wherefore did they put in print those statements? Why did the " Soir " publish those advertisements if not to cause these solemn statements to reach the poorest hamlets in the remotest corner of the province of Quebec, in order to influence public opinion and impress upon the compatriots of the hon. First Minister the fact that the cause of the Manitoba Catholic minority would not be jeopardized, would not run the least risk in the hands of that hon. gentleman, but, on the contrary, that the Catholic minority would secure better protection from a Catholic French Canadian Premier than from the hon. leader of the Opposition of the day. The hon. member for Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion) and the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet) do not stand alone as having given such pledges. There is also the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine). That hon. gentleman, one of the luminaries of the Liberal party, was one of those whom public opinion was pointing to as a colleague of the hon. Premier in the Government, destined to sit side by side with the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly. The statements made by the hon. member are also on record. On the 3rd of June, there was held at the town of St. Jean Baptiste, a meeting presided over by Alderman Grothé. The hon. member for Maisonneuve, when dealing with the school question, which, said he, was looked upon by his opponents of such paramount importance that they declined speaking of any other matter, stated, among other things, that he also pledged himself to have complete justice awarded to the Catholic minority and, moreover—and I invite the attention of the House to the words of the hon. member—" that all the rights enjoyed by them previous to 1890 should be restored to them either through means of conciliation or by a Remedial Bill, but not such a farce as the measure introduced in Parliament last session." Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite show again by the plaudits with which they greet this statement, that their views on the question remain unchanged, and I cannot help rejoicing at the fact, as a sincere friend of the Manitoba minority, because I now realize that those papers which have thrown out the hint that the hon. First Minister was about making a compromise of some sort or other, have simply tried to set public opinion on the wrong scent. I therefore trust and sincerely hope that the hon. members who, by their cheers, show that they still entertain the same views, will, under all circumstances, join hands with the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has declared that the hon. First Minister had his most cordial wishes for a happy and speedy settlement of this question, and that anything he could contribute to that end would be at all times cheerfully done ; a co-operation, I may say, which the Premier was not entitled to expect, from the course pursued by him and his political supporters during last session. Since the views of the hon. members opposite remain unchanged, and they are still willing to have complete justice dealt out to the Manitoba minority, since they want to have all the rights the minority enjoyed previous to 1890 restored to them, and not only crumbs, as stated by the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly, but their complete rights and privileges, I trust and sincerely hope that the hon. gentlemen will join hands with my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, and will work in accord with him to afford an adequate measure of justice to the minority. My hon. friend, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee), and English-speaking Protestant, has also proclaimed himself the champion of the rights of the Manitoba minority, the friend of that minority. He made a declaration to that effect in my presence, and in the presence of thousands of electors during the electoral campaign. " What I want to secure for the Manitoba minority, he stated, is not only crumbs, but I want complete justice dealt out to the Catholics of that province," and, addressing, the Catholic French Canadian portion of his auditory, he added: " You have all the desirable guarantees in the person of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier). He is a compatriot of yours, a man professing the same religion as you do, a man belonging to your race ; therefore, you cannot but trust him, and you

may be sure that he will restore to your fellow-countrymen in Manitoba their complete rights in educational and language matters." Such are the solemn pledges taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite in presence of their electors. and now the cheers coming from the same hon. gentlemen go to prove that they wish to be true to their pledges in that connection. No trouble need be anticipated, Sir, on the matter, as the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has promised the hon. First Minister his most cordial co-operation, to ensure the maintenance of the constitution of our country and secure the respect of the rights of minorities, regardless of race and creed. The hon. Premier's policy is bound to triumph. We are not, on this side of the House. I say so without fear of contradiction. in favour of a policy of obstruction, like that carried out during the last Parliament by the hon. Premier (Mr. Laurier); no. we do not wish to climb into power over this question, nor do we wish to perpetuate in this country, religious and national strife, in order to reach the Treasury benches. Now. the hon. First Minister is sure that his policy will triumph, should it square with the promises given to his fellow-countrymen and which his present supporters in this House have pledged their word to have carried out.

I am also satisfied that the views of my colleagues from the province of Quebec and of the First Minister himself on that question still remain unchanged. and should it happen. next session, that the Manitoba goveramesnt had failed to give justice, of their own free will, to the Catholic minority. then. as stated by the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion). by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet), as well as by the other Liberal candidates in ten or fifteen ridings which I visited during the electoral campaign, the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches opposite will award entire justice to the Manitoba minority and give them back the rights they enjoyed previous to 1890. And the Government, in that case, may surely rely upon our co-operation and support. Not only does the hon. leader of the Opposition proffer his co-operation and support, but the hon. members on this side of the House have made up their minds, come what may, that the constitution of the country shall be upheld and carried out.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Your whip (Mr. Taylor) stated quite the reverse.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Wait till the whip gets up in his seat in this House and you will see what he will state.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) He stated the contrary in another place.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I would not cast any blame on the hon. Prime Minister should ten or fifteen followers of his refuse to support him on this question, but let him rest assured that, in that case, he might rely upon the support of at least seventy-five members on this side of the House, which would amply make up for the loss of the former. With the hon. leader of the Opposition and the whole phalanx of able men whom I see sitting behind him, the hon. First Minister need not feel uneasy about victoriously carrying out his policy, and this national and religious issue would thus forever be removed from the arena of federal politics. The hon. gentlemen opposite. as I just stated, have thrown out a few hints about the exercise of clerical influence during the last election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation). Nc, no.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Let the hon. gentlemen have patience and wait until I have offered the House a few remarks in this connection. Let them not get impatient now; all I have to say on the matter will be said with fair-play and above board. In the counties which I visited during the electoral campaign most emphatic pledges were given to the voters in connection with the school question. The House has just listened to the utterances fallen from the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion) such as reported by his own organ "Le Soir." I have also placed on record the declarations made by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet), by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee) and by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine). I could also mention in this connection the name of the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Gauthier). "Le Soir" actually printed what follows:—

Mr. Gauthier having stated that he acquiesced in the collective mandement of the bishops, this circular cannot prejudicially affect his case.

All the members from the district of Montreal whom I had the honour to hear addressing public meetings, did actually adhere to and acquiesce in the collective mandement of the hierarchy. And commenting upon the mandement, they said: "As you see, gentlemen, the collective mandement of the hierarchy is nothing but a censure passed upon the course pursued by the leader of the Government" alluding to the leader of the late Cabinet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DUPONT. As I see, the hon. gentlemen opposite are in a very joyful mood, but let me tell them to keep cool, and treasure up in their memories this remark, for their future guidance, and it is this, that a government begins to die on the very day it is born, and further that their Government might be short-lived, or at least, that quite possibly it may not enjoy such longevity as the late Government did. Now, a life of eighteen years for a government is equivalent to one of 120 years for an individual. As just stated, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite nearly all accepted and

acquiesced in the mandement of the hierarchy, going even to the length of asserting that it was a direct censure of the measure introduced in the House last session, which was evidenced, they stated, by the fact that the mandement required from the candidates that they should pledge themselves to vote in favour of an effective Remedial Bill. The Liberal stump-speakers further said: "The Bill introduced by the Conservative Government last session, therefore, was inoperative, ineffective and it was introduced solely in order to throw dust in the eyes of the Catholic voters of the country." That is the reason why I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite who supported the leader of the Government of the day during the last campaign have made a scandalous abuse of the mandement of the hierarchy. I have, upon several occasions, heard another objection urged to the effect that the large mass of the clergy were sympathizing with the Conservative party. Let the hon. gentlemen allow me to make one remark in this connection. The Roman Catholic clergy of the province of Quebec have sided for a great many years with the Conservative party. For a number of years past, the Liberal party has inured itself to war against the Conservative party and against clerical influence; they have all along opposed the clergy, as evinced from the well-known fact that it was the Liberal party that first raised before the tribunal of justice the issue of undue clerical influence or intervention in elections. This celebrated issue of undue clerical influence at the elections was brought before the courts in Canada by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, on the very day when they thought fit to avail themselves of the episcopal mandements, they forthwith made an unblushing and scandalous abuse of the same. Upon all occasions, they never refrained from availing themselves of undue clerical influence, as it was styled by them. I have before me a list of the names of priests from whom the Liberal candidates have extorted letters which they later on circulated and spread broadcast among the electors and in the public prints, and whose purport was to show, in connection with the school question, that the voters could, with a safe conscience, support my hon. friend the leader of the Government of the day (Mr. Laurier), and claiming in his favour the support of French Catholic voters. I have here a list of a number of priests who thus affixed their signatures to letters which the Liberal candidates would read to their supporters in order to convince them that the policy of the leader of the Opposition, the then Premier ought not to be approved of nor supported by the electorate of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name them.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Here are the names of some of those priests: the Rev. Messrs. Dugas, Proulx, Vézina and a host of others. I may further say, Mr. Speaker, that whenever a priest declares in favour of the Liberal party, he always carries along with him a number of partisans, because it is a well-known fact that, as a rule, the priests side with the Conservative party. So, on the very day when the hon. gentlemen opposite were enabled to prevail upon a certain number of priests to advocate and champion a policy favourable to their party, they were seen hawking around letters obtained from those priests, and the mandements of the hierarchy, and fiercely attacking the leader of the Conservative Government who, they stated had brought forward an ineffective legislation in favour of the Manitoba minority. Mr. Speaker, as the only French shorthand writer now available is, I presume, beginning to feel pretty tired, and as the regular time fixed by the hon. leader of the Government is up, I hope the hon. gentleman will allow me to move the adjournment of the debate. As my hon. friend acquiesces in my demand, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PARIS UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to take part in the Paris Universal Exposition in 1900.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government has not yet considered that question.

PURCHASE OF BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

Whether the Government have entered into negotiations with the Quebec Government for the purchase of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway? Has there been any correspondence between the two Governments on the subject?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The only negotiations that have taken place are contained in certain correspondence upon the subject be-

tween the late Government of the Dominion and the Government of the province of Quebec. The Quebec Government having written suggesting that the Dominion Government purchase it. The latter Government by Order in Council, replying that a purchase could only be made by authority of Parliament, but that the proposition should receive consideration at an early date.

JOSEPH LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. Were complaints made in 1895 against Mr. Joseph Lemieux, Inspector of Fisheries for Mont St. Louis, county of Gaspé ?
2. If so, what is the nature of the said complaints ?

1. Yes. 2. Fraud in connection with payment of claims for fishing bounty and in rendering accounts for disbursements not incurred.

BREAKWATERS, &c., AT P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates for the current year for the repair and extension of the breakwater at Belle River, also for the pier at Mink River, and the wharf at Red Point, in the province of Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The breakwater at Belle River is not under the control of the Government, neither is the wharf at Red Point. With regard to the pier at Mink River, the matter is under consideration.

DREDGING AT P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Does the Government intend to give orders for the dredging of Vernon River and Murray River, in the province of Prince Edward Island, during the coming autumn or ensuing fall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No.

CAMPBELL COVE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the contemplated repairs to Campbell Cove breakwater, in Prince Edward Island, during the present year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The matter is under consideration.

ANNANDALE WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the repairs to the wharf at Annandale, Prince Edward Island, during the current year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No.

LIGHTHOUSE AT ST. PETER'S BAY, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to rebuild and repair the block on which the lighthouse is erected at St. Peter's Bay, Prince Edward Island, during the current year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). My department is conferring with the Department of Marine in reference to the requirements at this place.

STEPHEN'S PIER, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the repairs to Stephen's Pier at Montague, Prince Edward Island, during the current year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The matter is under serious consideration.

NEWPORT WHARF, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the extension of the wharf at Newport, Prince Edward Island, during the current year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No.

PUBLIC WORKS IN P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to repair and improve during the current year the following public works in the province of Prince Edward Island, viz :—Tignish Breakwater, Miminegash Breakwater, West Point Pier, Brae Breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is the intention of the Government to repair the breakwaters at Tignish and Miminegash. The question of constructing works at West Point and Brae will be considered during the recess after the close of the present session.

PORT PHYSICIAN—ST. JOHN, P.Q.

Mr. DUPONT asked :

Whether Dr. George Tassé, port physician of St. John, P.Q., has been discharged from his position ?

If so, for what reason was he discharged, and at whose instance was the dismissal effected; who has been appointed to succeed Dr. Tassé, and by whom was such successor recommended?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies.) 1. Dr. George Tassé was employed to attend sick seamen requiring relief under the provisions of the Sick Mariners Act at the port of St. Johns, but there was no appointment and no salary for such position. His remuneration consisted in fees for patients attended. On the 11th August last instructions were given to the Collector of Customs to employ Dr. H. Moreau of St. Johns, in all cases when it was found necessary to employ a doctor to attend a sick seaman. Dr. Moreau was recommended by the member representing the district.

THE WRIT FOR SASKATCHEWAN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government, if he is able to inform the House at what time he will make his selection as to which seat he will sit for, having been selected for two. You, Sir, said yesterday, that you had received no notice as to the issue of a writ for the Saskatchewan district.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My selection of a seat has been made long ago. I had been elected for both Saskatchewan and Quebec East, and when I accepted office both seats became vacant. I selected to sit for Quebec East.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask this question in consequence of my understanding Mr. Speaker to say yesterday, that he had no notice of the Saskatchewan seat having become vacant, and consequently that the writ could not issue. I would like under those circumstances to ask, Mr. Speaker, when the writ for Saskatchewan district would issue.

The PRIME MINISTER. Probably, as soon as my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) from his seat in Parliament chooses to notify Mr. Speaker that the seat is vacant; or, when two other members outside of the session choose to do so. That is provided for in the statute.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you of the vacancy that has occurred in the district of Saskatchewan by the selection of the leader of the Government, on accepting office, to sit for Quebec East.

Mr. McCARTHY. It seems to me that the more regular way would be to move for the issue of a writ. The House has control of its own proceedings.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In accordance with that suggestion, which I have no doubt is entirely correct, I beg to move:

That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant for the issue of a writ for the election of a member of Parliament for the Electoral District of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would mention to the House that no notice whatever had reached the Speaker of the vacancy, and the Speaker until notified in this way, or by two hon. members outside of the session, cannot officially know of the vacancy, and cannot act without such notification.

Mr. McCARTHY. The vacancy occurred before your election as Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but it might have happened that I had received notice since my election.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to remind the Minister of Finance that I have not yet received the additional papers in re the Governor General's warrants.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). A portion has been sent to me. The remainder, I expect, will be here before the close of the sitting.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has everything except the Orders in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. And the legal opinion.

The PRIME MINISTER. The legal opinion we have. The Orders in Council are not material, do you want them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Before the adjournment of the debate, last night, the point I was making was this, that the reason why the gentlemen who now support the policy of the Government succeeded in carrying the elections, was solely because they adopted the programme of the Conservative party, and, above all, that portion of the platform relating to the Manitoba school question, and also because they pledged their word that they would do a great deal more for the Catholic and French Canadian minority than what was granted to them by the Bill put before Parliament last session. In the course of my remarks, I endeavoured to point out to this House the deep religious fervour evinced before the electors by the hon. member for Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion), by the hon. mem-

ber for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), and by several other supporters of the Government from the province of Quebec. My remarks in this connection were not made out of derision, nor prompted by a desire to be offensive to any of my hon. colleagues in this House; on the contrary, this new departure of the Liberal party in their attitude towards the hierarchy and the religious leaders of the overwhelming majority of the population of the province of Quebec is a source of gratification to me as also to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; the more so as the members of the Liberal party and their ancestors had proved quite refractory to that clerical influence, as the name goes in the province of Quebec. Let the hon. Prime Minister also allow me to offer him my congratulations for having fearlessly reproved a celebrated journalist of Montreal, the editor of the "Patrie," who had fancied that, under the leadership of my hon. friend, the Liberal party could, on the hustings and in the press, go farther than their predecessors in the direction of animadverting upon the acts of the clergy. I wish also to congratulate him on account of the direction given to his party, which, I believe, will prove beneficial, not only to that party, but also to the general interests of the province of Quebec. Now, I doubt not but that the reason why the hon. Prime Minister, who has entered upon that course and committed his party to that policy, resorted to the appeals I have referred to before the electorate of the province of Quebec, was simply to ward off the effects of the position taken by the leader of the Government at the time. There are still left, however, in the party, some unruly political friends to whom the hon. Premier shall not fail, I doubt not, to give a good lecture. The hon. member from Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet), whom I now see in his seat opposite, is one of those unruly members. But the hon. gentleman has also deemed it prudent to tread, from a distance in the footsteps of his political friends, in order to secure a majority of voters in his constituency. I had the opportunity to hear his statements before the people, his comments on the collective letter of the bishops of the province of Quebec concerning the school question, and, if I mistake not, at a public meeting held in the county of Laprairie-Napierville, which I attended, the hon. member stated that his programme on the Manitoba school question had been approved of by his bishop.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) No. I never said so.

Mr. DUPONT. Translation.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say so; if I misunderstood the nature of his statement, I am quite willing to withdraw what I have said. But I understood that my hon. friend had read to the people at that political meeting, a letter to the effect that high eccleciastical dignitaries approved of his course. I freely confess that the meeting in question was very unruly, and that, perhaps, explains why I could not catch the exact meaning of the letter I alluded to. At any rate, Sir, I may say that the behaviour of the hon. gentleman towards two members of the church to which he professes to belong, and which obtains the obedience of nearly all the voters of the riding he represents here, his behaviour, I say, towards those distinguished prelates, who command the respect of the whole Catholic population of Quebec, as well as that of the English-speaking and Protestant population, was simply shameful. One of them is an old missionary who has devoted his life to the cause of education among his compatriots; who has taken part in the colonization and civilization of the North-west, thus laying down the foundation of the future prosperity of those regions, paving the way for the creation of the provinces which have since been carved out in the west, and of other prospective provinces. I say, Sir, that the attitude of the hon. gentleman towards those two prelates calls for the most unqualified condemnation at the hands of all his colleagues in this House. I am satisfied that his colleagues on the other side of this House do not approve of the extravagant and discreditable conduct of the hon. gentleman towards those two high dignitaries of the church.

Now, Sir, to return to the point I was making last night, previous to moving the adjournment of the debate, I am satisfied that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition in this House (Sir Charles Tupper) did not overrate the importance of the school question, nor the strength of the public feeling among the electorate of the province of Quebec in connection therewith; and, in order to substantiate that statement, I did put on record the views advanced by a certain number of hon. gentlemen who now sit opposite. But let us proceed. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), in the course of the electoral contest, also made use of a letter from a priest, although not a parish priest in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman, in order not to be out of countenance, as he could not prevail upon the clergy in his riding to approve of his programme, applied to a member of the clergy outside of his electoral division, endeavouring to secure an endorsement of his programme, which he might oppose to that of his opponent, in order to induce the electors of his riding whose votes he was canvassing, to believe that his ticket had the approval of the clergy. The hon. gentleman actually stated that he also was willing to uphold the cause of the Manitoba minority, to which the rival candidate and the Conservative party had pledged themselves; and that he was even decided, in gambling parlance, to go one better than the Conservative. The paper, "Le Soir," published the following note:—"Mr. Fortin, the

candidate, has a letter from a former missionary," and that candidate was the member for Laval. Then followed the letter which I shall dispense with reading to the House. That letter bore the signature of the Rev. Mr. Vézina, a former missionary to the United States. There are also other hon. gentlemen from the district of Montreal who sought to ingratiate themselves with the electors by proclaiming aloud their good intentions towards the Manitoba minority.

If I make these remarks, Sir, it is not with a view to pointing out the facts alluded to as grievances, nor do I wish thereby to level them, as charges or injurious imputations at my hon. colleagues opposite. Quite the contrary; I congratulate them on their having gone back on their former policy and coming back to better views on the matter. I congratulate the hon. gentlemen upon having entered upon the contest in the province of Quebec as champions of the rights of the Manitoba minority, thus treading in the footsteps of my hon. friend, the hon. member from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), and of the former member for the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), now member for Wright County. Both these hon. gentlemen, at the last session of Parliament, pointed out to the Liberal party the true course to be pursued, in order to secure the signal victory they gained in the province of Quebec.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) If what you say is true, why then did your party oppose me so bitterly at the last election?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I am not speaking of the last electoral contest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) They are a lot of humbugs.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Let the hon. gentleman have patience. I will tell him, by-and by, what people think of him. If the hon. member for Wright was offered opposition, I may point out to him that I am neither the leader nor one of the leaders of the party, that I am not manager of the Conservative party in my province, and that I have never been but a simple soldier in my party, just as he is himself in his own party. If the hon. gentleman was offered opposition at the last election, it was probably owing to the fact that, at a certain meeting, he expressed his regret at the course——

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) Let the hon. gentleman prove his statement, and I pledge my word to him that I will resign my seat immediately.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The report to which I refer was not published in the Conservative press but in the Liberal papers. From the reports of the Liberal press, I gather that at the meeting held at Sohmer Park, in Montreal, the hon. gentleman let it be understood that he was beginning to regret having pursued the course he had taken last session. Such was the interpretation put upon the speech delivered by my hon. friend, and such was, as I think, the reason why he was opposed at the last election. Now, let me tell my hon. friend that I had nothing to do with that opposition offered him, and I merely suggest to him the reason which I have heard alleged at several meetings, why opposition had been offered my hon. friend in his county.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but if I may be permitted to make one observation——

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be better perhaps that the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) should ask the permission of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dupont) to make a correction, and no doubt the permission will be given, and the gentleman who has the floor will take his seat; otherwise the interruption might give rise to unnecessary confusion, and two hon. gentlemen would be on their feet at the same time.

Mr. DEVLIN. I merely wish to correct the hon. gentleman from Bagot (Mr. Dupont) when he states that I expressed regret for my position on the school question. If he can prove that, I am quite ready to resign my seat immediately.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) The statement made by the hon. member is so general, so loose, that witnesses could hardly be found to decide the issue. But I shall not take the time of the House in bringing forward evidence and looking for witnesses to prove what the hon. member for Wright may have stated, last spring, at Sohmer Park. I have, so far, made good the fact that the hon. gentlemen who now support the Prime Minister have been returned to this House solely because they gave pledges that they would go far beyond what the Conservative party had done in connection with the Manitoba school question. They have endeavoured by all means in their power to lead the electors of the province of Quebec to believe in the sincerity of their pledges to the effect that they would restore to the French and Catholic minority in Manitoba all the rights and privileges adjudicated upon by the Privy Council judgment. Further, they did give their pledge that they would vote for a measure approved of by the hierarchy of the province of Quebec. Such are the means resorted to by the hon. gentlemen opposite in carrying on the contest upon the Manitoba school question, and that explains the error fallen into by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition who, lacking the necessary information on that point, could not get an insight into the true position of affairs during the electoral contest in Quebec, and who was therefore

led to believe that he had over-rated the importance attached by the electorate of the province of Quebec to this question. I have further charged the hon. gentlemen opposite with having appropriated to themselves the fiscal policy of the Conservative party. I may further add, Sir, that not only did they steal from the Conservative party their fiscal policy, but they did much worse. As I have stated previously, I took an active part in the electoral contest in several ridings of the province of Quebec, and I heard my hon. friends who now support the Government preaching pro and con, and altering the nature of their statements on the fiscal policy, according to the needs of the hour. Now they would pledge themselves to maintain the protective tariff for the benefit of manufacturers and of the manufacturing industries of the country, and to do nothing that might imperil the existence of those industries, and therefore not to cut off the duties imposed by the Conservative Government; now, they would attack the same tariff, and run down the Conservative fiscal policy, when in presence of the rural constituencies. In the latter constituencies, they would strive to point out to our good rural population that the protective tariff was a tariff that imposed heavy taxes upon the farming community, and that the imports thus levied upon the farming class were so levied solely with a view to the aggrandizement and enrichment of the fortunate manufacturing interests; and that it was through the imposition of taxes levied upon the farming community that the great millionaires had sprung up in Montreal and other large cities of the Dominion; further, that it was through the instrumentality of that same fiscal policy and of the taxes levied under it that had been reared those large palaces, those immense industrial establishments that were to be seen in Montreal; and therefore, they would wind up their speeches by asking the farmers to repudiate and vote against such a policy. They would tell the rural voters that it was through the taxes levied upon them, to the benefit of the manufacturing classes, that had built up those castles whose splendour dazzled their eyes when visiting the city. All that wealth of the larger cities, all those manufacturing establishments, it is all very fine, no doubt, would they say, but you, rural voters, what did you get from the Government? Why, all that wealth is not yours, but the monopolists, who have sprung into existence under the fostering policy and who have grown fat, enriched themselves at your expense. Such, Sir, was the language used in the province of Quebec by the friends of the hon. Premier, when making their onslaughts upon the protective policy before the electors in the rural constituencies. Now, to return to Montreal, to the county of Maisonneuve, now represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine), hearken to the words uttered by the hon. gentleman before immense meetings: "You will be told that the Liberal party is hostile to a protective tariff, but I tell you, gentlemen, that the Liberal party will never hurt nor disturb one single industry in Montreal."

It was because they varied their policy, according to the interests of their hearers, and because of the conversion which I already referred to with regard to the school question, that the candidates of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) succeeded in carrying the elections. The hon. gentlemen opposite, having modified their views on that important issue, the electors believed in their conversion. I trust that they are sincerely converted and that they will strive to redeem their pledges and frame for the relief of the Manitoba minority a more perfect measure than the one introduced at the last session of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now deal with the causes which brought on the return to power of the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman, in his speech, pointed out three causes which account for his accession to power. He said the hon. leader of the Opposition was defeated at the polls, first, because the Administration of public affairs under the late Government had been extravagant and corrupt; in the second place, because the tariff policy had bred monopolies, and lastly, because the Government had been guilty of negligence in relation to the Manitoba school question. My hon. friend, with his wonted eloquence, endeavoured to create in the House and the country the impression that such had been the causes of the downfall of the late Administration. To my mind, there are other causes than those pointed out by my hon. friend, which materially helped him to climb into power. There is, first, the cause which I pointed out, in my opening remarks yesterday, namely, that the Conservative party had been eighteen years at the head of affairs. That the Conservative party should have succeeded in retaining so long the reins of power is, indeed, to be wondered at. I may tell the Prime Minister that such a long lease of power is unparalleled in the history of any other British colony. Neither in the parliamentary annals of the metropolis, nor in those of any other country enjoying popular freedom, could there be found an instance of such a long lease of power. In the parliamentary records of Great Britain, we find that the celebrated William Pitt, one of the greatest statesmen of England, succeeded in holding the reins of power from 1783 to 1800. But, by what concourse of circumstances was Pitt enabled to remain for so long a period of time at the head of affairs? We all know that it was owing to the French revolution and to the wars of the republic and of the Empire. During these eventful years, when wars raged without interruption throughout devastated Europe, William Pitt was invested with unbounded confidence of the British nation. The British voters reposed in the

political genius of William Pitt a confidence which they have since withheld from all other public men. With this extraordinary concourse of circumstances, Pitt held the reins of power only eighteen years. Since that time, governments have suceeded each other almost at fixed and regular intervals, and statesmen of genius like Gladstone, Disraeli, Derby, Palmerston, and other were unable to hold power for a longer period than one parliament, with the exception of Gladstone who, when resigning office in 1874, confessed that he did no longer enjoy the confidence of the House of Commons. In every free country, the popular mind is always variable. Ever since the people were free to overthrow governments at pleasure, the popular mind has always been fickle.

Let me also invite your attention, Sir, to the record of the republics of old. Those who are conversant with the history of the free peoples in ancient republics, no doubt recollect this anecdote which shows how fickle-minded is the multitude. You remember, Sir, having read about that illiterate plebian holding out a shell to Aristides, and asking him to write down his name on it, which meant condemning him to exile. But, asked Aristides, what grievance have you against me? None at all, replied the plebian, except that I am wearied with hearing them call you the "just." This anecdote, Sir, evinces the fickleness of the popular mind, and of public opinion in free countries. Why is it that the hon. Prime Minister could not, ere now, reach the Treasury benches? It was certainly not through any lack of ambition or efforts on his part or on that of his followers. All that the hon. gentleman wanted was such a programme as was calculated to give satisfaction to public opinion, and that programme the hon. gentlemen have found, in despoiling us of our policy.

There is a further explanatory cause of the change of Government, brought on at the last election. A party, in the long run, gets disgusted with power. Do the hon. Prime Minister and his friends call in question the accuracy of that statement? Perhaps the hon. gentlemen are not yet tired with being in power, but let them wait a little longer, and they will realize the truth of my statement. The leaders of a party, in the long run, get disgusted with politics, and all its concomitant troubles, which overtask the patience of those at the head of affairs. Out of patience, wearied with public administration, the Ministers sometimes neglect to vindicate their policy and to educate public opinion. Such was the case with the Conservative party. Still, let not the hon. gentlemen fancy that we have been dumbfounded or disheartened over the defeat of our party. The Conservatives are prepared to do their duty on the Opposition side, to help the Prime Minister to carry out his programme and to achieve all the great reforms he has pledged himself to carry out; but we shall also battle for the triumph of our principles.

Another reason why the downfall of the Conservative Administration occurred, is found in the ever-growing vigour which develops among the members of the Opposition, in proportion as the Government grows old. Bonaparte was wont to say that in rhetorics he knew of but one figure, that of affirmation and repetition. If, as stated by Bonaparte, there is but one figure in rhetorics, that of affirmation and repetition, the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) and his friends have used it to satiety. Over and over again, and often without meeting with any contradiction from the adverse party, they have asserted that under the Conservative Government, the country was on the high road to ruin. For years past, the First Minister has travelled from one end of the Dominion to the other, spreading broadcast his promises to the electorate, and repeating that the Administration was corrupt, that the protective tariff was framed in favour of monopolists. Those harangues of the leader of the Government, repeated to satiety by the phalanx of brave friends who supported him, took hold, in the long run, of public opinion. It was through those affirmations and repeated statements which, to my mind, are unfair and wrong, that the hon. First Minister succeeded in educating the country and leading public opinion to believe that it was high time for a change of Government, and that, should he come into power, he would work wonders, and that he would protect the interests of all classes in this country. It is in the task of performing those wonders which the hon. gentleman has pledged himself to work, that the loyal Opposition of Her Majesty intends to co-operate with him. I may here remark, Sir, that I do not believe the present Ministers to be lavish of promises, but I may add that their supporters and those forming part of the Government have been very lavish of promises. A careful study of the political records of free countries teaches us that governments composed of heterogeneous elements are not remarkable for their longevity. Possibly the personnel surrounding the Prime Minister may not be one calculated to secure to his Ministry a long lease of power. The Cabinet of my hon. friend is not a Liberal one. It is neither more nor less than a coalition Ministry. Why, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has taken into his Cabinet to help him in the administration of public business, the hon. member for St. John-Iberville (Mr. Tarte), the defeated candidate in Beauharnois. That defeat was a blow struck at the Government in the very province of Quebec. The hon. gentlemen opposite who support the Government have shouted themselves hoarse about the great triumph achieved in that province by the Liberal party, and have given credit for it to the Minister of Public Works. I remember, Sir,

that when the First Minister was, for the first time in his life, taken into the Mackenzie Cabinet, I went, with the hon. member for St. John-Iberville (Mr. Tarte) and with many other hon. gentlemen from our province, to the county of Drummond and Arthabaska in order to give a lift to the hon. Prime Minister, that is, to help ousting him from the position he had accepted as Minister of the Crown. The hon. member for St. John-Iberville, now Minister of Public Works, displayed, during that struggle, all his well-known energy. With the co-operation of all the friends of the Conservative party, he succeeded in expelling the Prime Minister from the county of Drummond and Arthabaska.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) He regrets it now.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I believe that the hon. First Minister had within the ranks of his party all the necessary elements to form an exclusively Liberal Cabinet. But, I ask, Sir, why is it that the Liberal chieftain who, one day, enacted this aphorism: "It is not given to everybody to be Liberal, but one should be born a Liberal," thereby hinting that, should he ever be called upon to form a Liberal Administration, he would take into his Cabinet none but those who were Liberal-born, who had been life-long Liberals—how is it, Sir, I say, that the hon. gentleman has taken into his Cabinet the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who joined but yesterday the Liberal ranks? Why did he overlook the past services of hon. gentlemen fully as well qualified as the Minister of Public Works and, in the judgment of the Premier's political friends, a great deal better qualified than the member for St. John-Iberville happens to be, for the position? How happens it that the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) was not invited to enter the Cabinet? He is an old political fighter who has done his party yeoman service. At the very time when the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) was fighting the battle of the Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John-Iberville (Mr. Tarte), not so very long since, was combating him with his wonted energy and violence. There are undoubtedly among the First Minister's friends, other hon. gentlemen who ought to have been chosen. Admittedly, the hon. First Minister has a phalanx of distinguished men, representing the various constituencies of our province. There is the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) a Liberal born, a life-long Liberal, and I ask, how does it happen that he has not been taken into the Cabinet? His sound Liberalism, surely, should not stand in the way of his political preferment: still, his merits have been overlooked, and he had to give way to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte).

Mr. PREFONTAINE. (Translation.) I was not born a Liberal.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I always knew you to be a Liberal; how long have you been a Liberal?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. (Translation). Ever since I reached the age of discretion.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) There are two other gentlemen opposite, whom I now see in their seats, my friend the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), and I ask, how comes it that those two hon. gentlemen, who are old political fighters, having taken an active part in all the electoral campaigns, in order to bring about the triumph of their party, have not been taken into the Cabinet? As the hon. gentlemen all know, and the Liberal party as well, the electors in the country look unfavourably on the Ministry, such as constituted, because the Liberal party is not really represented by the present Cabinet, at least so far as our province is concerned. It is neither more nor less, as I said, than a coalition Ministry. How comes it, I ask, that the hon. gentlemen whom I have just mentioned, have not been selected, that their merits were overlooked, and that others should have been selected in their place? How happens it that the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) was not invited to join the Cabinet, the preference being given to men of loose and ill-defined political opinions, over life-long Liberals, known throughout the province of Quebec as having fought the battles of the party, and secured the triumph of the First Minister? That such men should have been left in the cold, outside of the Cabinet, is beyond my comprehension and I have this to say to the hon. Premier, that his political friends in the province of Quebec are puzzled to find out by what fascination, by what secret power the hon. member for St. John-Iberville (Mr. Tarte) was enabled to guide him in the composition of the Cabinet, and by what means he was enabled to lead the Premier into believing that himself, the hon. member for St. John-Iberville, was entitled to take the lead, instead of those who had secured the triumph of the Liberal party, through long years of stubborn fight. It is sought to create the impression that to the hon. member for St. John-Iberville (Mr. Tarte) is due the credit for the victory achieved by the Liberal party on the 23rd June. No, Sir, the victory gained by the Liberal party at the last election was not secured through the efforts of that gentleman. The party has won the day independently of the hon. gentleman. The party has triumphed owing to the fact that, for many years past, grievances had piled up against the Conservative party, and also through the policy of affirmation and repetition adopted by the Liberal speakers, and without the intervention of the hon. Minister of Public Works being at all necessary. The Liberal party in our province fail to understand how it came about that this man

who turned Liberal but yesterday, with his ill-defined and loose political opinions, was allowed to usurp in the Ministry the position which, to the mind of the Liberal party, and I may say of all the electorate, rightfully belonged to the old fighters who had won their epaulets but have been deprived of them. As for us, members of the Conservative party from the province of Quebec, we are quite unconcerned about that issue, although there is very little room for rejoicing at such a want of fair-play. To my mind, a Liberal policy, a Liberal platform cannot be properly administered, nor fairly and freely carried out by a coalition government, but only by a Liberal one. I believe that the Administration formed by the hon. Premier is one that has no hold on public opinion, one that will be torn up by domestic dissensions, and it oftens happens that such a government proves to be a scourge for the country whose affairs it administers, because it has no hold, no grasp on public opinion, and because also instead of being homogeneous it is composed of heterogeneous elements. Just observe what actually occurs in connection with the Manitoba school question. I do not say that the First Minister is ready to make concessions, nor that he has made any; but, if we were to judge from appearances, and from the ambiguous and double meaning of his utterances, and therefrom draw inferences as to what he is going to do, one could not help presuming that he is on the eve of entering upon a course of concessions which might prove fatal to the Manitoba minority, nothwithstanding that he has pledged his word that he would not make any. The supporters of the hon. gentleman have taken before their electors the solemn pledge of making no concessions; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), accustomed as he is to flounces of rhetoric, and with his wonted eloquence has once more resorted the other day to his flowery rhetoric to prepare public opinion. The hon. gentleman told us that he knew full well that whatever settlement of the school question he might make, he did not expect to satisfy extreme men. He should have explained his meaning and told us who are those extreme men. I will simply tell my hon. friend that I do not know of any extreme men in this House, with the exception of those who are endeavouring to rob the Catholic minority of their rights guaranteed to them by the constitution of this country. Those are the extreme men; and I know of no others. There are no other extreme men but those who, under the cover of night, are feloniously sharpening their knives to cut off the rights and privileges guaranteed and confirmed to the minority by the constitution. Are those the men pointed out by the hon. Premier, with that flowery rhetoric of his so artistically presented to the House? Be that as it may, I trust he did not mean, under the appellation of extreme men, to throw a hint at those who object to having the rights of the French and Catholic minority in Manitoba sacrificed through a compromise. Before bringing my remarks to a conclusion, allow me, Sir, to draw attention to a charge levelled by the hon. Premier at the hon. leader of the Opposition. The Prime Minister, referring to the severe but just rebuke administered to him by the leader of the Opposition with regard to the interview he had given to an American journalist, and in the course of which he undertook to surrender to our American neighbours the control of the great waterway of the St. Lawrence, on condition that they should pay half the cost of the deepening of our canals, the hon. Premier, I say, stated, in reply, that the leader of the Opposition had not the weakness to be so candid, when in 1891 he had deceived the electors of this country, and that the best diplomacy was to be honest in speech and action as well and not to deceive one's countrymen. I have looked over the papers relating to the negotiation of the reciprocity treaty of 1891 between Canada and the United States of America, to find out the truth of the charge levelled at the leader of the Opposition, and I confess that I found nothing whatever of a nature to justify the use of the unfair and unwarrantable epithet applied by the hon. leader of the Government to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition is well known throughout Canada for a long career wholly devoted to the welfare of the country, and for the unsparing and unstinted use he has made of his great talents for the furtherance of the same cause. And, of late, Sir, with a self-devotion which has elicited the admiration of all his friends, we have seen the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) after having resigned the remunerative functions of his high office in London, throwing himself, in spite of his age, into the thick of one of the most hard-fought electoral contests on record, with a vigour which has fired with enthusiasm all his friends and won the admiration of all those French Canadians who realize the meaning of true self-devotion, and which sent a thrill of terror through the heart of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentlemen, I think, would do better to modify somewhat their language, when they choose to attack the leader of the Opposition. Their language should bear the stamp of generosity, fair-play and truth. They should not, in my opinion, inconsiderately level charges at an old patriot, who, in the judgment of the country, has rendered eminent services to Canada, with the sole view to depreciating and running down the Conservative party which under his leadership, I have no doubt, and with the skill and self-devotion he will display in the future as in the past, will achieve a signal triumph before the electors of this country.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address a few observations to the House on the subject now before us. I must say that I do not feel quite at home on this side of the House, and I suppose that many gentlemen on the other side of the House have a similar feeling. Let me express the hope that we shall not remain long enough in our respective seats, to feel at home. The Conservative party to which I have the honour to belong has now been in power for about eighteen years. Their record is before us, and it is a record of which any political party might be proud. They can point to the opening of the North-west, to the deepening and enlargement of the canals, to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, an undertaking which challenged the admiration of the world. They have been during these eighteen years a party of courage. They have not accomplished these great works without vigorous opposition from the Liberal party, for I think I may safely say that in almost all these great enterprises they have been vigorously opposed, and suggestions have been made from the Liberal party which would have rendered these works useless. But, Sir, because they were the party of courage, they have gone on with the works in the face of this great opposition. Sir, the Conservative party was the party having faith in this country. I have sometimes wondered as I listened to the speeches made by members of the Liberal party when in Opposition in this House, and especially speeches made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have sometimes wondered what opinion he could expect outsiders to form of this country, as he proceeded to paint everything in the most gloomy manner, as he talked about the black flag floating over every farm in the land, and as he told us that mortgages were everywhere as a result of the policy of the Conservative party. The members of the Conservative party have not talked in that way about their country. I call them the party of faith in Canada. They had faith in the future of Canada and they have faith in it still. And, Sir, not only were the Conservatives the party of courage and the party of faith, but they were the party of convictions. They had a policy and they knew what that policy was. When they went before the people they did not go with something indefinite which nobody could ascertain what the meaning was, but they went before the people with a definite policy; a policy which they presented clearly and which could be understood by all. Sir, not only were they the party of courage, and the party of faith, and the party of convictions, but I think we may truly say that they were the Canadian party. They were the party who always stood for Canada first. They were the party who, when it was proposed to surrender some of the rights of this country to a foreign country, when it was proposed to barter away some of our privileges, they were the party who stood for Canada, and, Sir, they stand for Canada to-day. During the last five years this party has suffered great losses. The greatest loss of all was when Sir John Macdonald, who had for thirteen years ruled the destinies of this country, was called away. I think I may say without exaggeration that he was one of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, and I may also say that his loss to this party and to this country was irreparable. But, Sir, not only did that loss fall upon the Conservative party, but the man who was next called upon to lead the fortunes of the party, a man of great ability, Sir John Abbott, was also called away from this life. And, as if a series of misfortunes had come upon the party, our next Premier, a man who was recognized by all who associated with him as towering above his fellows in ability, the late Sir John Thompson, was also called away. And so, in a very few years this party suffered the loss of three premiers, a loss which I think no party ever before sustained in so short a time. But, Sir, although these men, who were the leaders of the party, were taken away from it, still the party did not despair. It continued to pursue its policy, and to develop the resources of this country. But, Sir, to-day we look around and we find this great party, which for 18 years ruled the destinies of this country, in Opposition. I propose to ask why this is so. Well, Sir, I believe one reason is that the party was so long in power. Eighteen years is a long time for a party to rule a country like this. It may be said that the Liberal party has been longer in power in the province of Ontario; but in that province the interests are not so diverse as they are in a country like the Dominion of Canada. In this country the east has a different idea of what it wants from the west. Then, this party was so long in power that the idea seemed to pervade the minds of many people, some Conservatives among them, that the time had come for a change—that a change would be a good thing for the country. I found that idea myself among many Conservatives. Why was this? Because the times were hard and business was dull. The hard times in this country were caused largely by the dullness of business in the United States which has existed during the last four or five years, and we in this country always feel the influence of hard times there. Our people felt that the times were hard, the prices of their products were low, and many of them talked as if the change of Government could not make matters worse, and might make them better. Not only were times dull, but the people were told over and over again that the dull times were the result of the protective tariff. That was impressed upon them over and over again until I believe some who doubted it at first

came to believe that there was something in it, and they thought they might like to try a change of some kind. Added to the statement that the hard times were due to the protective policy of the Conservative party, great promises were made as to what would be done if the Liberals came into power. Sir, we heard these promises repeatedly; they were made all over the country. The Liberals asid: "Put us in power, and you will find things improve. It is because you have the Conservative party in power, with their protective tariff in force, that you have business depression; but put us in power, and you will find an improvement in the state of affairs." A good many people said: "Well, we will try them; we will take them at their word; they say things will improve, and we will see whether they will or not;" and to-day we have the Liberal party in power in this country. But, Sir, notwithstanding all these causes, the Conservative party would be in power to-day but for another reason. I find that the province of Ontario disappointed the hopes of the Liberals, and I may say that it exceeded the expectations of many Conervatives. The great province of Ontario did not go back on the Conservative party, but showed that it still believed in the policy of that party. I find that the majority by which the Government is sustained to-day came from the province of Quebec. Now, I say that notwithstanding the causes which I have mentioned, the Conservative party would still be in power if it had not been for that unfortunate Remedial Bill about which we have heard so much. I hold that the Conservative party is in Opposition chiefly because of the dissentions in the party on that measure. I believe it is that to which the Liberal party owe their advent to power. Now, Sir, I think most of the members of this House know my position on that Bill; they know the attitude I took; they know that I was against the Government policy, as many others were. But while I was conscientious in my opposition to the Bill, I believed that those who supported the Bill were just as conscientious as I was. I believe so still; I have no reason to doubt it. But I am satisfied that the great reason why we are out of power to-day is the dissentions that existed among us on that Remedial Bill. But, Sir, there is another reason, which I consider an equally important reason, that is, the attitude of the Liberal party on this question. What was their attitude? Why, Sir, in Ontario the cry was, "Hands off Manitoba; no interference with Manitoba." Why, the only thing my opponent had against me, though I opposed the Bill very strongly, was that I had not opposed it strongly enough; and the Liberal party supported him and opposed me on that ground. But in Quebec what was their position? Last session in this House I heard a prominent member of the present Liberal Government say that the reason he objected to the Bill, and would vote for the six months' hoist, was that it was not strong enough. He said: "This is said to be a remedial Bill, but there is no remedy in it at all." And so I am given to understand that in a great many constituencies in Quebec the Liberals said: The Bill which the Conservative party brought forward as a remedial Bill is no remedial Bill at all; it will not amount to anything in the way of helping your poor, suffering compatriots in Manitoba; we want you to vote for a party that will give you a stronger Bill, a Bill that will have something in it." I only know that this is so from rumour: but I have no reason to doubt that such was the case, and I think it unfortunate that any great party in this country should take such a stand. I think it unfortunate that in the great province of Ontario they should be so much opposed to interference with Manitoba and make that their rallying cry, while in the province of Quebec they should say, "The Bill offered to you is not strong enough, and we will give you a stronger Bill if you will put us in power." Sir, we have heard a great deal of the race and religion cry. Personally, I am opposed to such a cry. I believe the French have as much right in this country as the English-speaking population. I think, as a speaker said yesterday, that they are not French, but Canadians, as we all are. Whether we speak English or French, I think we are proud to call ourselves Canadians. I take no stock in the race cry; I would disdain to use it. I may say the same about the religious cry, but there is no doubt there are men in this country who are influenced by the religious cry. I have heard it said about myself, that I used this cry. Well, in the province of Ontario I did complain in the legislature there that in the public schools in eastern Ontario, where the majority are French, English was not taught; but in discussing that question I carefully abstained from saying anything about any one's religion. I said, as I say to-day, that a man's religion is a matter between himself and his God, of which no one else has any right to complain or with which no one has any right to interfere. But there is no doubt this cry is used at the elections, and I believe it was used in the province of Quebec. Now, I have indicated briefly what I consider some of the reasons why the Conservative party is in opposition to-day, and as I do not intend to speak long, I shall not say more on that subject.

I intend to say a word or two regarding the criticisms made on the First Minister's interview with a Chicago newspaper concerning our relations with the United States. I may say that I have always advocated the most friendly relations with the United States. I have frequently taken occasion in this House to express the opinion that our relations should be most friendly, that the United States was a country which we should seek to have as our friends, that,

situated as we were, so close to one another, being mixed up with each other in business and social matters, there was every reason why we should be most friendly. I have always taken that attitude and spoken in that sense, and I believe that my Conservative friends around me have always done the same. I was therefore very sorry to find that the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) implied in that interview that the Conservative party had been unfriendly to the United States. Sir, I repel that insinuation, I deny it most emphatically. The Conservative party is not, and has never been, unfriendly to the United States. It is a party which is just as friendly to the United States as the Liberal party. But while we are friendly to the United States, we want, at the same time, to be loyal to Canada. We want to be Canadian and British; we do not wish to show our friendliness by giving away something which the United States have no right to expect. We have no call to seek to be friendly by truckling to them, and I believe that if we should do what the hon. First Minister suggests, we would lose their respect. I believe that they will respect us all the more if we insist on our rights. We have rights as a country which we are bound, as Canadians, to maintain, and no self-respecting country like the United States could possibly lose its friendly feeling for us because we insisted on our rights. While it is true that the United States are close to us, while it is true that it is most desirable to have them as our friends, and while we should do everything in reason to secure their friendship, at the same time we must not forget who are our real friends. Our real friends lie across the ocean, and not close at hand. We must never forget that we are part of the British Empire. In this country, some people, because the United States are so close to us, because they have friends and relatives in that country, are apt to forget that we belong to the British Empire; and sometimes, in disputes between the two nations, they are apt to take the part of the United States and give their sympathies to that country. In so doing, they are going too far, because, while we desire to have the United States our friends, we must not forget that our real friends are the British people across the ocean.

Now, I intend to consider, briefly, the clause in the Address about the tariff. That clause reads as follows:—

> The operation of the tariff will be made the subject of careful inquiry during the recess, with a view to the preparation of such a measure as may, without doing injustice to any interest, materially lighten the burdens of the people.

I think the latter part of the sentence "Such a measure as may, without doing injustice to any interest, materially lighten the burdens of the people" is a very good specimen of fine phrasing. If the Government could do that, they would be a Government that was governing in the interests of the country. But it all depends on the meaning you attach to the word "injustice." As I read that sentence, as I see how indefinite it is, as I see that you can take any meaning out of it you wish, I cannot help recalling resolutions which have been placed on the Order paper in this House, year after year, by members of the Liberal party, asking that corn, coal oil, binder twine, agricultural implements, and so forth, be placed on the free list. Why, Mr. Speaker, one of the charges made against me during the campaign was that I had voted against the duty being taken off binder twine. That seemed to be a cardinal plank in the platform of the Liberals who opposed me. They thought that I should not be returned because I refused to vote for the total abolition of the duties. I said that I supported the Government in reducing the duty from 25 to 12½ per cent, but declared that I was opposed to completely taking the duty off. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have, over and over again, asked that this should be done. Will these same gentlemen advocate it now? Why are these resolutions not placed on the Order paper to-day? Have they changed their minds on this question? Do they think that these articles should have a duty imposed upon them? Do they think that they should be protected? Were they sincere at that time, or are they sincere now? I leave them to answer that question in this House. Now, I admit that we could not expect a new tariff to be brought down now. We all admit that. It would be impossible for any government coming into power as recently as the present Government has, to frame a new tariff to be considered this session, but I claim that it is quite fair to ask what is their fiscal policy. They have had many policies when in Opposition—policies almost without number. We could not fix them down to any one policy because their policies were constantly changing. Now, I would like to ask which of the many policies that they have brought before the country have they settled on, or have they not settled on any one policy at all? Some people who supported the Liberal party are expecting free trade. That may seem absurd, and no doubt it is, but it is a fact that there are people scattered throughout the country who are expecting free trade because they were told by some of the Liberal speakers that they were going to get it. I do not think that requires any answer from the Government to-day, because such a proposition carries its absurdity on its face. But there is one proposition that has been laid down, over and over again, by the Liberal party, and that is this. They believe in the complete elimination of protection from the tariff. The changes have been rung on protection over and over again. The hard times, the exodus, the mortgages, the low

prices of farm property, the low prices of farm produce—all, they declared, were caused by protection. Protection they have called a curse and legalized robbery, and I do not know how many other bad names. Now, I want to know this : Have this Government agreed to adopt this view of protection ? Do they still think that it is a curse and the cause of all the trouble in this country, the cause of hard times, the mortgages, the exodus ? Do they think that still, and do they intend to eliminate protection entirely from the tariff ? I have some reason to think that they have changed their minds a little on that question. Why, during the elections, they were a great deal more moderate. We did not hear so much about protection being the cause of all these troubles. What did we hear ? We heard the manufacturers told not to be afraid, that the Liberal party were not going to do them any injustice, that they could safely support the Liberal party, and need not be afraid at all that their industries would be injured. But most significant of all, where was the hon. member for South Oxford then ? Where was he during the election ? We did not hear him. We had been used to hear of him going all over the country enunciating his views, denouncing protection, but where was he ? I leave the Liberal party to answer that question. I do not know where he was. No doubt they knew where he was. He was able to be out and around but he was kept at home, I suppose, somewhere out of sight, so that he could not enunciate these views to the people. But more significant than the question, Where was he then ? is the question, Where is he now ? Where is the hon. member for South Oxford now ? He expected to be Minister of Finance. That was the expectation he entertained for years. He was financial critic for his party from first to last. And now where is the hon. member for South Oxford ? He is Minister of Trade and Commerce, a portfolio which, it is said, is soon to be abolished, and then, I suppose, he will not be in the Cabinet at all. To me who believe in moderate protection these things seem a good sign. The fact that the hon. member for South Oxford was not allowed to go through the country airing his views on protection, and the fact that he is not our Minister of Finance are good things from my point of view. But why not tell the country plainly what the policy of the party is ? Before the election, business men were waiting to see what the result would be, and business moved along slowly, because they were uncertain how the elections would go this time. Now they ask, are they to be kept waiting six months longer and after the Liberal party who have been denouncing a protection are returned to power. I ask the Government to let the country know the principle upon which they are going to revise the tariff. We on this side do not ask for details ; that would be unreasonable ; but we ask the Government to declare whether they intend to retain moderate protection or to adopt a purely revenue tariff. I think this is a fair question and I believe the country will so regard it. We have a right to know whether gentlemen opposite entertain the views they entertained when in opposition or whether they have changed their minds. Business is dull now, we know, and the winter is approaching. On behalf of the workingmen, I ask for some definite statement. I was amused at the remarks of the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) who said that he was a manufacturer and knew that the manufacturers of this country were not impatient to know the policy of the Government. I myself know that that is not a fact. Manufacturers have spoken to me on this subject, and manufacturers, generally, I believe, regard this as a very serious question. Whether there is to be moderate protection or no protection at all will make all the difference to the manufacturers and to the workingmen of the country. Sir, I should be glad to hear that they will maintain protection. In such a policy they should have my support, for I believe in protection. They talk about lowering the tariff. Duties are lower now than they were on account of prices. A few years ago prices were one-third higher than they are to-day, and thus ad valorem duties are lower than they were. The consequence is that we have less protection as well as less revenue than we had. In some cases the duties should be raised rather than lowered.

Mr. GIBSON. On leather, for instance.

Mr. CRAIG. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) has referred to that matter, I wish to tell him what perhaps he does not know, and what, I think, the parties who opposed me did not know. We have the same duty on leather to-day as we had under the Mackenzie administration.

Mr. GIBSON. Your friends did not attend to your wants.

Mr. CRAIG. Yes ; they attended to them. The duty was 20 per cent and they made it 17½ per cent. They made a mistake. To-day leather is coming into this country, laid down here at prices lower than it can be made here for, and thus the duty is so low that it does not afford any adequate protection at all. Therefore it is that I say we have not only less protection but also less revenue than we had. Now I wish to say something in which perhaps the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) will agree with me. For my own part I should like to see the fiscal policy of the country taken out of politics altogether. I see no reason why, with a change of Government, we should change the tariff. That is a bad fashion. It is not the fashion in England, for there the fiscal policy remains the same no matter which party may be in power. I trust that the Liberal party which is now in

power here, after they looked over the situation will decide that it is not necessary to reduce the tariff, but that in some cases they will increase it. But again I urge this point, and urge it as strongly as I can, because it is for that very reason that I rose to speak—that the Government should frankly tell us whether they intend to retain moderate protection or whether they intend to remove all protection and enact a purely revenue tariff. I have been asked why I am a Conservative. I am a Conservative because I believe in protection to our farmers, our workingmen and our manufacturers. I object to Canada being made the dumping ground of the surplus of the United States. I believe that the home market is the best market. We talk about getting markets outside, and I believe in that. But the market the farmers want to-day is the market at their door, the home market. I have said before and I repeat now that a farm near a prosperous town where a great many workmen are employed is far more valuable than a farm equally fertile a great many miles away. We all know that to be the case, and I hold that to be an argument in favour of protection and the home market. I want to develop the home market, and I believe that can be done only by protecting in a moderate way our manufacturers. I want our workingmen to use beef and flour raised by Canadian farmers and the farmers to use boots and shoes, clothing and other articles made by Canadian workingmen. That is the only policy that will build up our country on a solid foundation; and it is because I believe this that I belong to the Conservative party. And in closing I would say that because the majority of the people believe in that policy —for this Government's majority is from Quebec and was obtained on the question of the Remedial Bill and not on the question of the tariff—I am confident that the Conservative party will soon again be called upon to control the destinies of this country.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not rise to reply to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) who has just taken his seat, nor yet to the speech made by the hon. gentleman from Bagot (Mr. Dupont). If it were in order for me to speak in my mother tongue as the hon. member for Bagot has given his eloquent speech in his mother tongue, I would tell him, in the words of the immortal poet Ossian—

> Lean an irinn's ni i du 'lighe direach,
> Chau 'ne a bhan ann sa bheatha so
> Ach anns ti tha re tighinn.

I say this is as applicable to-day and in this House as it was in those pre-historic days when the Gaelic language was the universal language. I do not rise as I said before, to reply to either of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but I have risen to reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Prince West (Mr. Hackett) last night, at least to those parts of that hon. gentleman's speech which referred to the province of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman displayed an Egyptian darkness of mind in relation to the matter in hand which surprises me the more because the hon. gentleman has the honour as he no doubt deems it, and as I should certainly consider it, to come from the province of Prince Edward Island, a province which produces very able men, men who when they undertake to seek the suffrages of the electorate prepare themselves and make some show of acquaintance with the matters upon which they address this House. The hon. gentleman, in his remarks stated, if I recollect aright, that the province of British Columbia was murmuring, as evidenced by the address of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), because, forsooth, they had not received sufficient appropriations under the late Administration; that the province was murmuring because the appropriations were not commensurate with the revenue derived from that province. He also took issue with the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver who had mentioned the fact that the revenue derived from British Columbia far exceeded the appropriations given to that province. The hon. member for Prince West (Mr. Hackett) took issue with the hon. member for Vancouver in that statement, and the ground upon which he based his contradiction was that there were no means of ascertaining what the appropriations to, and the revenues from, the various provinces are. Now, I think that the hon. gentleman in making that statement is not at all familiar with his subject. I would remind him of the facts which are given in the Statistical Year-Book, which was compiled under and during the late Administration, and I presume he will not contradict or minimize anything appearing in a compilation made under the late Administration. He will find that in the Statistical Year-Book for 1894, or 1895, in the one item of fisheries alone, the revenue from the province of British Columbia is put down as something like $30,000; and he will find in the same Year-Book that the amount of the appropriations in respect to the fisheries in that province, was only something like $5,000. That might not be a matter of comment if we did not find in the same Statistical Year-Book a reference to the revenue derived from the province of Nova Scotia from her fisheries, which was something like three or four thousand dollars, and the amount of appropriations in respect to the fisheries of that province during the same time was in the vicinity of $200,000. Now, I do not complain of the province of Nova Scotia getting that incommensurate amount of appropriations as compared with the revenue derived from her fisheries; but I say there is an appearance of discrimina-

tion against British Columbia, remembering as I do, and as the hon. gentleman ought to know, that the fisheries of British Columbia are stated in that same Year-Book to be the richest, not only in Canada, but in the whole world. I think these facts would afford a sufficient pretext for murmuring if the people of British Columbia thought they were not getting their due, or not getting appropriations commensurate with the revenue derived by the Government from that province. Now, I might go on through the various industries of that great province. I venture to say that the same remark would apply to the lumber industry and to the mining industry.

The hon. gentleman stated that the province of British Columbia owes its development to the fostering care of the late Administration; he particularized the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and asked that a great deal of credit be given to the late Administration for the promotion and completion of that great road. He stated that inasmuch as that road had been built during the late Administration, the province of British Columbia had no reason to find any fault with neglect in matters of detail. He has forgotten, if he ever knew, that British Columbia does not owe the Canadian Pacific Railway to any party. He ought to have known, but he apparently does not, that British Columbia made it a condition precedent to her coming into confederation that that transcontinental road should be built. No doubt there are hon. gentlemen here who will remember that even as far back as thirty-five years ago this question of a transcontinental road was mooted in eastern Canada, particularly in Ontario, and it was then conceded that Canada could not become a united nation until her territory stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific. With that end in view, British Columbia, as I stated, made this condition precedent to her coming in; she was promised this transcontinental road, and this compact or promise that was made to her was binding on both parties, and upon all Administrations. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman went a little out of his way to display a lack of knowledge of the subject in hand in saying that gratitude was due from British Columbia to the late Administration for the construction of that great work. He ought also to remember the circumstances under which that line of railway was undertaken and completed. He ought to remember that it was commenced under the Mackenzie Administration, and that before that Administration had time to complete the work, it went out of office. He ought to remember that if the road had been completed as at first intended and commenced by the Mackenzie Administration, it would have cost less than it has cost the country, and the country would now own the road. But as the case now stands, the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost the people of this country something like $89,000,000, or about $10,000,000 less than the subsidy granted by the people to this company, and the country does not own the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate got control of it and built it. Under these circumstances, even assuming this road is a credit to this country, I say that it has cost the country very much more than it ought to have cost, and very much more than it would have cost had the Mackenzie Administration completed it; and not only would it have cost less, but the country would now own that magnificent line of railway. Now, I do not wish to minimize the advantages to British Columbia or to the Dominion at large arising from that transcontinental road; but while the charter remains as it is at present, and while that company has the privileges it now enjoys, there will always be differences of opinion as to circumstances militating against the people of this country in regard to freight rates. The hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten, if he ever knew, that the Canadian Pacific Railway is practically independent of the Government and of the people in regard to freight rates, inasmuch as the Government are not permitted to regulate those rates until the dividends on the amount invested come up to 10 per cent; so that the Canadian Pacific Railway is virtually independent of the Government, as, I submit, it should not be. However, I simply refer to this remark of the hon. gentleman to show how fallacious his statements in regard to British Columbia are in their entirety. I will say nothing further on this occasion, as I trust to have an opportunity during this session to make some further reference to the manner in which the province of British Columbia has been treated by the late Administration; and I did not wish to let this opportunity pass without controverting some of the statements made by the hon. member for Prince West (Mr. Hackett). I waited until now, expecting that other members from British Columbia senior to myself, and who have interests in that province at least as large, and perhaps larger than the interests I have there, and who ought, therefore, to have the interests of that province at heart, as I have; I expected to hear from those two gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the House, some reply to the statements of the hon. member for Prince West; and the fact that they did not undertake to challenge his statements, is my apology for taking up the time of the House at this late stage of the debate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. gentlemen on the Government benches have so soon lost all interest in this debate, and have apparently so early in the session applied the cloture, at all events to their own side of the House. I venture to say that this discussion has not been without con-

siderable interest to the country, and that, from many points of view, it is most timely, and has involved very serious questions, indeed. Nothing has stood out, in my mind, so prominently as the absolute want of preparation of the great Reform party for the position they were unexpectedly called upon to fill in this year 1896. Whatever hon. gentlemen may think about the propriety of the issue of Governor General's warrants —and that is a subject I shall later on discuss briefly—it is clear that there was an event "unforeseen" by the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, and that was the success of the Reform party at the polls at the last election. The fact is that though the election took place on 23rd June, and the Conservative Government resigned somewhere about 10th July, we have now reached 27th August, and yet that wonderful Reform party, that wonderful aggregation of all the political talent of Canada, is unable, at the present moment, to form a Government for this country. The helplessness of that party was exhibited in a marked degree when they had to tear in pieces all the British precedents and constitutional practice in regard to meeting Parliament and the time when Parliament was to be met after a dissolution of Parliament and general elections had taken place. I venture to state, and I have looked somewhat into the question, there is neither in Canadian parliamentary history nor in the history of the mother country in modern times any justification for the extraordinary course pursued of proroguing Parliament until the day in August, when it was called to meet for the despatch of business, after Parliament had been regularly and duly summoned for the despatch of business in July last. Contempt for Parliament in regard to Governor General's warrants is one thing, but it is another evidence of absolute contempt for Parliament when those wise precedents in regard to procedure and practice which have been so carefully and regularly followed in the mother country, are ignored. Let me give two or three examples, and show not only what the practice is in Great Britain on that point, but incidentally point out to this House and to the country, if I possibly can do so, the difference between a great party that is ready to take office, that has reasons for taking office, and a party taken suddenly unawares, without any preparation for office and without having any programme to carry out when it accedes to power. In 1868 there was a dissolution of Parliament in England in November. It was called to meet for despatch of business on December 10. In consequence of defeat at the polls, the Government resigned on 2nd December. Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the triumphant party, promptly formed a government, which was completed on the 9th December, and sworn in, and Parliament met on 10th December. Again, on the resignation of the Gladstone ministry, Parliament was dissolved, and it was called for despatch of business on March 5th. A government was formed by Mr. Disraeli, owing to his success at the polls, on 24th February, and he met Parliament in due course, and, according to the regular practice, on the day when it was summoned for the despatch of business, and that was at the earliest possible day after the general elections. The last case to which I will call attention occurred in 1880. The Disraeli government were defeated at the general elections. Mr. Gladstone accepted office on April 28th. Parliament having been called to meet on April 29, Mr. Gladstone met Parliament on that day, with his Cabinet. In regard to this matter, it is interesting to refer to "Hansard," and I will do so briefly to show how difficulties and inconveniences in connection were dealt with, because hon. gentlemen know that the extraordinary and unprecedented course followed in Canada was adopted solely for the convenience of the Ministers, because it was more convenient to discuss with their friends from various quarters their arrangements, and the difficulties incident to the formation of the Cabinet, and also to get over as many by-elections or elections for office as possible. That is clearly the only possible reason which exists in the case we have in hand. But reference to any of the authorities, and I have before me the record of the proceedings in 1880, shows that the procedure was for the Government of the day to meet Parliament with such of the party as it had at its back, to elect a Speaker, and then to suffer the inconvenience while Parliament is adjourned for such number of days as Parliament decides in its pleasure, of holding the elections for Ministers, and, as soon as possible afterwards, meet the House and proceed with the consideration and discussion of the Address from the Throne. Further, Mr. Speaker, to contrast a great party with a weak party, a party with principles with a party that has no principles worth carrying out, or principles which members of the party are not at all times ready to acknowledge, on those different occasions, it will be found that although the Parliament was a new Parliament, the Government never met it with a Speech from the Throne that did not represent far more than a request or demand for supplies. Every one of the Speeches on those different occasions to which I have referred mentions important legislation or pressing measures that require consideration at the hand of the people's representatives. The only case in Canada when, after Parliament was summoned for the despatch of business, it was almost immediately prorogued to meet on another day for the despatch of business was in 1881, was not after a general election, when the Government of the day, for state reasons in connection with negotiations at Washing-

ton touching the treaty of 1888, undertook to advise His Excellency to prorogue the meeting of Parliament for about twenty-three days. But that does not interfere or clash in any respect with the long line of parliamentary precedents in the mother country, which, in all these matters, have been guardedly and carefully followed here. The difficulties that prevented hon. gentlemen opposite from following in the straight and regular course were political difficulties, as every day becomes more apparent. The helplessness of the Reform party was shown once before. In 1873, for instance, Mr. Speaker, you will remember, and every hon. member is probably familiar with the fact, that when a party long out of power, when a party claiming that it possessed leaders of great ability and a policy worth trying, was given an opportunity, it was unable to form a Cabinet out of its own material, and so they whipped out of the ranks of the Conservative party, men who, while professing Conservative principles, showed very clearly that they had no principles whatever, when it came to a question between principle and office. They took, for instance, two inveterate Tories, two gentlemen who are in the present Cabinet, but two men who had given very fair and very faithful support to Sir John Macdonald and to the principles which he had advocated. I refer to Mr. Scott, the present Secretary of State, and to the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Those two men were whipped out of the ranks of the Conservative party and, attracted by the sweets of office, they agreed to assist the great Reform party in forming a coalition Government. Mr. Coffin, Mr. Ross, Mr. Burpee, Sir Albert Smith; all of these gentlemen were given office; the Reform party at that time not having within its ranks the material to make a strong Cabinet. And again, true to this practice of theirs of violating precedents and of showing, on serious occasions, their weakness, we find, in 1896, a most extraordinary procedure adopted in connection with Cabinet-making. Take, for instance, the shock that went through this country—I hesitate not to say that Canada and Canadian public opinion received a shock in connection with the advent to office of the representative of Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). He was a life-long Conservative, a dyed-in-the-wool Conservative, a friend and ally of the Conservative Government for years in Quebec, a gentleman who went to the electors as an independent Conservative candidate for their suffrages, a man never professing Liberal principles, a man who, up to the time he was appointed to office would have utterly scouted the idea that he had sympathy of any kind with the leaders of the Reform party, a gentleman, who, if he is not done injustice to by the rumour, is reported to have refused indignantly a request to drive in the same carriage with the present leader of the Government, after the last general election. After all this, after this parade of political independence, a Cabinet office proved too much for him, and he sits there a member of what is no doubt a coalition Government, because we have had no public recantation of his views, although we have had him showing that he cannot withstand the temptation of the gaudy trappings of office. The offer of a cabinet position proved too much for his principles. Without desiring to say anything offensive, Sir, it is absolutely necessary for me to ask: What is the difference between the conduct of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell), who is a member of the present Government, and the case of the poor wretch who, in the excitement of an election contest, sells his principles for $5? The one act would be stigmatized as corrupt. For such an act, a man could be punished, and I believe that for the action of the gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) when the electors of his constituency have an opportunity they will take means of exhibiting their indignation at the manner in which they were trifled with.

Now, then, there is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). This Government had occasion to resort to the principle of coalition. No member of this House has ever heard the present Minister of Public Works boast of any change of heart or of principle. The hon. gentleman, it is true, claimed our attention on many occasions as an upholder of purity in public life. His name—many of his friends consider—is synonymous with the best kind of political purity that can be devised. In connection with corruption, too, we have heard of his name being mentioned, but I have yet to learn of any public utterance of that hon. gentleman in which he recanted the principles of the Conservative party, in which he repudiated the National Policy and the various lines of the platform of the Conservative party, for which he so ably and energetically fought until a very recent period; and so, these two Conservatives are sitting in office. These two Conservatives are used to bolster up this Reform Cabinet and to enable it to make these extraordinary boasts of which we have heard so much in the last few days. I believe, Sir, also, that the Parliamentary Companion shows that the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was proud to place his name there as a Conservative in 1879. Nevertheless, he has been induced to leave a province in which he gave considerable trouble, I am free to confess, to both Conservatives and Liberals on various different and exciting occasions. I could mention the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and the Minister from Verchères and Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion). On the question of remedial legislation these two gentlemen are as far apart as the poles, and yet, for the purpose of assisting in the formation of a partly organized government, they agree to sit to-

gether to-day. Now, let me see whether the offence of these gentlemen, judged by their own leaders of the past, can be considered as a subject worthy of the attention of Parliament, or a matter of serious consideration in the country. I find that the leader of the Reform party in 1871 laid down with great clearness his idea of this system of attempting to form a government in a free country. Mr. Mackenzie then said :

There are only two ways of carrying on a government ; one is by having a government composed of men who are entirely in harmony on all leading subjects, or by a coalition of different parties who are determined to carry on the administration of affairs in any way they can manage, the only possible way being to bribe a certain number of constituencies.... To procure good government, it is necessary that a Premier should strictly select his colleagues from the party whose principles he intends to carry out. To bring into the Cabinet the member of an opposing party is coalition.

And he denounced, and his party denounced coalition, until it is true the time came for these gentlemen to put their principles into practice, and then they acted as they have acted since ; going back wholly and completely upon their principles, one and all. Now, then, I venture to remind the House that the Reformers in Opposition and the Reformers in power are no more peculiarly before the public now than they were in 1874. There is one of the leaders of the Reform party who, in his day, was active, and who, by his activity, was of great benefit to the Reform party. He is now forgotten and unhonoured by Cabinet rank. I refer to Mr. Jones who was Minister of Militia in the last Reform Government, and who, for many years, has been one of the most active opponents of the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia. I find this hon. gentleman taking to task the Government from his seat in the House, as I am endeavouring to do, in connection with the political crime of professing one thing in Opposition, and of practising the other thing when power is obtained. Mr. Jones, in 1876, brought the Government to book for the change of front in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway policy, and the hon. gentleman who last spoke from British Columbia (Mr. Morrison) makes this reference the more important, because it will give him a certain insight into the history of the country in a particular, to which I am sure he has given as yet very little attention. Mr. Jones reminded this House that when in Opposition, the Reformers had opposed the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the incurring of obligations such as were necessary to carry it out in the manner they proposed when they attained power. In 1876 he said to them in this House :

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roscoe) who had just sat down had stated that since the Government came into power a series of blunders had been committed by them with regard to British Columbia. He quite agreed with him. When the Government occupied seats on the other side of the House they took the position that the terms of union were incapable of fulfilment. The amendments which the party then moved, the objections which they urged and the mistakes which they pointed out had all received moral vindication and fulfilment. The present Government had made a mistake in not repudiating, when they came into power, the whole arrangement ; but brought in another Bill in order to carry out in a more gradual way such a policy.

I refer to that because it is the testimony of one of the allies of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I propose to show that they have not improved by time, that they are as ready to violate the principles which they professed in Opposition when they attained power as ever they were. Their conduct before made the phrase, "an organized hypocrisy" synonymous with Grit rule in Canada. An organized hypocrisy confronts us to-day—an organized hypocrisy not very palatable to some of the gentlemen who are forced to support it ; an organized hypocrisy made up of those gentlemen to whom I have referred, differing from each other on the principles I have alluded to, and none of them daring to debate in this House the grounds on which they won on the fiscal question in the last election ; none of them daring to declare the principle on which they propose to deal with the tariff ; none of them venturing to put before the House and the country their own idea of the principle upon which they were elected, and the principle upon which they will stand and fall in connection with that subject, but trying to turn the attention of the people to such matters as the leader of the Government alluded to the other evening—that of race and revenge. And, forsooth, they charge the Conservative leaders and the Conservative party with endeavouring to create ill-will between the French race and the English race in Canada by the cry of French domination. I have a word to say about that, Mr. Speaker, and it is this. I have never had any other opinion than one in regard to the happy fortune of Canada in having the representatives of two of the great races of the world living side by side. I rejoice at every growing sign of union between those races, union in every conceivable way, and I have evidences of the growth of that union. I believe myself that it is a happy thing for this country that those two proud races are dwelling side by side under the same laws, respecting the same institutions, and loyally serving the same Queen. But it was not always so. There have been attempts by demagogues, by men who disagreed with the views I have just uttered—attempts to set the English people and the French people at each other's throats. The cry of French domination is an old cry. It came from Liberal ranks against the late Sir John A. Macdonald. Time and again he was charged on every hustings and in every school-house in On-

tario with having played into the hands of Roman Catholic and French Quebec. The air rung with the old charge of French domination, and every means was taken to stir up the prejudices of the people of Ontario against Sir John A. Macdonald's strong and sturdy allies who came from the province of Quebec. I have under my hand the proof; and, in view of the bold statements that have been made in this House, from which it might be inferred that upon our shoulders rested the responsibility of raising such a cry, I propose briefly to give the authorities for my counter statement that that despicable cry came entirely from the Reform party. For instance, take the "Globe" of 1882, the representative organ of that party. In an article headed "Government by the Bleus," here is one sentence:

If Ontario were properly represented in the Dominion Cabinet, its invasion of the rights of this province would be more wonderful.

Again, on February 4th, 1882, in an article on "Provincial rights," speaking of Sir John A. Macdonald, it said:

Is he playing the double but dangerous game of pandering to the prejudices and the dread of progress of our French fellow-citizens at the same time that he is using them to check Manitoba and punish Ontario? If this were all, the case would certainly be bad enough. It would certainly be most discouraging to the progressive provinces to find themselves hampered at every step by their connection with their compatriots on the lower St. Lawrence.

Language of that kind does not tend to create the best entente between the two races. Another article on February 13th, 1882, says:

When the Act of Confederation was passed, the people of Ontario fondly hoped that the days of Lower Canadian domination were at an end.

Again:

They had so long been fettered by French non-progressiveness.

Again:

The solid French vote is Sir John A. Macdonald's reliance on every emergency, and the leaders who in reality control that vote are much too astute to sell it for nothing. They insist upon their own terms, and they practically get them. Those terms are dictated scarcely less by jealousy of Ontario's power and progress than by the inveterate Conservatism which is the bane of the French race in Canada.

Again, on February 14th, 1882, in an article entitled "Anti-federalism at Ottawa," here is a sentence or two of the Hon. George Brown:

We in Upper Canada have complained that the minority of our representatives, the party defeated at the polls in Upper Canada, have been year after year kept in office by Lower Canadian votes, and that all the local patronage has been dispensed by those who did not possess the confidence of the people. We have complained that the land system was not according to the views of our western people. We have complained that local works of various kinds—roads, bridges and landing piers, court houses, jails and other structures—have been erected in an inequitable and improvident manner. The people of Upper Canada will hereafter have the entire control of their local affairs, and will no longer have to betake themselves to Quebec for leave to open a road, to select a county town or to appoint a coroner.

And the article goes on to show how the evils of old days were coming to pass again by the subservience of Sir John A. Macdonald to the province of Quebec. From another article headed, if you please, "French domination and official patronage," on April 27th, 1882, I will give an evidence of where this dangerous suggestion emanated from:

As to Mr. Tassé's complaint of Ontario's jealousy of French domination, it is unfortunately too true that we are under the necessity of maintaining that eternal vigilance which is declared to be the price of liberty, in order to prevent our dearest interests from being sacrificed by our rulers in obedience to the behests of the Quebec phalanx.

And, again, here is a sample of the feeling which still existed in the breasts of the Reformers of Ontario as late as the 23rd of January, 1891, on which date the "Globe" said:

In Quebec, cradled in the excessive paternalism of Colbert, the people have been trained to regard the state as the one and universal provider.

And does he forget the insult offered to the gentlemen from Quebec and their present revered leader by the Toronto "Globe" at the time of the adoption of the French treaty. The "Globe" accused him then and those who went with him into the lobby to vote for that treaty of pandering to sentimentalism and voting for it because it was French.

But this session we have indeed witnessed the irony of fate. There are several gentlemen on the other side who have been bitterly punished. Some know why they have been punished; but some who are not on the Treasury benches at present, and are dissatisfied, but who were ready to go there if they had been favoured as others have been, do not perhaps know why they have been punished. How hard it must have been, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to have sat quietly through the inaugural proceedings in this House, while the First Minister of Canada, the leader of the Reform party in 1896, was nominating you, Sir, into the Chair. How that scene must have recalled to the hon. gentleman—I sometimes forget his Canadian constituency—from Norfolk the words which he wrote a few years ago when, thinking of how he had been brought up at the feet of George Brown and imbibed the teachings of the Toronto "Globe" and contemplating French domination, he thus unbosomed himself in a letter to a friend:

With a French Canadian leader and under the manipulation of such unscrupulous machine politicians as J. D. Edgar, et al., I have not the utmost confidence in the Reform party.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Rather a chestnut, that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A chestnut, yes, but a good one. I say, in all earnestness, that I never had the slightest particle of objection to a leader being chosen for the Opposition side from the French Canadian race any more than I would have on any occasion shown opposition to the votes of the Conservative party being given to a French Canadian leader, but it is rather singular, to say the least, to find these hon. gentlemen opposite throwing the taunts they have done across the floor of the House this session on this subject when we have before us the living evidence of where is to be found the deepest antipathy to French domination.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He never bolted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He would like to. I can understand why the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was punished. He cannot have Cabinet rank, that is clear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He could be made a Solicitor General.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why was the late member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) deserted ? He had spent a long life in the service of the Reform party. I fancy he was the senior in Cabinet rank, in the late Government of Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, to the present leader of the Reform Government. Why was he thrown over ? He was a man who had in Parliament, on various constitutional questions, rendered us great assistance. He was a loyal Reformer, true to his party. Even on this Remedial Bill he showed his loyalty, because he spoke one way and voted the other. He voted with his party against his convictions. He did everything a man could do, desperate or otherwise, to support his party, and as yet we do not know what is going to happen. I am told that the newspaper with which he is connected gives evidence of dissatisfaction.

Again, there is the Hon. Alfred Jones, formerly member for Halifax. He expected better treatment at the hands of his party.

Mr. FIELDING. There are a lot of unhappy people in the House to-day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and I am dealing with some gentlemen who are out of the House owing to the fact that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and others are in it. The hon. gentleman knows that the claims of Mr. Jones on his party were such that there could be no comparison with them on the part of any other Reformer in Nova Scotia. He was the head and front of the Grit party in that province. He gave a great deal of ability, industry and application to the work in the Reform interests, but he has been deserted in these happy days and laid to one side.

Then there is the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), who was a vigorous supporter of the Liberal party in this House. His energies were called into play on many occasions, and he did his work well. He was a leading member of the House of Commons. How is it that such men as the hon. member for Lambton have come to be omitted from this galaxy of talents, this aggregation of all that is wise and wonderful, not only in the Reform party but in the Dominion ? Why should he be omitted from the "gathering of statesmen" which the hon. member for South Oxford says his leader brought about. I have suspicion that one of the reasons why such active men as these I have mentioned were left out is that they were too active. They have put themselves on record, and I found on casually looking over a speech of Mr. Gladstone that he supplies perhaps the reason why these old war-horses have been stalled, said Mr. Gladstone, in 1880 :

I will therefore content myself with echoing words used by the leader of the Opposition. I entirely agree with him that a party acceding to power from Opposition is not thereby entitled to disown principles on which it has spoken and acted when it occupied those benches.

The fact is these gentlemen would have suggested considerable difficulties to the astute Prime Minister in those twistings and turnings in which it has been his custom to indulge. This session and during the remainder of his Cabinet career, I fancy his difficulties will continue, though they would have been a great deal more trying had some of these old friends been called by him to his assistance in forming a Cabinet.

But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says that no matter how the Government have trod on the loyal feelings of their loyal supporters, no matter how they have sent these veteran statesmen to the right and to the left, his leader has "gathered around him three of the most distinguished statesmen of the day," and of course one of these gentlemen took the post of Finance Minister. Personally I am glad to see the hon. Finance Minister in the House. Politically I will do all I can to make his career as brief as possible in his present position and in this House, but although it is natural for the hon. member for South Oxford to have the highest opinion of the man who was chosen to be put over him and who is over him, and notwithstanding all my good feeling to that hon. gentleman and my welcoming him as I do personally to this House, I would like to know from the hon. member for South Oxford the grounds for giving the hon. gentleman

this high rank and precedence as a statesman.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Everything is comparative.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know, and it is just this comparison between the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member who fills the position which the former swore he would fill that I should like the hon. member for South Oxford to explain. I want to show the hon. gentleman the kind of a man who is chosen in his place. I want to give him an index of the statesmanship that is preferred to his own, because if Nova Scotia can give us the information, there were certain aims and ambitions of the present Finance Minister when he entered the local political arena——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Tell us about the nest of traitors.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am discussing seriously the position in which certain of our friends opposite are to-day, and, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to ask you to give your attention to any disorderly elements that may be behind those hon. gentlemen. Let those gentlemen who want to interrupt speak from their feet if they have the courage to do it and are able to stand, but order must be maintained. Now, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, came into public life with certain aims and ambitions, and they were clear and distinct. He was a Reformer of the reformers in a local way. He was going to abolish the legislative council—and that legislative council has withstood his attacks and his assaults and is in exactly the same position as he found it in fourteen or fifteen years ago. He undertook, and swore by all the gods that he would accomplish his end, to tear Nova Scotia from out the Dominion of Canada. He gained power in Nova Scotia by the agitation in favour of the province seceding from the Dominion. And he did his best, and did it very well for a time, to set his native province against all the western provinces. His great aim, as he knows and will admit, was, at that time—in 1886, not so very long ago—not only to wrench Nova Scotia from out the Dominion, but to establish a union of the maritime provinces apart from these western provinces, with whom we had nothing in common, as his argument was. But he also threatened any man who would trifle with this question or go back on his professions of repeal, which did good service for him in 1886. But, thank God, Mr. Speaker, to-day, notwithstanding that that was one of the great aims of the hon. gentleman's political life, the Dominion of Canada was never welded together more firmly than it is in this year, 1896. The hon. gentleman carried these feelings of hostility to such a length that it was only the other day, and, I think, after he ceased to be Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, that the school children of that province were allowed a holiday on Dominion Day. Even during the last session in which he sat in the provincial assembly, a motion was presented by a Conservative member to make the first day of July a national holiday and have it observed in the schools of Nova Scotia, and this was voted down by him. And I do not believe that though that hon. gentleman was Prime Minister of Nova Scotia for many years and up to the time he came into this Cabinet, the Dominion flag has been allowed to float over the provincial buildings of Nova Scotia. He has failed in all these puny efforts which were directed to tearing down the legislative council or tearing to pieces the Dominion of Canada. And yet the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says the hon. gentleman is a statesman and calls upon us to admire him. Certainly we cannot admire him for what he has done, but, as in the case of other Reformers, we shall have to admire him, if we can, for what he intends to do. The hon. gentleman came into power on the cry of economy. The provincial extravagance before his time he thought appalling. His policy was retrenchment. He was able to show that we were spending too much—several hundred dollars too much. I think, the hon. gentleman's figures showed—on the Lieutenant-Governor's garden. The garden in which vegetables were grown, the patch of land at the back of Government House he showed to be a drain upon the resources of the province, and he promised great reforms and the saving of several hundred dollars every year. But, to his credit be it said, as soon as he took office he forgot all about that, and he has increased these perquisites, and altogether deserves, as I will admit, considerable credit for having gone back on himself and having treated the Lieutenant-Governor with proper respect and made that gentleman's position as comfortable as he could. Before these days of retrenchment we never enjoyed the luxury of a public debt, but we have one now, thanks to the services of his protégé the hon. member for South Oxford. He has rolled it up, and rolled it up pretty quickly too. I think he is able to show an expenditure of $300,000 a year, over and above that required under the administration of his predecessor. And out of the largesse of the National Policy we have furnished him the funds to spend right and left. The royalty on the coal, the mining industry having been fostered by the Conservative Dominion policy has enabled the hon. gentleman to do these great things to which I have referred.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Considering the position which the Minister of Finance occupies in this Parliament, it is only fair that I should add something to the reference that I made this afternoon to the career of that hon. gentleman, that new, bright and shining light in this galaxy of all the talents, treating the subject more particularly that I proposed to do when we rose. I find the apostle, as he was called, of retrenchment and economy, involved in a rather curious career in the province of Nova Scotia. When the Government of which he was first a member, but not Provincial Secretary, came into power in Nova Scotia, the gross debt of the province, in 1882, was less than $100,000. Within the next two years after they had the aid of this financial genius, they added nearly $300,000, making the gross debt, on 31st December, 1894, over $371,000. Then the hon. gentleman took charge, and we find from the following return presented by him to the provincial Parliament, some interesting information which may guide us as to what that hon. gentleman can do in the way of economy and reform if given charge of the Dominion finances for any length of time. The financial condition of Nova Scotia on 31st December, 1894, is represented in a return of his to the provincial House, as follows: Gross debt, $371,570.89; assets deposited at Ottawa, $1,052,945.84; miscellaneous assets, $411,533.14; total assets, $1,469,498.98. Showing a surplus of $1,092,928.09. The financial condition of that province on September 30, 1895, according to the return of the hon. gentleman laid on the Table of the local House, was as follows: Gross debt, $3,346,899.99; assets, deposits at Ottawa, $1,056,238.58; miscellaneous assets, $302,767.59; total assets, $1,358,006.17; deficit on capital account, $1,988,093.82. So that that financial genius changed a surplus of a million dollars in 1884, into a deficit on capital account of nearly two millions on September 30, 1895; in other words, he expended $3,081,021.91 more than income between December 31, 1894, and September 30, 1895. So all these gentlemen who are pressing the Minister of Public Works for additional expenditures, may take heart and feel that the chances for a very lavish and heavy expenditure are tolerably good when the finances of this country are in the hands of the hon. gentleman. Now, to recapitulate, the gross debt under his management of $371,000 in 1884, became, in 1895, $3,346,000 odd. Let me refer, for instance, to the expenditure on Government House. Long and loud were the complaints of that hon. gentleman in regard to the excessive extravagance of his predecessors. From 1879 to 1882 the Conservative record shows an average expenditure of $3,840 on Government House, and it was almost a crime in the eyes of the hon. gentleman. He was given the reins of power, and from 1883 to 1895 the expenditure amounted to $16,000, or an average of $4,840 as against that lavish and extravagant expenditure under the Conservative Government of $3,840 a year. I need not go into other subjects, because it would become a little too provincial, but the tale is the same in regard to the expenditure on the provincial building and items of that character. Now, those are some samples of many showing the differences between Grit professions in Opposition and Grit practice in power. Why, Mr. Speaker, if in this House there has been one thing more than another that our friends opposite have dwelt upon, it was the fearful advantage taken by the Government of the day in regard to non-simultaneous polling. The Government of the day, they used to tell us, ought never to take advantage as so to arrange by-elections that one could influence another. Now, Sir, these gentlemen have already given us quite a lot of material to comment upon in a very brief period, and without going into all the various ministerial by-elections. I will take the elections in the province of Nova Scotia. There were only two members to be returned, and it was not deemed wise to any extent to follow the rules they laid down in Opposition. If my memory serves me right, there was fully a week between the time fixed for the election of the Minister of Finance and the day fixed for the election of the Minister of Militia, both in the same province. No explanation has been given why these hon. gentlemen did not hastily seize the opportunity of showing how much they believed in their professions, by holding the elections, in that province at any rate, on the same day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Were they sworn in at the same time?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Whether they were sworn in at the same time, I am not able to say, but at any rate they were Ministers together.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they were not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They came to the province as Ministers together. The hon. gentleman sees a distinction. You may whip the devil around a stump in many ways, I suppose; so these gentlemen had to arrange that they should be sworn in on different days, and forsooth, the great principle of simultaneous polling had to vanish into thin air. At any rate, they so arranged that these elections did not even take place on the same day in that one province, yet hon. gentlemen know full well how these have varied in different provinces. We are thus only at the beginning of the great examples shown by a Reform Administration in regard to this important subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The election in North

Grey and in Queens-Sunbury were held on the same day, and with the same result.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and carried by the same means; and I will give the hon. gentleman at once a sample of how they did carry those constituencies. It was a crime on the part of a Conservative Government to mention public works or public undertakings upon the hustings. Why, if a Minister went to Moncton and spoke a few words of encouragement in regard to a local enterprise there, a graving dock, the changes were sounded long and loud as to the iniquity of the whole proceeding, as virtually involving the corruption of constituencies, holding out hope of reward by means of railways and public works. Is there a man who has gone through Grey, or Queen's and Sunbury, or who has followed the speeches of the Ministers, who does not know that these desperate means were chiefly resorted to, above ground and on the platform, in order to influence the electorate? In regard to that again I must refer to the Minister of Finance, as well as to the Minister of Railways. They had scarcely been appointed Cabinet Ministers when they prepared to tear to pieces and absolutely to scout some of the boldest professions of their present colleague, the member for South Oxford. Now, even if he has been put in the background, even if the cherished object of his ambition has been denied him, even if he cannot keep faith with the constituents who elected him on his solemn pledge that he would be Minister of Finance, surely he should be treated with more respect than he was treated by the Minister of Railways and Minister of Finance. How did these hon. gentlemen talk to their constituents? First of all, let us remember that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce had written a carefully prepared letter to the Patrons of Industry in the province of Ontario, in which he told them that when they advocated that there should be no railway bonuses, they were in line with the Reform policy, and that the Reformers had fought against all the provincial railway subsidies, that it was a cardinal plank in their platform, and that under good Grit rule there would be no railway bonuses. Sir, we know that time and again we were charged with an effort to corrupt various constituencies by holding out that a part of our policy was to take federal money to build provincial railways. The hon. Finance Minister had no opposition in his constituency. That hon. gentleman knew that in Queen's and Shelburne there is an intense desire on the part of the people, a very reasonable and proper desire in those railroadless counties, to have railway facilities such as are enjoyed by similar important constituencies in Canada. Those people have demanded from time to time that attention should be given to this subject. The attention of the late Government had already been directed to the constituency in that regard, and though the Finance Minister had no opposition and was elected by acclamation by the people, yet out of the goodness of his heart and with his idea, which is not the prevailing idea of the Reform party of the way to handle the public money, he there and then went back in the most direct and absolute manner on those professions to which I have referred as emanating from the late financial exponent of the Reform party. He held out the hope, a hope which I trust he will fulfil, and he will follow out to the letter the declarations he made in the constituency, that railway facilities would be provided, and he led the electors to believe that the great object of his life in this Cabinet would be to supply them with the transportation facilities they required.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Quote any promise I made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I can come pretty nearly doing so. The "Morning Chronicle" contained a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman. But I find hon. gentlemen opposite have wonderful memories. I have asked several questions in regard to statements made by Ministers to the electors, who were captured by them; but I find that the promises were only on paper, and pretty bad paper at that because it will not be honoured.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will not be able to quote from that paper or any other paper any promise made by me to give Queen's and Shelburne a railway; but if he means that I expressed my sympathy with the people there and my desire to serve them, that is correct.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me if he imagined that I did not ascribe to him considerable astuteness. The hon. gentleman held power too long in my province to lead me to reflect on his extraordinary ability in not binding himself particularly, but in inducing electors of his province to expect great things from him. The language he used was uttered in the absence of a contest, with no enemy in front or behind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After I was elected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the day of the hon. gentleman's return. The hon. gentleman should understand that I am not pressing the argument which was used against us, that these were promises born in bribery. The hon. gentleman was not opposed. But I am showing that it has taken the Government a very little time to go back on the loudest professions they made when in Opposition. Here is the way the hon. gentleman spoke.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not going to the people, but I had already won the election.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was saying in public what he had no doubt already said many times in private. The hon. gentleman said :

> One question in particular had long occupied a foremost place in their minds, and that was the question of railway extension. While most of the counties of the province enjoyed the benefit of railway extension in some degree—some of these perhaps only in a very small degree—it was a striking fact that the counties of Shelburne and Queen's were totally without railway communication.

In the history of railway legislation in Nova Scotia, that hon. gentleman showed his utmost contempt for all parliamentary ideas, and control was given by the majority that would do his bidding by which the hon. gentleman was able to obtain the most extraordinary powers ever placed in the hands of any body of men called the Executive, whereby he could by Order in Council, if he pleased, bind the province in thousands of dollars for any railway project that might meet with the approval of his Cabinet. The hon. gentleman thus obtained most extraordinary powers, such as hon. gentlemen behind him in this House would not think of placing in his hands.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And not in yours.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly, and very wisely so, for I would not ask them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is somewhat parish politics.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does the hon. gentleman say ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The reference you are now making to Nova Scotia politics.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman objects to my reference to Nova Scotia politics as being parish politics. And yet the hon. gentleman was one of the leaders of his party in the maritime provinces ; and I ask, did he tell the people of Nova Scotia that the question of railway extension, which is so interesting to that province, was only parish politics ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I merely suggested that the discussion of purely provincial topics is hardly apropos of a debate on the Speech from the Throne in this Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If such is the hon. gentleman's view, he will probably be able to give the House the benefit of his advice at a later stage, but he should remain quiet now and not even discuss parish politics. Hon. members, however, must be allowed to proceed with the debate on the Address.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What we complain of is that you are not debating the Address.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If this is parish politics, the Finance Minister knows nothing else. Who introduced parish politics here ? The Minister of Trade and Commerce referred to the hon. gentleman, who had supplanted him, as one of the three great statesmen surrounding the present Prime Minister. I have been looking to the Finance Minister for a sign of genius. He has been a parish politician, and a successful one ; if it is necessary to go into parish politics, that is his forte. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has the habit of interrupting me—perhaps it is useful in keeping me to the subject—but if he will allow me I will refer to a speech and make a quotation. I did not introduce this subject, but the Finance Minister wanted grounds on which I based my argument, which I propose to follow up, in which I contended that hon. gentlemen opposite in an extraordinarily brief space of time have gone back on some of their most solemn promises made while occupying seats on this side of the House. In addition to what I have already quoted from the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance, the hon. gentleman said :

> The Coast Railway Company being now satisfied that they would have all fair consideration——

From whom ? No doubt from the Finance Minister, and properly so.

> —not only from the local government, but from the Dominion Government as well had announced their intention of vigorously prosecuting their work.

The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the late Government placed on the Table of this House a promise to grant Dominion aid, but through the obstruction of hon. gentlemen opposite no action was taken on the resolution presented. The hon. Finance Minister cannot do more than implement the promise we made, and secure a grant of Dominion money for a local railway, and this right in the teeth of the declaration made by the member for South Oxford that the Reform party was opposed to any grant of that kind. I am not going to read, for I have not the record here, but I am going to refer—and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is a witness—to promises made not on the day of the election (that is the great point made by the Finance Minister after he is out of the woods), but in the heat of a contest by the Minister of Railways of a similar character to those presented by the Finance Minister when he was elected. That was bribery and corruption, gross and outrageous cor-

ruption in our time, according to hon. gentlemen opposite; but this is not only following our policy, but it is repudiating the speeches of members of the Administration made to the Patrons of Industry. Well, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) though out of the Finance Department is not out of public life—although it is hinted that he is going soon. He was kept pretty well out of public life during the last campaign, much as I regret it. One of the wisest things done, was the action on the part of the First Minister in keeping that hon. gentleman far in the background. I remember that the hon. member for Halifax—I do not know whether you would call him the senior or the junior member for Halifax, so I will take the liberty of mentioning his name (Mr. Russell)—was quoted in the county of Pictou in my contest, by Mr. John Thomas Bulmer, who came to oppose me there, as being responsible for saying, that he stated with authority, that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would not be Finance Minister in Mr. Laurier's Cabinet if that hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) were returned to power. It was one of the strongest points against me in the county. It did a great deal to lower my old-time majority; the fact of it being said, that the Prime Minister would have very little to do with the hon. member for South Oxford. But there was a great deal of wisdom in that, although I fancy it cost the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) a pang to be compelled to make that promise and pledge to the electorate of Canada. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is a member of the Government, and according to Mr. Gladstone's authority, his statements as a leading member of the Reform party largely bind that party. That hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, and said more than once, when we asked him for his policy: that he was like the physician, ready to prescribe when he was called in. Has he been called in, Mr. Speaker? If he has, he has not been ready to prescribe. He has spoken in the House. He has used the old worn out adjectives. He has abused his opponents as vigorously as ever, but his anathemas against the National Policy seemed to have departed. The hon. gentleman spoke, and spoke vigorously, for some time the other night without in any way pretending to prescribe. Let us follow him a little further. In that very important letter to the Patrons of Industry, an organization that threatened trouble somewhere, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1894, made pretty positive statements in regard to subjects that have been discussed on this side of the House and which have been avoided by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I want, for instance, particular notice to be taken of this pledge. In this letter, describing the position of the Liberals, published in the "Globe" on the 25th October, 1894, addressed to the Patrons of Industry by Sir Richard Cartwright, he says, speaking of the tariff:

> I believe the necessity for immediate action to be urgent.

Now let us see what he is referring to. In the latter part of this same letter, an official letter, a letter as binding upon the party as any leader could write, he makes certain statements. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to contrast them with the language used in this debate. I ask you to contrast it with that halting, limping, apology for inquiry, that plea for the lapse of a long period while these hon. gentlemen make up their minds. In the meantime they hope to run a few by-elections under the happy conditions that heretofore existed, whereby in each constituency the Liberal candidate may have his own policy and swear that it is the policy of his leader though they all differ one from the other. This is what the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) informed the Patrons of Industry:

> The time is ripe——

Ripe, mark you, Mr. Speaker, in 1894, but not ripe in 1896.

> The time is ripe for very extensive and far-reaching reforms. We have suffered much, and have, it is to be hoped, learned something. I, for my part, would be sorry to see the issue dwindle down to a mere question of revenue tariff.

Think of the contempt for a revenue tariff involved in that sentence, and then remember the earnest advocacy the other evening, by that same hon. gentleman, of a revenue tariff, and a revenue tariff only. He continued, to the Patrons:

> This is a good thing in its way, but very much more than this is needed now, and very much more than this can be got, if only our chances are not thrown recklessly away. We need among other things a radical readjustment, not only of our tariff, but of our whole system of taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not underrate the ability of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright). I know his ability and his unpopularity. They are undoubted, and hon. gentlemen opposite understand both of those features of his character as well as I do. But he knows the meaning of the English language, and I say that that statement, while more definite than anything that has come from the Treasury benches in this debate, is as different as possible from the hints and suggestions that each individual of the Ministry is endeavouring to make on the present occasion. Now, how many months are required for the Liberals to bring forth this policy of theirs? It seems not to be denied that the period is ominous. for some nine months are to elapse before this tariff policy can be brought forth. In matters political I think that an unreason-

able period. I do not know an occasion in Canada where the reform of the tariff, or changes in the tariff, ever required that period of gestation.

Well, Sir, I am not going, if I can avoid it, to travel over the arguments that have been used in advance of me, but it is impossible in a free Parliament, it is impossible at this time and in this year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, to avoid comment upon the extraordinary and dangerous condition assumed by the Government of the day touching this special and reserved power of His Excellency to issue warrants upon the Treasury. The hon. gentlemen opposite have not outdone us in any particular in regard to the importance of that subject. If their position be right, if what they have done is within the law, and they profess to have been acting on legal advice—though it is significant that at this late period in the session relatively they have not given us the benefit of the advice of which they have acted—if their position be sound, then parliamentary government is an absolute farce. Hon. gentlemen have referred to the necessity for calling us here, but if these gentlemen can spend our money at the rate of $1,000,000 a month by means of a special warrant, and by postponing Parliament for one month after it has been called for the despatch of business, then what is the use of calling Parliament at all. I call attention to the fact, that no one on the opposite side of the House has yet attempted to answer the arguments from this side. If they can spend our money by special warrants for two months, what is to prevent them going on month after month ? They seem to say that a majority of the people of the country said they could do so. God forbid that the people of the country should say that. It will not meet the argument in this House, for the Prime Minister to abruptly say that he has canvassed his supporters, that they agreed to put in his hands the conduct of public affairs, and that he challenges us to a vote, that he stops debate, that he sends the whip through his party, and that he will leave all the debate to us and will assume the voting power at the earliest opportunity. We demand, and we have a right to demand, the reasons, and not to be satisfied, as the hon. member for South Oxford said, with the Government sheltering themselves behind the mere language of the statute or a statement that there was legal advice that this conduct was right. Let the members in this House representing the law department, rise in this debate and give us the reasons. Let us have their complete position on the subject, not for party purposes, but for the advantage of the public at large.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman could not have heard the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not hear the Solicitor General. I did not know he had spoken in this debate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did he discuss the subject of the Governor General's warrants ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As the subject will come up again, I readily apologize to the House for travelling on a line which I would not, of course, have taken had I heard any hon. gentleman representing the law department speak on the subject. It will, however, come up again, and, in the meanwhile, I shall have the opportunity of reading what the hon. Solicitor General has said. But on the general question, I ask the attention of the House to one or two principles which I think have not been mentioned in the debate hitherto. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was utterly unable, with all his undoubted ability, to get away from his own idea of this extraordinary power on the part of the Governor General, pronounced in 1891. But I want to go back to another period. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that there was no principle more vehemently fought for or advocated by the Reformers before confederation, or since, than the sanctity, so to speak, of this principle of parliamentary control over the expenditure of public money. Not to go before 1867, let me give the opinion of the late leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, as reported in the "Globe," of July 6th, 1872, in the following words :—

> The policy of the Liberal party is to make the parliamentary government supreme ; to place the Government directly under the control of Parliament ; to take from them all power to use any portion of the people's money without a direct vote for such service.

I will not repeat the language of the hon. member for South Oxford, as we have already heard it ; but equally strong was he in 1891 on the position that not only must the circumstances be exceptional, but—and I ask the particular attention of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who the other evening, interrupting my hon. friend from the eastern townships (Mr. Ives) to contend that nothing hinged on the word " or "—that the expenditure was to be within the spirit of that Act, and strictly unforeseen. But, skipping that reference, let me come to the leader of the Government's own declaration in 1896, in the very campaign which has just ended, speaking, I think, in Toronto, on June 13th, shortly before the responsibility of the Government devolved upon him. I ask particular attention to his language, in which the case was

well put. I do not say the application of it was right, but the principle he there enunciated makes the action taken by him subsequently when in office all the more reprehensible, in my humble judgment. On that occasion, as reported by the "Globe," he said:

> If you scan English history you will find that the pages of that history, from the Plantagenets up to the revolution of 1680, show that the one feature which is more conspicuous than all other features is that the people maintain the struggle against the Crown of England in order to obtain the control of the expenditure of public money—the control of the money which was paid by the people in the form of taxes. That struggle went on for generations, nay, for centuries, as you all know. It cost the life of one King and the crown of another King, but the English people were relentless and would not give in until at last they obtained from the Crown the recognition of the principle that all moneys should be voted by Parliament, that all authority for the expenditure of public moneys should originate in Parliament. This is the law of the land; we received it from the Parliament of England. We boast that we are British subjects, we boast of our parlimentary institutions, and to-day I invite the attention of friend and foe to this salutary principle, that all moneys are to be controlled by Parliament, that no appropriations are to be made except upon the floor of Parliament.

With that language I do not quarrel in any particular. It is sound, it is healthy, it is necessary to the well-being of Canada; but I charge to-night, and later on I think we shall make the charge good, that the hon. gentleman was hasty in violating that sound doctrine enunciated by him on the eve of the last election. Legal advice now? Why did not these hon. gentlemen ask for legal advice before? Why were these hon. gentlemen so quick in their charges and so eager in their representations of what the statute meant? The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., for instance, interrupted my hon. friend the other night to contend that much depended on whether the word of the statute was "or" or "and."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is unfair. I did not make any reference to the statute. The hon. member used the word "and," whereas the statute used the word "or." I simply called attention to the fact, that is all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so, and the hon. gentleman, in calling attention to the fact, insinuated that there was a difference between "and" and "or," or else his remark could have no bearing on the subject. The point of our contention is that that word "or" must be read as "and," and I say solemnly and earnestly that if that word "or" is not to be read as "and" and you are to say that any expenditure not provided for by Parliament may be made by a Governor General's warrant, parliamentary government or responsible government is a farce. We do not argue that the expenditure was not honest. No man suggests that these hon. gentlemen since coming into power have spent a single dollar corruptly; no man has contended that they have not taken care that the money expended has been honestly expended; but the principle is far-reaching. The principle is this: If they have the right to make that expenditure for good and substantial reasons, if they have the right to construe that power as one to be exercised in regard to an item found in the Estimates, then I say they can expend the whole of the money of the people of Canada at one executive blow. One executive whim will do the whole thing: and, placed in the strait, while they are honest to-day they may be dishonest to-morrow. And the action of the Auditor General is something I cannot understand. So far as the papers go, he never raised a hand or suggested a difficulty as regards this very important question, which lies at the very door of parliamentary government, of parliamentary control over expenditure. So I hope that, if I have done nothing more, I have emphasized the position which I take in regard to this matter. We do not propose to charge the hon. gentlemen with any corrupt intent; that is not necessary. We do propose to point out to them that having improperly and contrary to parliamentary practice and procedure further prorogued for despatch of business the Parliament called after the general election to meet on a certain day for the despatch of business, they, in the meantime and without parliamentary sanction, made an illegal use of the powers vested in the Governor General concerning special warrants.

Then, again, I think it not untimely, in this debate, to point out the extraordinary position which they now take regarding another important financial matter. Those hon. gentlemen were very much exercised at one time with regard to the financial readjustment of the federal aid to the various provinces, and they summoned the Prime Ministers from every province in Canada to meet in the city of Quebec for the purpose of considering the urgent necessities of the various provincial exchequers. At that convention these local premiers came to a certain decision with regard to the grant of money that should be paid year after year out of the federal treasury in aid of the local treasuries of the different provinces, and having submitted their decision, contrary to good political usages in the mother country, to the leader of the Opposition, who is now leader of the Government, they extracted from him a pledge. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said that in that transaction the leader of the Government was bought and sold by Mr. Mercier. He charged him here squarely one night with having been bought and sold by the late Mr. Mercier, and be

cause of the pledge which the leader of the Government then gave to implement the resolutions at Quebec, Mr. Mercier promised that hon. gentleman in federal politics a large majority. And I think a colleague of the First Minister, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), was with the Conservative party when they denounced that bargain or that arrangement and working in unison with them. I think that in 1887 the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) was working hand in hand with the Conservative party and had no sympathy and never expressed any sympathy with the party then in Opposition.

Mr. DOBELL. The hon. gentleman is drawing largely on his imagination and it is not the first time he has done so. I shall be happy some time to have the opportunity of calling attention to the way he has done so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has interrupted me, but he has not done me the courtesy of saying whether my suspicion is correct, that he was then a good, solid and substantial Conservative working with the Conservative party.

Mr. DOBELL. That is not the suspicion to which the hon. gentleman gave utterance. That to which he did give utterance was absolutely false, and the hon. gentleman has been wrong in other utterances he has made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think that either side of the House appreciates the style of the new Minister. I have quarrelled, as my right was, with a very important act in that gentleman's political career; I have challenged his conduct, as my right was, and I have done it in parliamentary language, and he has not the courage to answer the fair question I put, although he did have the audacity to interrupt me. The hon. gentleman does not deny and cannot deny—and I give him the opportunity of doing it—that he himself was a member of the Conservative party in 1887 and acted with it, when those resolutions were passed at Quebec. He dare not, he cannot deny it. We have, then, this Government in this singular position. We have the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) so full of the old spirit of secession, that though he was willing to sit at that round table and arrange how much more money Nova Scotia should get out of the Dominion, he would not allow that conference to rise until it was solemnly recorded that he would take all he could get without prejudice to his right to go on and fight for secession. And these hon. gentlemen imagine to-day that instead of being backed by so narrow a majority that they were afraid to meet Parliament on the day it was called and in the regular and constitutional way go for their elections and let this Parliament adjourn from day to day, they are supported by an enthusiastic and overwhelming and hidebound majority. When we mildly and in parliamentary form put before them the solemn professions and resolutions—a bargain, as the hon. Minister of Finance has intimated, in a letter over his own name—whereby the conference resolved that so much federal money should be spent, and when we cite the hon. Finance Minister's declaration that he had Mr. Laurier's pledge that when he was in a position to do it he would give the provinces these extra grants, that hon. gentleman gets up in his place, as he did yesterday, and gives an entirely evasive answer and suggests that no action, forsooth, will be taken by him, now that he is snugly ensconced in a federal position, unless the local authorities further press it upon him, and then, forsooth, this mighty Government will take the matter into their consideration. We have the solemn bargain put before the people of Nova Scotia whereby the finances of Nova Scotia are to be strengthened as a reward for Liberal success in the Dominion, and a bargain to which the First Minister is committed, yet, forsooth, when these gentlemen are in a position to carry out the pledge they are not able to say whether the pledge will be acted upon but will only promise that if it is put before them they will take it into their consideration. That may be satisfactory to them, but I do not think it will bring much comfort to the colleagues whom the Finance Minister has left to their own resources in the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are having a very comfortable time jut now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says they are, and he looks as if he were having a still more comfortable time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will permit me, he looks as if he were not having a very comfortable time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Looks may be deceptive. The hon. gentleman looks as if he were having a happy time, and I look as if I were not. In that case, he must be having an unhappy time for I certainly am enjoying myself very much. Now the hon. gentleman seems to insist that we are miserable over here. Why, we have not begun any blue ruin story. We have left hon. gentlemen opposite the finest country the sun ever shone on, and we have left it in a far better financial condition than the different provinces of Canada are in which have enjoyed Grit regimes for the last eighteen years. We have left hon. gentlemen opposite a position in which they ought to be happy, at any rate, for a time, and I can assure the hon. Minister of Finance that if he thinks there is

misery here, he is certainly speaking without the book. We propose only to remain here during the hot weather. We have not any intention of remaining longer and there is a great deal of amusement afforded from that side. First of all, there is the rapidity with which hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches can swallow every sacred profession they have hitherto made. There is a sad side to it, but there is also an amusing side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For example, the Remedial Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, the hon. gentleman, I believe, is swallowing that too. The principle may stick a little but I think it has got to go down. For instance, here is our genial friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Is it not sufficient to make us happy over here to find him unable to lift up his voice. Why, there never was a session that lasted this long in which we did not hear him before this. I declare to you, Sir, that I have not seen that hon. gentleman with a blue-book in his hands this session. I have never heard him ask a question. There are some other reasons perhaps that also make the situation not as humorous to him as it seems to us, for he was one of those industrious and indefatigable men who are certainly entitled to better treatment at the hands of their party than they are receiving to-day. However, he may be the Minister of Interior at a later period. We shall hope so. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite not only insist that we are miserable, but they cannot understand our anxiety about this question of the tariff. I have heard a good deal in the debate, but I venture to say there are reasons for the anxiety, whether on the side of the House or in the country, in regard to the extraordinary position that the Government are attempting to assume. Gentlemen on the Treasury benches have had the assurance from leading members on this side of the House of hearty co-operation with them if they are only in a position where they can declare to us and to the country at large that the principle of protection in the tariff will not be disturbed. A simple assurance of that kind and the supplies required could be voted, and everything else that is to be done in this Parliament quickly done. There is no obstructive spirit on this side, and I hope there will never be. But we do ask, we venture to ask on behalf of the business men, some answer to that question. Take my own county—this may be said to be parish politics, nevertheless there are gigantic interests involved in that county in the shape of iron and coal industries. If hon. gentlemen opposite were to say that they would not disturb the iron and coal policy, and if a by-election were to take place in my county, it is possible that I should not be returned; for I would give every credit—I hesitate not to say it—to the Government for regarding these two great interests that have grown up during the last eighteen years. But I would thank them, in the interests of my country and in the interest of these huge industries to know that much. On the other hand, is it not fair that if they propose to stick in the knife and root out the principle of protection in that tariff as regards coal and iron, is it not fair that if, peradventure there should be a by-election, the voice of the people pronounce fairly and unmistakably on that policy. And what is my case is the case of many others. The hon. gentlemen may say: You are careful of your own position merely as a member of Parliament. God forbid. I say the same with regard to other items that I do with regard to iron and coal. Take the item of coal oil. The advocacy of the abolition of that duty did its work in the province of Nova Scotia and in other places. But aside from politics altogether, we know there is an enormous amount of capital involved in that industry, and business men wish to know—and it seems to me they have a right to know—the principle that is to be applied. I need not mention other articles, for those I have given sufficiently illustrate the case. We do not ask for items, because we know how unreasonable that would be. But we say: You have advocated policy after policy differing one from the other just as the localities differed in which they were presented. We ask you to have the courage of your convictions, as we had in former days, to tell us on what principle you are going to touch that tariff. Are you going to exclude the principle of protection? Is there no hon. gentleman who will tell us "Yes" or "No"? Is there no one who will show that courtesy to this side of the House. We will take any answer that is given—we are bound to take it. But on every ground of fair-play and reason we have a right to an answer. You, Mr. Speaker, with your proclivities in favour of the Government of the day, as I know they are, you know that British fair-play and a fight man-fashion demands that in politics as in everything else you should show your colours to your adversary. Yet these gentlemen try to fight us behind masked batteries, keeping within the lines of Torres Vedras. Is this style of guerilla warfare to continue? I do not think that such a course will commend itself to the country. This side of the House asks no definite particulars as to the exact amount of duty on every item. But we trust they will not cease to demand before this House rises, such definite information as will satisfy not the Opposition merely, but the commercial community at large. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who notwithstanding the position he now occupies in the Government, is considered an authority on these things, has told us that

it is possible to have a revenue tariff without incidental protection. That is an important statement. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we are going to have a revenue tariff, but they stop there and do not tell us, according to the two distinctions that they themselves refer to, on what basis it is to be arranged—whether it is to be a revenue tariff with incidental protection or a revenue tariff without incidental protection. Then again, can we imagine that these hon. gentlemen have any respect for the mandate of the people. I have heard something about that, but what I know is that there has been no mandate from the people to eliminate the principle of protection from the tariff. I challenge any hon. member of this House to show the contrary. You cannot give the names of the majority of this House in favour of that principle. And yet we know how the mandate of the people may be treated. It is no assurance for us to know how the votes have gone, because we know that when in 1891 the hon. leader of the Opposition, acting differently from his action of 1896, had the courage to issue a manifesto, so that all who declared themselves his supporters could be bound to something definite, he supported unrestricted reciprocity, and came back defeated. And yet, to use his own language, he said that, not withstanding the verdict of the people, he intended to continue the advocacy of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. That indicates how much he regards the mandate or the voice of the people. Then, in regard to these assurances that no interests would be needlessly disturbed, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that in that debate of August 4th, 1891, the present leader of the Government, then the leader of the Opposition, said that whether unrestricted reciprocity had a disturbing effect or otherwise on the interests of the country, the benefits attaching to it were so great and so overwhelming that his party would not hesitate to advocate the instant adoption of it as soon as possible. So we have nothing definite to guide us in this maze of varied policies. But the Minister of Finance or his friends will say: Did not we promise you that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would not be Minister of Finance, and have not we redeemed that promise? Yes; and that is the only promise they have redeemed. Then, it is said, you need not be afraid because the Minister of Finance is not known in this House as a radical and violent tariff reformer. Now, Mr. Speaker, it becomes my duty to give the hon. gentleman some introduction to the House in respect of tariff matters. For, though it was another vital principle of the Reform party that there should be no coalition of federal and provincial governments, the hon. gentleman was the head and centre of a federal Grit committee for the province of Nova Scotia while we were paying him as Prime Minister in local affairs. So the hon. gentleman is not unknown in his own province in connection with federal politics, and I ask you to say, in view of his utterances which I shall quote to you, whether we have not reason to fear that if the hon. member for South Oxford would have chastised us with whips, the present Minister of Finance will chastise us with scorpions.

Now let me give you a few ideas of his on this question of fiscal reform, and I do it for the purpose of pressing upon hon. gentlemen opposite the reasonableness of our inquiry for definite information at this stage. For instance, I find that hon. gentleman said, speaking in St. John, as reported in the St. John "Sun" of 25th August, 1893:

> The tariff discriminated against the poor man. The Liberals had declared for free trade. The Government, on the other hand, said they would stick to protection. Surely we did not need an Act of Parliament to compel us to buy flour from Ontario. Let us have freedom of trade, and we would buy all we could from our own manufacturers and producers.

Then, further on, he said:

> The National Policy was a mockery, a delusion and a snare. In closing, Mr. Fielding called upon all to help to bring about free trade.

It is of no use putting the question on the paper, these gentlemen meet us with gibes and jeers. I do not mind the jeer in the slightest, but as representative of a large body of people, I have attempted this session to see how much there was in all these pre-election statements. Let me go on and give you some of these statements, and hon. gentlemen opposite in whose presence I give them, may state, if they are so inclined, whether they are correctly given, and in what particular they do not agree with them. For instance, in the Halifax "Chronicle" of 4th October, 1893, speaking at Middleton, the present Minister of Finance is reported to have said:

> Let us go to the root of the evil and condemn this system of so-called protection and the Government who are responsible for it. Let us have a Parliament and a Government who recognize the harm that is being done, and are prepared to apply the remedy of a sounder trade policy.

And again, I find that hon. gentleman threatening the manufacturing industries of this country, and therefore all the industries of this country, saying on the 5th October, 1893, as reported by the "Morning Chronicle," a paper friendly to him:

> The Liberals protest against the doctrine of compulsion, they protest against the restriction of trade. Restriction may be necessary in dealing with poisons, but in dealing with bread the Liberals demand that the people shall have liberty to buy wherever they wish, and that

no penalty shall be imposed upon them for so buying.

This is absolute free trade without doubt. On another occasion, and as reported in the same paper on the same day, he says:

True tariff reform, such as the people want, cannot be expected from the present Ottawa Government. Indeed, they admit as much, for in order to propitiate the manufacturers they have had to declare that they will stand by the principle of protection. Upon that principle the Liberals take issue with them. While the Conservative leaders cling to the principle of protection, the effects of which I have endeavoured to present to you to-day, the Liberals denounce that system as wrong. While the Conservatives declare that they will move forward on the lines of protection, even if they have to increase the average duty up to 50 per cent—such is the statement of the Minister of Finance—the Liberals declare that the true policy is to move in the very opposite direction. That is the issue between the two parties. We ask the people of this province, regardless of past political connections, to join us now in this war against the protectionist system, and to assist in placing in power at Ottawa a Government headed by Hon. Wilfred Laurier, charged with the duty of bringing the country back as rapidly as possible to the sound free trade principles which we learned in the long ago from the mother land, the operation of which gave to our people a measure of prosperity which experience has shown cannot be obtained from the policy now in force.

Nothing could be stronger than that. The hon. gentleman is an out-and-out free trader, and yet he dare not tell me now, after the answers I have received from his colleagues, that he would repeat those statements as being the present policy of the Government of which he has become a member. I challenge him to do so. I challenge him respectfully in this debate to be as definite to the people of Canada in 1896 when in office, as he dared to be when out of office in 1893, after the celebrated resolutions of the Reform convention held in this city in June of that year. Then we have had some references outside of Parliament since this Government was formed. The leader of the Government stated in this House the other day that he was unable to give me definite information upon a very important aspect of the tariff, that referring to coal and iron; but what did the hon. gentleman say at the candidature of the Minister of Public Works, at St. John's, Que.? He is reported to have said:

What we advocated in Opposition we shall put into practice when in power.

To meet that hon. gentleman fairly and above board, I put a question on the Notice paper I said: This is what you advocated in Opposition in regard to interests that I particularly represent, in regard to interests that vitally affect my province, in regard to interests that affect us both from a federal and a local standpoint, in regard to interests that have been discussed in the files of your organ, the Toronto "Globe" for almost every day in the year, ever since you have been in Opposition. Here is a crisp cut sentence from your lips that the first thing you will do when you get into power and deal with the tariff, is to put coal and iron on the free list, and I ask you respectfully, were you reported with substantially accuracy on that occasion? You, Mr. Speaker, know the very extraordinary answer, the evasive, the cowardly, the disrespectful answer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What word is distasteful?

An hon. MEMBER. "Cowardly."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, then, if the hon. gentleman thinks that it is the act of a brave man to dodge a straight question, I withdraw the word "cowardly." But does any hon. gentleman tell me that the answer he gave was not evasive? They have not been fighting, as I fought, in a coal district with a Laurierite candidate advocating not only a duty on bituminous coal but a duty on anthracite, and insisting that it was part and parcel of a revenue tariff, and denying that his leader had ever stated that he would take the duty off bituminous coal. Perhaps if hon. gentlemen had been in my position, they would have some sympathy with me in putting the question as to whether he was accurately reported when, in addressing the manufacturers of Montreal, and later on in the presence of western manufacturers, he held out the tempting bait that coal and iron would be put on the free list. The President of the Grand Trunk Railway is reported to have said the other day that he had a pledge of free coal. Hon. gentlemen opposite have voted for free coal on this side of the House time and again, whenever the question was submitted to them. Their leader goes to Montreal, the great commercial metropolis, and shows what a huge duty it is, amounting, he says, to 60 per cent, an outrageous duty. He tells them before the election, When we get into power you will have free coal and free iron. He gets into power, and I ask him, Did you say that you would have free coal and free iron? "I cannot charge my memory," is the reply of one of the bright and shining lights of this agglomeration of statesmen. Will you tell me that that answer, not to me alone but to the people whom I represent, is either satisfactory or respectful? Is it according to parliamentary usage? He had not the courage, and he dared not deny that the statement, published throughout the country at the time, was absolutely correct. He knows the use that was made of it, he knows the canvas that was based upon it, and having got the advantage of that—I shall not describe his position, I shall not characterize it accurately lest I offend the sensitive ears of hon. gentlemen opposite, but who were not quite

so sensitive when they sat on this side of the House. But the people who are concerned, Mr. Speaker, can deal with them and deal with them adequately. I wonder if hon. gentlemen think it would be parliamentary for me to say that the leader of the present Government has a certain ability in concealing his principles. My authority for that opinion is the hon. Minister of Public Works. He wrote statements in regard to his present leader that I would not dare to mention in the presence of these sensitive gentlemen. I would be at once called to order. The most insulting statements from his vitriotic pen that the mind of man can conceive were written by the hon. gentleman who now sits behind the First Minister. I recall one mild sentence: "He possesses a certain ability in concealing his principles." I am ready to take the responsibility, for once in my life, of agreeing with the Minister of Public Works. We have had a warning from the late Minister of Finance that I commend to the silent and dumb members who represent the great Reform party, and that is that if they are half-hearted in their policy, and I suppose that means in the advocacy of it, their ministerial life will be short and limited. We would, of course, all regret that. We would much prefer, of course, that they should be bold and commanding. One of their late leaders used language which I think I should repeat, that a man who taught one thing in Opposition and another in power was a demagogue in whom the people could have no confidence whatever. This opinion was expressed by Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, who was at one time considered an authority. I commend it to the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The din of battle has hardly died away, the smoke has hardly cleared before our eyes, and so it is not necessary for me to argue long as to the necessity of having something definite. What have been the policies on the tariff we have had to meet? On our side there was a clearly-cut and honest position—protection to Canadian industries. We have had to meet all the tactics of the enemy, and attempts to set farmers against manufacturers, and so on. Let me run over some of the policies which have enabled hon. gentlemen opposite to live out the storm, and finally to occupy the Treasury benches, and recounting them, as I will briefly do, hon. gentlemen opposite will see that it is not for the purpose of satisfying our curiosity, but in the interest of Canada and in their own interest that they should quickly and now give Parliament something definite on these important questions. Hon. gentlemen opposite have advocated—and the advocates, I can name in this House—free trade straight, free trade as they have it in England, free trade to come in forty year's time, a gradual swoop, not a sudden swoop, as it was described in the graphic language of the First Minister. They have advocated a revenue tariff, a tariff for revenue only, and only a tariff for revenue. The differences are, perhaps, hard to follow, but these have been advocated by hon. members in this House. Then they have advocated incidental protection, protection itself, and the other night the First Minister, in our hearing, used a new phrase, that the issue was not free trade or any of the policies I have referred to, but it was National Policy intact as opposed to a revenue tariff. What is that policy? Ought we not to be allowed to look behind the veil; ought we not to be allowed to have a glimpse of this new policy, which is not free trade or revenue tariff, but National Policy intact as against revenue tariff. Such policy would enable hon. gentlemen opposite to leave the National Policy as a whole and to modify it only in certain particulars. Then we have had reciprocity and we have had it advocated by free traders. An English free trader would laugh to scorn any idea of reciprocity. Then they have advocated unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, free trade, and protection as to coal. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who is, I believe, a loyal supporter of the First Minister, a man who triumphed over an hon. gentleman who was one of the ornaments of the last Parliament, was, during the campaign, if I do not misunderstand the reports, a free trader in general, a revenue tariff man, but a protectionist up to the handle on the item of coal, and there is a coal mine in his county. Then we have heard from the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). He is a free trader and holds all the other variations of view under that head, but he has always been a consistent protectionist as regards the item of coal oil.

Mr. LISTER. I should like the hon. gentleman, who is very industrious in hunting up what hon. members have said, to hunt up my statement on that subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman is not in office, and I am not in office, and we have, therefore, some spare time, we could go together to the library, and no doubt we would be able to collect some information on that point. I do not, of course, wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it back.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will take it back if I misrepresent the hon. gentleman. In this House the hon. gentleman has advocated the interest of refiners. I ask whether I am wrong in understanding the hon. gentleman to be an advocate of the present duty on coal oil?

Mr. LISTER. When we go to the Library together we will talk that over.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems to be prepared to run to the Library or to go on the street, but this House is the place in which to

settle this question. I have stated candidly his position, and he is too candid a man to controvert the record as it appears in "Hansard."

Mr. LISTER. You took the duty off coal oil, but you kept it on coal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly, and I hope the duty will never be taken off coal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentlemen opposite reduced it on coal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is strongly in favour of protection for Canadian fruit.

Mr. GIBSON. You required Mr. Montague to tell you what my special line was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And also for Canadian wines. These facts indicate some difficulty on the Treasury benches in regard to duties which they intend to cut off? Then we have the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), who is a free trader in everything but flour. I think he is right as to flour, but he should be consistent as I am and be willing to have protection all around. Then the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has a little weakness about canned goods.

Mr. CHARLTON. What did the hon. member for North Norfolk say about that subject? Please quote his words.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen found fault with my quotations a little while ago, and now an hon. member asks me to quote his language when I cannot do so. He has, however, a weakness in the direction I have indicated. Then there is the member for Queen's, who has a weakness for pork. He is a free trader out and out; he has used all the illustrations of the motherland, and has told this House of the duties imposed there, for there is an inland revenue tax on nearly everything; but the hon. gentleman while advocating free trade in coal and other products not produced on the island, is very sound on the subject of protection for pork. Then there is the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), who is strong on free trade in general, but is a protectionist as regards beet-root sugar.

Mr. LISTER. The published cartoon will save a great deal of trouble.

Mr. GIBSON. They are all set out there

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not need the cartoon when all the hon. gentlemen are in front of me. This is I suppose a delicate subject, and while perhaps some amusement has been derived from it, after all that no doubt is the secret of the sphinx-like attitude on the part of the Treasury benches. I appreciate their difficulties, but I think the country would be more lenient with them if they face these difficulties like men and to some extent run amuck of these differing and discordant views of the hon. gentlemen of their party, and give us clearly and distinctly the policy upon which they ask to be allowed to govern this country for some time yet to come.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, as a comparatively old member of the House and yet a young Canadian, I want to join in the protest that has gone up in this Parliament against that Chicago platform of the leader of the Canadian Government. I may be supersensitive, but to my mind, Mr. Speaker, there is something entirely revolting in the idea that the First Minister of a proud land like ours, and of a land that has already assumed such importance as Canada, should hasten with such indiscretion to Chicago, and supplement the policies and platform of the Republicans, and the Democrats, and the Populists, and the Silverites, and all that, with the policy of the Canadian Government; and that mark you, in advance of any utterance in this country or in this Parliament. If he spoke by the book, if he was authorized by his colleagues to tell the people of the United States of these extraordinary reforms and changes in the tariff that he was prepared to make for a certain bargain to which I shall refer, why is it that these hon. gentlemen opposite cannot discuss with us a great deal more of their fiscal policy than they have deigned yet to do, or than we have even asked them to do. If the Prime Minister of this country was speaking as a business man or a man of affairs, to the people of the United States, telling them that he was able to make these huge and radical changes in the tariff of this country for a consideration, surely before he did that he had estimated all the money he required, he had considered exactly what reductions we could stand, and was consequently in a very different position from that which he and his colleagues pretend to be in during this session of the House. I say that that line of action on the part of the Prime Minister is regrettable. I do not regard it merely as a party man, or as an opponent of his. While he is Prime Minister I wish to see him respected abroad and respected at home as well. I want to see him the representative of Canadian nationality and Canadian commercial independence. I want him to hold the honour of our country high. I say, Sir, that it is humiliating to a spirited people to hear that halting, and that lame, and that weak appeal to the people of the United States, not only for favours, but for money and for pecuniary aid in solving these national problems, which we can satisfactorily grapple in good time out of our own resources. Such an appeal offends the patriotism of the people of Canada, young or old. I say that earnestly and seriously. I think our people

have good reason to feel offended when the hon. gentleman endeavours to charge us and to tell the American people that there has been hostility on the part of the people of Canada to them. What mischievous purpose has he in view ; what fell designs lurk there. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you who has done us harm. That speech is not the first utterance that has done harm to Canada in the eyes of the people of the United States. That speech is not the first utterance that has put further away from us, even a valuable bargain with the people of that country. In another speech gross wrong was done the people of this country. This is not the first utterance in the United States on the part of the Prime Minister. When he was leader of a great Canadian party in opposition, when he represented thousands and thousands of his countrymen, he dared to say in the city of Boston what he has never dared to say in Canada, namely : that the conduct of both England and Canada during the American civil war was a disgrace to both of those countries. That was a statement contrary to historical facts. Surely, Sir, the effect of such statements is not to encourage very friendly feelings towards us on the part of the people of the United States. Then, when the Prime Minister hastens to go upon his knees before the people of the United States, and to say that if they will get us some money, if they will give us some cold cash, if they will put their money into the development of our canal system, we will throw away our commercial independence, we will throw up the proud position of the races in this country, and we will part with our sovereignty over all that belongs to Great Britain on the American continent. When he tells them that we will allow them to have joint control over Canadian public works, how humiliating it is. If you give a foreign nation joint control over the canals or public works of Canada where can you stop ? They could help us to work out our post office system. We have a deficit in connection with that, and the people are asking for greater postal facilities, and if all our national pride is to be sunk we might make such a bargain that the United States mails would be known all over the land instead of Her Majesty's mails. They might do it on the cheap for us. We might also save a lot of money on our militia, if we should put ourselves straight into their hands. I say, Sir, that such language gains nothing for us. I say that our neighbours like ourselves respect men who value their independence, and if any people ought to have an independent spirit surely it is the people of Canada under the ægis of the British Crown. I believe too, Sir, that there are no money terms upon which to-day we would as heretofore even share the user of our fisheries. The fishermen of the coasts of Canada will resent that suggestion. I throw out as strongly as I can, my warning to the First Minister to retrace his steps, and to abandon as quickly as possible the Chicago platform as pronounced by him in this Presidential campaign. I ask him to look to the Canadian Parliament only, to consult that Parliament alone ; and he may rely upon it, that no matter how much we may feel annoyed—as we have reason to be annoyed for hon. gentlemen opposite not taking us already into their confidence—I can assure him speaking for myself, and speaking without the slightest hesitation, that whenever the Prime Minister and his Government submit any proposition to this Parliament in the interests of Canada, or any part of Canada, I will give them my loyal and hearty support. And as they fight for Canada and Canadian commercial independence, they can rely just as much on the support of this side of the House as they can upon the gentlemen who sit beside them. I, for my part, do not wish to press the Government unduly, but I press them earnestly to be definite and to be candid. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not an unreasonable request.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to participate at any length in a debate which has been going on these four days past, but I think it proper to set the hon. gentlemen opposite right concerning certain facts which they have apparently forgotten, or which they would throw into the back ground.

Now, Sir, judging from the remarks fallen from the hon. gentlemen opposite, it strikes me that they have not yet recovered from the stupefaction they have felt at the result of the popular verdict of the 23rd June. They are apparently unable to realize the suddenness of their change of fortune, and how they happen to find themselves in the cold shades of the Opposition. As they still have five long years left to ponder over their defeat, we are quite willing to let them busy themselves with that unprofitable and unsavoury task.

There is still another matter about which the hon. gentlemen concern themselves a great deal : they want to find out what is the fiscal policy of the Liberal party. They pretend to have forgotten the emphatical statements made upon so many occasions, either on the floor of the House or outside of it. That policy has been solemnly enunciated and placed before the country by a convention composed of thousands of delegates of the Liberal party from all the provinces of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, published in all the newspapers, and discussed upon all the hustings. It was on the lines of that programme that was based the appeal made to the country. And it was endorsed by an immense majority of the electorate throughout the breadth and length of the land. Now, in what does that policy consist ? It consists in a gradual and prudent tariff reform, in the interests of the masses, without doing any injustice to any class of the population.

Now, allow me, Sir, to quote, in its very terms, that solemn declaration, accompanied by some of the explanations given of its articles by the hon. leader of the Government of the day (Mr. Laurier). The resolution carried at the Liberal convention held at Ottawa, reads as follows :—

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a tariff, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

No more explicit language, it seems to me, could be used. We are in favour of a reduction of protective taxation, so as not only to materially lighten the burden which presses upon the shoulders of the people, but also to encourage our home and foreign trade, chiefly our trade between Canada and Great Britain. In the speech delivered at the opening of the convention by the hon. leader of the Government, who was then leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman gave utterance to the following words, which preface, so to say, the resolution :—

Nothing is more difficult—that is one of the evils of protection—than to wipe away protection, because under it interests have been established which every man who has at heart the interest of all classes must take into consideration. It is always easy to increase the tariff, because by so doing you increase the private fortunes of certain individuals, but whenever you decrease the tariff it has always to be done with careful consideration, and I am sure that when the Liberals are in power, they will not be indifferent to this primary truth.

That speech was the prelude to the resolution which I have just read to the House. The policy then endorsed by the Liberal party, they still want to carry out. We want a reform of the tariff, but such a reform as will be effective and operative, without injuring the existing interests. It is urged that the Liberal party has varied on that point. I am ready to show that ever since that resolution was endorsed by the Liberal convention held at Ottawa, in 1893, the language of the Liberal party and of its leader has always been the same. Let me quote an extract from a speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Government in 1894 at the session which immediately followed the Ottawa convention. The hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier), at the sitting of the 12th April, spoke as follows :—

What is the lesson to be deduced from this state of things ? It is this—(and this is the proposition we rely upon on this side of the House) : As the price of agricultural products has been reduced to the lowest point, it should be the aim of the tariff to reduce the prices of manufactured goods also to the lowest point. The farmer is bound by his circumstances to sell in the freest and cheapest market, so also ought he to be privileged to buy in the cheapest market, consistent only with the imposition of such duties as are necessary for raising the revenue of the country. That is the proposition on which we stand.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Who said that ?

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) The hon. Prime Minister, on the 12th April, 1894.

During the electoral campaign which ended on the 23rd June, the hon. leader of the Opposition, who is now leader of the Government, had the opportunity again to deal with the question. He dealt with it at Elmira, county of Waterloo, where he anew laid down the fiscal policy of the Liberal party. After stating that free trade, as they have it in England, is not applicable to Canada, and that revenue, under a Liberal Administration, would be levied by means of customs duties, the hon. Premier further said :

The Liberal party on several occasions declared it, and I also over and over again stated so, but the Conservative press tries to stir up the fears of the manufacturers and to lead them to believe that should we come into power, we would ruin all the industries, whether they have been benefited by the National Policy or not. Gentlemen, we have no such thing in view. We are not revolutionists. We shall continue to raise a revenue by custom duties on imports, but we would raise it so as to cause the masses to benefit by it, and not some classes.

Such has been the invariable policy of the Liberal party, from the time of the great Ottawa convention in 1893. We want an efficient tariff reform, one that will protect the masses and not certain classes ; in short, a gradual and moderate reform, so as to injure no interest. A tariff revision is not a matter to be done inconsiderately ; it should be carried out so as not to decrease the revenue, and in such a way as to cause the least injury to vested interests, while, at the same time, benefiting the masses and encouraging the farmers who, for over eighteen years, have been weighed down by burdens, without deriving any benefit. It is necessary that the Government should make a careful survey of the position and master all the details, they have to take information about the economic position of the country and get an insight into the requirements of the public service. They cannot reduce the taxes without taking into account the exigencies of public administration, for the taxes should not be immoderately reduced, as it is necessary to provide for the services of the country. Such an inquiry cannot be brought to a conclusion in a day or in a month ; and if, in February or March next, the Government are through with their work, they will have done more than their duty. It is a serious task they have under-

taken to bring to bear, and they should have all the necessary time to carry out their reform. It will be necessary for the Government, first, to inquire into the means of reducing the expenditure, in order to operate a corresponding decrease in the taxation. Those two things should go together. Therefore, it is necessary for the Government to go cautiously about their work. If they proceeded otherwise, they would prove to be lacking of foresight. We are in favour of tariff reform, but we are not in favour of radical changes. On the contrary, those changes should be made gradually, and should be very moderate. The revenue, as stated by the hon. Prime Minister, having to be raised by means of duties on imports, the home industries shall benefit by it. That reform, therefore, will be made in the interest of the masses, and not with a view to protecting certain classes to the prejudice of the public. On the other hand, the services of the country shall not suffer from the contemplated changes.

It is urged by some that the delay asked for would be prejudicial to the manufacturing interests. I maintain, on the contrary, that such a delay is necessary in order to allow the manufacturers to dispose of the surplus of their output and get ready for the change resulting from the new order of things.

It is customary for France, the United States and other countries always to fix a date for the coming into force of tariffs and commercial treaties affecting commercial and manufacturing interests. It so happens that the interested parties, have all the necessary delay for providing against the change brought about in the economic position of the country. And in that way commercial crises and disturbances are warded off. Now, Sir, I wish to say a word or two about a much debated issue in the course of this discussion, the Manitoba school question. I have taken a well defined stand on that question, and it remains unchanged to this day. Last session, I voted against my leader because I was of opinion that a remedial legislation was necessary in order to reach an immediate settlement of that vexed question, and also because I looked askance at the results of a general election carried on amidst appeals to racial and creed prejudices, as those which were actually made to the people. I was under the impression that an immediate settlement of the question was desirable and necessary. I have nothing either to take back, to alter in my position, or to excuse, but I say it is a matter of regret that, from the very moment it was known that negotiations had been entered upon between the Dominion Government and the provincial authorities to bring about an understanding and set the question at rest through conciliatory means, it is to be regretted, I say, that French Canadian and Catholic members of this House should have withheld their sympathies from the Prime Minister in the difficult task he has entered upon. It behoves us to help him in bringing about a satisfactory and peaceable settlement of this vexed question. I am ready to allow the Government all the necessary delay to carry on negotiations, earnestly hoping that they will result in giving full satisfaction to the interested parties and meting out justice to them, as they are entitled to under the constitution. I shall wait until the result of those negotiations is known, to appreciate them, as they merit. My hon. friend the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) laughs. My remarks, I presume, are not to his taste. I regret that the hon. member is unable for once to rise above the spirit of partisanship and judge of the question upon its merit. The hon. gentleman, should brush aside all party considerations, and mind only the interests at stake.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman is in favour of strokes of policy (coups d'éclat).

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I maintain that the Manitoba school question should be considered from a higher standpoint. As I said, at the outset, in 1893, when the question came up for the first time before this House, I attach a very high importance to it. I believe that it is a duty for all French Catholic members to give all the assistance they can to the hon. Prime Minister and not to aggravate the difficulties of his task. The troubles which might be raised here to-day would prove prejudicial to the cause of our co-religionists out west, and would entail for us a very great responsibility, in case the Premier failed, through that opposition, to carry those negotiations to a successful issue. Those are the few remarks I wished to offer, and I thank the House for its kind attention.

Paragraphs 1 to 7 agreed to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the hon. the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That the said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

That this House will, on Friday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

That this House will, on Friday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—ESTIMATES FOR 1896-97.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, August, 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved:

That the said Message, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That Louis Phillippe Brodeur, Esquire, member representing the Electoral District of Rouville, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns may I ask the Minister of Finance whether the Estimates which have been laid on the Table to-night are all the Estimates that will be submitted for the current year, or whether there is a Supplementary Estimate to be expected hereafter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There may be a Supplementary Estimate to be submitted later.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DOBELL. Before the adjournment I would like to say a few words on a personal matter. I happen to have been the object, to some extent, of attacks made last night and to-night, and I should like to give a few words of explanation with reference to these attacks. One hon. gentleman last night accused me of going over to this side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend, but I may say that this will lead to a prolongation of the night's proceedings.

Mr. DOBELL. That will do no harm.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure it is in order unless the hon. gentleman wishes to make a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a substantive motion to adjourn the House, and considerable latitude is generally allowed on a motion of that kind. The hon. gentleman will remember that he must not transgress another rule by referring to a past debate, except for a personal explanation.

Mr. DOBELL. I hope that I may claim the indulgence of the House, and if I should transgress any of the rules I shall be happy to be called to order and conform to the rules. I merely wish to trespass on the time of the House sufficiently to reply to some personal charges made against me by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) charged me with having come to this House with the object of gaining some distinction. Such a thought never entered my mind. To-night the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made the charge that I could be bought for $5.

Mr. FOSTER. I again call the attention of the House to this irregular proceeding. The hon. gentleman is taking advantage of this motion to adjourn to reply to charges which were made against him in the course of the debate which has just closed. Surely he cannot be allowed to do that ? He had a perfect right to make his reply before the debate closed.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has undoubtedly only the right to give a personal explanation on this occasion. If he wished to enter into debate, it would have been proper for him to do so before the Address was passed.

Mr. DOBELL. I have no intention of doing anything beyond giving the reasons why I joined gentlemen on this side.

Mr. FOSTER. I submit again that is not a personal explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Before you rule, Sir, I desire to submit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is attempting to put a limitation on the freedom of debate which I never heard in this House before. This is a motion to adjourn the House. I have seen some of the most important debates that

ever took place in Parliament arise on such a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. So have I.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may, as the hon. gentleman says, give rise to a prolonged debate, but I think the hon. gentleman who has been unduly attacked has a right to be vindicated even if it does take an hour or two of the time of the House. The night is young, it is only twenty minutes past ten, and I think even if the hon. gentleman was verging towards a breach of the rules of the House, the courtesy which is always extended towards new members of the House, and more particularly to one occupying a high position in the Government of this country, should be extended to the hon. gentleman, and he should be permitted to make his explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have moved my point of order, and I leave it, Sir, entirely in your hands. All that I ask for is that the rules of the House shall be properly enforced, and it does not make a whit of difference to me whether it is a gentleman high in position, as my hon. friend might say in comparison, or a gentleman not so high. We all have equal rights on the floor of the House. The hon. gentleman has entered into a defence of an attack made on him in a debate which is closed. He was sitting in the House before the debate was closed, and he was aware that those charges were being made, and had every opportunity then to reply. He should then have made his defence, and should not be permitted in this way, even through courtesy—and I will go as far in courtesy as is fair and right—to defend himself in this way against the rules of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I submit that it will be in order for any hon. gentleman on the occasion of a motion to adjourn to state the reasons which have induced him to enter the Government, even if he had to strain his feelings by withdrawing from the charming society opposite. I think that that is perfectly in order and very edifying.

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling is that, as I suggested to the hon. gentleman, that it would be out of order for him to refer to a debate which is closed on this occasion, but I think the hon. gentleman may make a statement to the House with reference to his own position, so long as he avoids referring specifically to a past debate.

Mr. DOBELL. I must thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for giving me this privilege of making a very brief statement of the reasons which induced me to join the Government, and I hope I shall make my statement a clear one. The only reason I had for joining this side of the House was that I lost all confidence in hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CASGRAIN. At what date?

Mr. DOBELL. I do not intend replying to interruptions of that kind, but intend only giving my reasons for joining this party and Government. When I became aware of the reckless pledges that were made by hon. gentlemen opposite and of the treachery that existed amongst themselves, I thought it was time to change sides, and I have felt myself fully justified in that course by the attempts which I have heard have been made by gentlemen on that side to disturb the harmony that exists here. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh, and I am glad to be able to put my opponents in good humor. I would much rather put them in good humor than excite their angry passions. I can only say that the conduct and the tactics of hon. gentlemen opposite are a graphic reminder of the misery and despair which Dante describes as existing among those unfortunate souls who contemplate the happiness of the blessed ones on the other side. I must say that to-night I feel more than happy at being here where I have found harmony and peace and goodfellowship and loyalty to our leader. I believe that our loyalty to our leader will carry us over a long series of prosperous years for Canada.

Mr. BRITTON. Might I ask the leader of the House when the Committee appointed to arrange for the Select Standing Committees of the House will make its report. I have special reason for asking.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may say to my hon. friend that the committee has not yet met. It is not usual for these committees to be struck until after the debate on the Address has terminated. We are happily surprised to find so peaceful a termination to-night. I have no doubt that within two days at the outside the standing committees will be struck.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WRIT FOR SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that in obedience to the

Order of the House, of yesterday, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ of election for the electoral district of Saskatchewan to fill the vacancy caused by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Honourable Wilfred Laurier.

CORRESPONDENCE IN RE CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That an Address do issue to His Excellency praying His Excellency to lay upon the Table of the House certain correspondence between His Excellency and Sir Charles Tupper.

Motion agreed to, and the Prime Minister laid the correspondence upon the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That the papers just presented to the House be printed immediately, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say a word before that motion is carried. I think there is a notice of motion on a cognate subject, and it is important that the two should be printed together and come down to the House. I imagine my hon. friend has no objection at all to the passing of the motion, which is for the appointments made by Mr. Mackenzie in the period intervening between the general election of 1878 and his resignation, and the appointments made by the late Government between the period of the election and their resignation. As the discussion would range over both of these, probably it would be well to have them printed together if my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) would agree to the subject-matter of the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, Mr. Speaker, I have to inform my hon. friend that when that motion of Sir Charles Tupper comes up for discussion I intend to move some amendments to it.

Motion (Mr. Laurier) agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to further amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill was introduced last session by me, but for obvious reasons it was not dealt with or considered. It is an adaptation of the English Act on the same subject, and for the convenience of the House, as the English Act is short, I propose to read the clause which has been adapted as far as possible for our purpose. Chapter 40 of the Imperial Statutes, 1895, is as follows:—

1. Any person who, or the directors of any body or association corporate which, before or during any parliamentary election, shall, for the purpose of affecting the return of any candidate at such election, make or publish any false statement of fact in relation to the personal character or conduct of such candidate, shall be guilty of an illegal practice within the meaning of the provisions of the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, 1883, and shall be subject to all the penalties for and consequences of committing an illegal practice in the said Act mentioned, and the said Act shall be taken to be amended as if the illegal practice defined by this Act had been contained therein.

2. No person shall be deemed to be guilty of such illegal practice if he can show that he had reasonable grounds for believing, and did believe, the statement made by him to be true.

Any person charged with an offence under this Act, and the husband or wife of such person, as the case may be, shall be competent to give evidence in answer to such charge.

3. Any person who shall make or publish any false statement of fact as aforesaid may be restrained by interim or perpetual injunction by the High Court of Justice from any repetition of such false statement or any false statement of a similar character in relation to such candidate, and for the purpose of granting an interim injunction prima facie proof of the falsity of the statement shall be sufficient.

4. A candidate shall not be liable, nor shall be subject to any incapacity, nor shall his election be avoided, for any illegal practice under this Act committed by his agent other than his election agent, unless it can be shown that the candidate or his election agent has authorized or consented to the committing of such illegal practice by such other agent, or has paid for the circulation of the false statement constituting the illegal practice, or unless upon the hearing of an election petition the election court shall find and report that the election of such candidate was procured or materially assisted in consequence of the making or publishing of such false statements.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the North-west Territories Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is entirely on all fours with the Bill that I introduced last session, and covers precisely the same ground as the Bill that Mr. Martin, the late member for Winnipeg, introduced and which passed a second reading. Unfortunately that Bill did not pass into law. The object is to restore the franchise in the North-west Territories to the same position it was in before the legislation complained of so strongly by my hon. friend (Mr. Martin), and which did not allow the elector on going forward to the returning officer's desk to make an oath that he was a qualified voter, but which required that the name should be on the list two days before the election. The legislation which my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) and I myself sought to undo, never had my approval, and now, after a trial of

the franchise as it exists under the obnoxious legislation, it is, I am persuaded, still more desirable that we should pass this Bill. The Bill, as I say, will be found to be precisely the same Bill as my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) introduced last session and which passed a second reading. How it came that we had no legislation in the matter, it would be hard to say.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Government opposed it.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I do not know that they did oppose it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of the Interior did oppose it distinctly and emphatically.

Mr. DAVIN. It passed a second reading, anyway. I think it highly desirable that this Bill should pass into law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. GIBSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) in further amendment of the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the intention of this amendment to the Railway Act is to cover the case of what has been known as a "buffer contractor" coming into Canada from a foreign country and taking a contract, and afterwards sub-letting it to sub-contractors, thus standing between the railway corporation and the sub-contractors who supplied the material and did the work upon the railway. It often occurs that such contractors at a convenient season either fail or run away, and the sub-contractors consequently have no redress against the railway company, in consequence of which large sums of money are to-day due to Canadians who have been engaged in the construction of railways under this system. The object of the Bill is to provide that all materials supplied and wages due in connection with the construction of a new railway, shall become a first lien upon the said railway company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That for the remainder of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays after six o'clock p.m., after Private Bills, and on Thursdays.

He said: I make this motion, Mr. Speaker, because, as has been intimated already, the Government have no intention of bringing in any legislation during the present session. By the rules of the House, as they exist at present, Mondays are devoted first to Private Bills, and then to Notices of Motion, Wednesdays are devoted to Notices of Motion until six o'clock, and after six o'clock to Private Bills and Public Bills and Orders, and on Thursdays, Public Bills and Orders have precedence over all others. Therefore, I suggest that we might perhaps take for Government business, Thursdays and that portion of Wednesdays consecrated to the consideration of Public Bills and Orders. As I say, the Government have no legislation to bring in, and, looking over the Public Bills which have been introduced up to the present time, though they are all of some importance, and some of them of more than ordinary importance, yet none are of such a pressing character that they cannot be well deferred until next session. Under the circumstances, I think that it will meet the wishes of the House that the session should be as far as possible a short one, and if the proposition I make is accepted, I think the business of the session will be accelerated.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on this side of the House, I am sure, unduly to prolong the session, nor to interfere with the purpose of the Government, which, I understand, is to get the supplies as expeditiously as possible, in order that the House may adjourn. But while that is true, I still think the private members of the House have certain rights outside of what may be the Government's intention with reference to the conduct of their business. The session has hardly commenced; the Address has just been passed; private members have had no opportunity at all for what constitutes a large part of the business of private members in a session of Parliament; and if the Government, at this early date take from them practically two days of the week, there is very little time left to them for Notices of Motion and for Public Bills in which they may have a great deal of interest. When the Government moves for Supply, of course grievances can be ventilated; but it is impossible to get information on various points except by motions regularly carried in the House. I submit to the House that my hon. friend is taking away from us that open door too early in the session. If he would take a suggestion, and allow matters to remain as they are for the next week, bringing his motion up at the end of that time, I think it would meet all the requirements of the case on both sides; and I think my hon. friend would find that the business of the House would go on just as well.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have every desire to meet the wishes of my hon. friend, and I think there is some misapprehension between us. I see the force of what he said a moment ago, that members of the House should have every opportunity to bring up Notices of Motion so as to get what materials and information they desired to have

for the discharge of the public business. If my hon. friend will look at the motion, he will find that I do not propose to interfere in any way with that part of the time of private members. By the rules of the House at present, as he knows, Mondays are devoted first to Private Bills and then to Notices of Motion. We do not interfere with Mondays. Wednesday afternoons are devoted to Notices of Motion up to six o'clock. We do not interfere with that. After six o'clock on Wednesdays, Public Bills and Orders are taken up. This is the time we wish to have, with Thursday, which is also devoted to Public Bills. So that the only two portions of the time of private members which we ask for are those portions devoted to Public Bills. The time devoted to Notices of Motion is left entire. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Public Bills on the paper, he will see that there are none so urgent in their character that they cannot be deferred until next session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think there are one or two Bills on the paper entitled to consideration, and there seems to be no reason why they should be postponed. The Bill which I have had the honour to introduce this afternoon is one which it will be well to adopt, and the sooner the better. There is also an important Bill with regard to the immigration of foreigners and aliens, known as the Alien Labour Law. It is a measure which has provoked discussion outside of the House, and which large numbers of people are inclined to support, and I think it is a Bill which it would be well to consider, and to consider at an early day. I think the hon. gentleman might perhaps let his motion stand owing to the exceptionally early time at which it appears, until he sees what progress is made with the business which the Government desire to press, and bring it up again in a few days. As this is Friday, there may be some hon. gentlemen who do not happen to be in their places to-day, who may be very anxious to have the opportunity of mentioning some subject which they desire to discuss at an early day.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a private member, perhaps I may be allowed to say a word or two on this subject. I came here this session thinking that only such Government legislation as was absolutely necessary was to be brought before the House; and as a private member having in my charge one or two important measures which I desire to advance, I have refrained from introducing them for that reason. If the purpose of the Government is to be carried out, the present motion of the hon. First Minister is a perfectly proper one. If the legislation of an ordinary session is to be proceeded with, then the objections raised by the Opposition are proper. In view of the fact that this is an emergency session, called for the sole purpose of passing the supplies, and in view of the fact that the Government has announced its intention to abstain from introducing any legislation, and that it is asking private members of the House to forego no more than it foregoes itself, I hold that the motion of the Government is a perfectly proper one.

Mr. FOSTER. The purpose I have in view would be very well met if the hon. gentleman left out Wednesday for the present, which would leave Wednesdays after six o'clock for Public Bills, and let the motion be simply for Thursday.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, I will make the motion in that way.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, if he proposes, when going into Supply, to make any explanatory or somewhat extended remarks with reference to supply. Of course I do not expect my hon. friend to make a Budget speech, because that has been made; but considerable time has elapsed since then, and I notice, in looking over the Estimates, that considerable changes have been made and that pretty large sums are asked for. I should like to know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to make any extended remarks upon the motion to go into Supply, and I should like to know also if he can tell us when the Supplementary Estimates will be brought down or what their probable amount will be. The hon. gentleman will see that while we have been asked for about $38,000,000 or $40,000,000 and are told that there will also be Supplementary Estimates, the House is in no condition to judge how it shall treat Supply in relation to the total amount that is asked.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It may have been the practice of my hon. friend to make that candid announcement at the beginning, but certainly I am unable at present to fix the precise date at which the Supplementary Estimates will be brought down or to give the probable amount. It is not my intention to make any extended remarks on the motion to go into Supply. The Estimates now submitted are, to a very large extent, those prepared by the hon. gentleman himself. Where they differ in the aggregate amount of any department, they differ, as a rule, on the side of economy. The general result of the changes to be made in the Estimates makes the amount of appropriation somewhat less than hon. gentlemen opposite proposed to make it. I will frankly say for myself, and I am sure my colleagues will take the same view, that we have not been long enough in office to have become as familiar with the details of the Estimates as it is desirable we

should, but the circumstances under which we are assembled, I think, warrant us in believing that the House does not expect from us that familiarity with the Estimates which my hon. friend had when he prepared his statement. Speaking generally, subject to what change may be made in a few instances, we propose to ask the House to vote the Estimates very largely as they were prepared by my hon. friend. But on this understanding, however, that we will have during recess the opportunity of continuing our investigation into the various departments of public business, and will have the right to withhold these moneys in any case in which, in our judgment, such expenditures may be found necessary. In the preparation of the present Estimates, there is a joint responsibility, if I may so express myself, between the hon. gentleman and myself. When it comes to next session, we will be prepared to accept full responsibility for the Estimates which we will submit then. As we proceed in committee, the various Ministers will explain any changes or where changes have been made in the various departments.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) laid on the Table the Orders in Council and the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice in relation to Governor General's warrants.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it the intention to have these papers relating to Governor General's warrants printed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If my hon. friend will make a motion, I will agree to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would not be in order except with the unanimous consent of the House, as the Orders of the Day have not been called.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved that the papers which have been laid on the Table be printed forthwith, and that the rule of the House to the contrary be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF MAJOR GENERAL CAMERON.

Mr. TISDALE. Might I be permitted to ask, without giving notice, whether the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will bring down the resignation of the Major General and the letter explanatory of its having been written which have not been brought down ? Will he be kind enough to ascertain whether he can find them and lay them on the Table.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden, King's). I shall do so.

SUPPLY—THE DISMISSAL OF PUBLIC OFFICERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I desire to call the attention of the House, in a general way, to the subject of the dismissals of public officers. I put a question to the hon. Minister of Marine a day or two ago as follows :—

(a.) When were the sub-agents of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Pictou, Nova Scotia, appointed ?

(b.) In what manner were they appointed ?

(c.) Have their services been dispensed with ?

(d.) If so, upon what grounds, and what notice, if any, was given them that their services would no longer be required ?

(e.) If a notice was given, what is the date of it, and at what time ? How much, if anything, was owing to the sub-agents by the department ?

(f.) Has the amount been paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). (a.) Noonan and Davies were employed in connection with repairs to the "Northern Light" in 1878-79, and were advised 14th April, 1879, that they would be allowed 2½ per cent commission on their accounts ; and on 11th July, 1879, advised that Minister had fixed allowance at 2½ per cent. (b.) Later the appointment was confirmed by Order in Council, 5th July, 1890, fixing salary at $400, and further increase of $50 by Order in Council, 20th January, 1894. (c.) Yes. (d.) The agent being a political partisan who actively interfered at the general election, the department, in the public interest, deemed that a new agent in whom it could have full confidence, should be appointed. (e.) Notified on 28th July, 1896. July salary still due, namely, $37.50. (f.) No funds out of which this can be paid.

It seems to me that this brings up more distinctly than any other similar instance in days gone by the questions as to how the public officials should be dealt with in this connection. I wish to compare this with the answer given in a case of the kind put by the hon. gentleman from North Huron (Mr. Cameron) :

Is the Government aware that Capt. A. M. McGregor, of the survey boat "Bayfield" has been an active political canvasser and partisan on behalf of Conservative candidates in the west riding of the county of Huron for the last fifteen years.

And then follow some questions with reference to that. To these the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries replied :

The Department of Marine and Fisheries has no official knowledge that Captain McGregor has been an active political canvasser.

The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not pretend that in this case Mr. Noonan and the others received anything in the way of a trial.

He does not and cannot pretend that there was the slightest investigation or official

inquiry made as to whether Messrs. Noonan and Davies, public servants against whom no complaint had been made, had forfeited their right to the confidence of the Government. The office is comparatively a small one, and that has an important bearing on this question ; and it seems to me, too, that as the Government were not in a position to pay these men the amount admittedly due them, they certainly had at least a further title to consideration which has not been given. From the answer given by the hon. Minister of Marine,—and he can correct me if I am wrong—there appears to have been no Order in Council rescinding the Order in Council under which these gentlemen were appointed, and if that be so, there has been a very grave irregularity in connection with the treatment of these men. The hon. gentleman does not pretend that in this case he has been so careful as he evidently proposes to be in the case of Captain McGregor. I think the answer in the case of Captain McGregor in reference to the charges against him was very proper and in accordance with the practice that obtained touching rumours ; and I know that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) himself if he has any charges of that kind, will demand and will see to it that in the investigation of them, Captain McGregor shall have what every public servant is entitled to before dismissal, a fair trial. Now, in this case, these men have been, so to speak, flung out of the department, evidently, from the hon. gentleman's answer, on a charge made behind their backs. And what does that charge amount to ? That they were political partisans—that is, that they voted for the Government or candidate of the Government of which they were officers. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will correct me if my memory is astray, but some sessions ago I recollect that hon. gentleman expressing the opinion in this House that civil servants should be disfranchised, giving as reasons the position in which they found themselves to-day according to the practice that obtained under different Governments, and that was that while it would be offensive and improper on the part of a public servant to actively oppose the Government, active support would not be and had not been considered an offence, and therefore the voter, if a public servant, was not in as free and independent position as other electors were, as a matter of course. And the view that obtained on all previous occasions, I think, was that, certainly in regard to these quasi civil servants or petty officers, whose remuneration as in these cases, is nominal, it was idle to expect that subserviency or decorum in regard to political matters that the Government could exact in the case of highly paid officials or civil servants proper. I have here a reference that was made in debate some years ago where this idea, which I am now putting forward, received some support at the hands of the Toronto "Globe." The "Globe," of 26th February, 1879, laid down the doctrine as follows :—

> In the public interest there are but two considerations which can justify the substitution of one official for another, except in cases where the holder of a place has been guilty of misconduct—the new appointee may be better qualified for the situation than the old or he may be able to save the country a certain sum every year.

Again, the same journal says :

> When country postmasters are displaced for political reasons, something like a revolution in our public life has occurred. They have hitherto hardly been considered as public servants at all. Their salaries are merely nominal, and they have been held free to take what side they pleased. It has been left for the men who were to introduce a "broad policy" to satisfy political hate by their sacrifice, and thus to take the first step towards establishing a Tory propaganda with the country postmaster bound to do the work of the party in power.

I make that reference simply to show the view that obtained, a very proper one, I think it was, and so admitted by the Government which was being criticised by the "Globe" at the time, that, in regard to the offices mentioned a different treatment should be given and a different course pursued from that in the case of a man who was bound for his salary to give his whole time to the public service and to act with great caution in matters outside of that. These men were by Order in Council subagents of the Marine Department. There are agents at Charlottetown, Halifax, Victoria, St. John and various other places in the Dominion, and these gentlemen were subagents in the town of Pictou. Undoubtedly they were supporters of mine, but the hon. gentleman knows that that characteristic is common to a good many of the officers appointed during the last eighteen years. And he would not pretend that, if he finds that all these gentlemen have supported the Conservative party—and have not exercised their rights as electors offensively—and otherwise have a clear record that he proposes a general decapitation of these officials. And I cannot understand why such treatment has been meted out to two of the most respectable citizens of the county I have the honour to represent. Their worst enemy could not call them offensive in anything. They are two gentlemen, young men, who succeeded to the office held by their father now deceased ; and these gentlemen, I feel bound to say, discharged their duties without offence to any one ; and, having represented that county since 1882, I am quite safe in saying that, while I knew them as my supporters and ranked them as such, I never was aware of any particular activity in political matters on their part. I believe they were members of the committee of a political organization, and I knew that when I was Minister of Marine there was nothing

particularly active in their political work or offensively partisan, and I feel confident that an investigation, properly conducted, would have enabled them to refute such a charge in a moment. But this is not the only course of treatment that seems to be meted out by gentlemen holding offices of comparatively minor importance or in connection with which the salaries are comparatively small. I will ask the attention of the Ministers who are in charge of the several departments to the way in which some of these men are being treated. For instance, I am informed that in my county immediately after the election, Roderick McLeod and Robert McLean, who were at work on the railway bridge crossing the harbour—attending the draw, and receiving, I suppose, the ordinary labourer's salary, were dismissed. They were restored for a short time. And this month they were dismissed finally, and two political opponents of mine, and supporters of this Government, Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas, were put on in their place. No cause was assigned whatever to these two men who had been summarily discharged from a position in which, so far as my information goes, they had always given satisfaction. They were in a position, as I am informed, and believe, to have shown, on investigation, that in no sense could they have been considered offensive partisans, or offensive workers in the elections. Then in the case of Noonan and Davies, who had as the warrant for their place, an Order in Council, they are thrown out on the street by order of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the secretary of the Liberal organization in the town of Pictou is appointed, under letter and instructions of the department, in their place. These two men, I believe, were members of a political committee—I do not know that for a certainty, but I believe it—they were certainly friends and supporters of mine, and they are thrown out of office without any complaint being made against them that they had an opportunity of answering, and in their place is appointed by order of the Minister, they having been appointed by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, a rabid political opponent of mine, and the secretary of the Liberal organization in the western part of Pictou county. The next case is really an extraordinary one, because, for a nominal sum, the services of a man could be obtained to do certain work about the fish hatchery in that county. A man named John McDonald—who, mark you, has not been paid for his services either, owing to the present situation of the finances—who had done his work apparently to the satisfaction of the department, and had served at the small sum of $5 a month, is thrown out without any charge being made against him——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Is the hon. gentleman sure of that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all; I say so far as my information goes, there is no charge against him, certainly there was no investigation, or none to which he was summoned, and that is sufficient for my point. In his place a friend of the Government is appointed at $5 a month and some allowance besides, as my correspondent mentions. Now, the next case is an extraordinary one. There is an island off Pictou county, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows well, Pictou Island, where a considerable number of hardy Highlanders, very heroic men, live. They have done wonders there in the way of saving life, and almost every family there is distinguished for heroism. They are a quiet and unoffending people, both those who support me and those who do not agree with me politically, live there on the best of terms. There was a man named Donald McLean, a captain of the Pictou Island lifeboat. That man is universally respected upon that island, and looked up to. The office, of course, is important in one way, and he has discharged his duties, up to the time I left office, to the satisfaction of the department, and at considerable risk to life, and for those duties he received a very small stipend. He has been charged with no fault, he has not been summoned to answer any complaint. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be kind enough to follow this case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am paying every attention.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not intend to bring this matter up without notice, but I have not been able to give it because I did not know this motion would come up to-day. In fact, I did not observe last night the motion that was moved under which the present order is taken up. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to these cases, not supposing that he can deal with them off-hand, but that he may give them consideration, and also consider the principle which, if my information be correct, has been violated, the principle that, under any circumstances, every public servant should have a fair trial before he is turned out of office. This man, the late keeper of that lifeboat, was deemed by me and those who advised me, eminently qualified for that position. He was not a young man, it is true, but Mr. Alexander Currie, who has been appointed in his place is about his age, or a little older. There was no complaint against the former occupant, and the only suggestion that occurred to the minds of those who looked into it, was that perhaps the department intended to put a younger and more vigorous man in his place. But between these two men there is no difference whatever on that score: I know them both. Well, I have mentioned these two or three cases as samples——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has mentioned all that have occurred.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All that have been brought to my notice so far, but these all came up so quickly that the Marine Department appears to be disposed to play havoc with these men whose only offence, so far as I know, is that, in the exercise of their franchise, they voted for me in the last election. I have no doubt they were supporters of mine, though I am not certain in regard to every name. That is the only offence, however, so far as I am aware, that these men could be guilty of. I suppose the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will say that the information upon which he acted went to show that these men were offensively partisan, or acted in a way inconistent with their duties as public officers. But even under such circumstances, I would press him, and press his colleagues, that before final action be taken, there should be an investigation into their conduct. I do not remember whether the keeper of that lifeboat is appointed by an Order in Council, but in the case of Noonan and Davies, I challenge the right of any Minister to dismiss them under such circumstances. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that where an officer is appointed by an Order in Council, his office can only become vacant by either death or resignation, or an Order in Council rescinding the one under which he held office. In that case there is a protection, because, before any Minister will go to His Excellency for such a purpose, he would have to satisfy the Government that there had been a regular investigation, and a report which justified the proposed action. It may have been overlooked in that case. But these people are not appealing to me in forma pauperis at all. Their offices being small, the hon. gentleman can understand that they are not absolutely helpless by being turned out on the streets, but the principle is far-reaching, and if the Government propose to go along in that course, I take it they will not confine their attention to the county I have the honour to represent, but that in other departments, as they can overtake these cases, there is to be a regular revolution in the service, and that, having begun in this way, no one knows where it will end. I press, in the strongest manner upon the department that no action of the character to which I have referred should be taken, until after a fair investigation had been held.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Speaker, it is obviously inconvenient to discuss the facts connected with the cases of those dismissed without having the papers before us. The House will see that the gravamen of the charge which the hon. gentleman makes is that there were two labourers on the Intercolonial Railway, who worked in his county, discharged. As regards myself, I know nothing of those facts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They are known to the Railway Department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know those men were dismissed by order of the general superintendent, and as to those men and to other names to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, the cases never came directly or indirectly before me or the department; but in the exercise of his proper discretion the general superintendent for the maritime provinces discharged them. I know nothing about them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will inquire, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall be very happy to inquire. The hon. gentleman also referred to some changes made in connection with manning the lifeboat at Pictou Island. Those changes were made by myself after I had had an opportunity of consulting with the gentleman who contested the county with my hon. friend, and I had ascertained the necessity of reorganizing the crew of that boat that it was in the best interest of the country that changes should be made. If the hon. gentleman wishes to go into details he shall have them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman act upon an official report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am coming to that point. I propose to tell the hon. gentleman the principles on which I have acted and on which I propose to act, at all events until I am overruled by my colleagues. The hon. gentleman referred to the matter of the agents of the department, Noonan and Davies. This is a small appointment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman, before he deals with that case, state in regard to the crew of the lifeboat whether he acted upon the statement of my opponent or upon an official report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I acted upon statements made to me by the hon. gentleman's opponent and by those in whom I had perfect confidence. There was no necessity for a report with respect to the statements made to me, and the hon. gentleman will be satisfied on that point if he makes an examination into the facts. I do not wish to make the statement here. This is a trifling and trumpery matter; there is no pay attaching to it except nominal pay. The main charge with respect to Noonan and Davies made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was that they had been summarily discharged. That is per-

fectly true. They were summarily discharged on my advice, and summarily discharged for the very best reasons in the world.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. After an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let the hon. gentleman possess his soul in patience for a few moments. Noonan and Davies are known to have been and to be active, violent political partisans.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I deny that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were members of the hon. gentleman's committee, actively promoting his election and using their power and influence to defeat the Liberal candidate at the late elections and previous elections. They are known to have enjoyed to an extraordinary extent the confidence of the hon. gentleman in political matters. They are known to have been active and violent political partisans in the town of Pictou.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has been exceedingly ill advised.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Many of those facts are known to myself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The charges are absolutely unfounded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That they have been active political partisans of a very pronounced type and stripe is known to myself, from conversations with those gentlemen and from the very best evidence in the world a man can have; and when a Minister is personally aware of a fact, surely there is no occasion to have an investigation. I state to the hon. gentleman that if in my own county I were met on the platform and blackguarded as I have been by political supporters of the late Government, and the whirligig of time brought its revenge and my party came into power, I would not institute a royal commission to ascertain whether I saw them on that platform or heard them make the statements, but I would act upon the knowledge that I possess myself. I would never discharge a man for voting for his party. That is a right he possesses, a sacred right which ought not to be interfered with. I have no right to inquire how he voted; I will decline to inquire how a man voted, because in exercising that right he is merely exercising the rights of a citizen in which he should be protected and encouraged at all times. But I say when a public official not only discharges his duty as a citizen and votes, but takes an active political part in the canvass preceding the election and makes himself in that sense politically offensive, he takes his life in his hands, and if the party which he so actively supports is unsuccessful, his political head comes off.

Mr. FOSTER. Otherwise it is all right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as my power can be exercised, and I am able to take it off.

Mr. FOSTER. That is might and not justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman says that is might and not justice. That is the principle I understand upon which the hon. gentlemen acted when they were in power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman laid it down very clearly and distinctly in several cases I have in my mind's eye. I remember a case of most cruel injustice, and that was the case of the keeper of the St. Paul's Island lighthouse. He is an old man holding the highest certificate of character, and he had discharged the duty efficiently for 25 years. He had a letter stolen from him, a private letter which he had written to one of his friends. The stolen letter was brought to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and on the information obtained from that stolen letter the man was discharged and was thrown on the cold world after 25 years faithful service, receiving no superannuation, no gratuity and no thanks. He had no inquiry made into his case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I state that is absolutely incorrect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is incorrect?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In regard to the action taken on the stolen letter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I say the letter was stolen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman knowledge of that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It appears in the papers brought down, which you placed in my hands.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That the letter was stolen ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It appears from the papers brought down by the hon. gentleman himself, and the hon. gentleman knows that the man was discharged. Why ? How had he offensively acted ? He was alleged to have written to a friend urging him to support a certain man at a municipal election, because if he did so it might help the Liberal party in the Dominion elections. That was the

sum and substance of the charge. For that offence, the hon. gentleman opposite, who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, dismissed him without any hesitation. He did not falter for a moment. The poor man lost the work of his lifetime, and he has never received any superannuation. I am not going to discuss these matters in detail. But what I believe by common consent to be the understanding of both political parties here is that a civil servant has an unquestionable right to vote for whom he likes without being called to account by anybody, or asked for whom he voted, and that in doing so he does not put in peril his position or right to promotion; but when a civil servant goes beyond that, becomes one of a political committee to promote the political success of one political party, takes an active part in the canvass or otherwise acts offensively to his opponent in the political campaign by becoming a heeler or actively assisting in the election of members, in my humble opinion by doing so he takes his official life in his hands and renders himself liable to be dismissed. I do not think he could complain or anybody else could complain. That was the position laid down by Lord Dufferin in the celebrated speech made by him on civil service reform some years ago. That is the position I understood to have been taken by both parties in this House. That is the position I propose for one to adopt in the discharge of the duties with which I have been entrusted; and I would go one step further and say this: that if in conducting my campaign I find men holding Her Majesty's commission standing on the platform alongside me and abusing myself and abusing my leader, and abusing the party to which I belong, calling us all kinds of names, calling upon the people to support them and denounce us; when the power comes to me their commissions will be revoked and the official life shall cease.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that I have no right to address the House again, but I want to ask you a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman says he wishes to ask the Speaker a question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that with your permission and with the permission of the House, I am ready to answer immediately the very serious charge which was made against me in connection with the St. Paul's Island light. I understand that I have no right to do so, and if any one objects I will not do it. But I am ready now to answer and to meet the erroneous statements that have been made.

Mr. DAVIES.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman understands perfectly well that having spoken once on the motion "that I do leave the Chair," it would be out of order to permit him to speak again.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is quite true, Sir, that if any hon. gentleman objects he can prevent me.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House now complain about dismissals in the public service, they have themselves very, very largely to blame for it. Eighteen years ago when they defeated the then Liberal Administration, the first action of these hon. gentlemen was, not to dismiss civil servants and public officials one by one, but they repealed Acts of Parliament which dismissed hundreds and hundreds of them throughout the country. I say here to-day, without fear of successful contradiction, that these hon. gentlemen by the course they have pursued for eighteen years past, have made of almost every official in Canada nothing but a political heeler. Why, Sir, go where you like through this country, and you will find that the men who were the foremost supporters of the late Government were men holding official positions and receiving the money of the people of this country, which money belonged to Reformers and Conservatives alike. These hon. gentlemen opposite, over and over again, from the highest to the least prominent of them, have stated that they were going to be in power for fifty years, and that we would never get there. Well, we are there now, but the effect of the statements they made has been to encourage these officials to disregard the position which they ought to occupy, and the conduct which they ought to follow, and so they have become in many, many instances offensive partisans, insulting the party to which they were opposed on every occasion, and encouraging men to speak of that party as they themselves were encouraged to speak by the leaders of their party in this House. Sir, I take it that the principle propounded by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the true principle. Every man in this country so long as the law does not deprive him of the right to vote has that right. I would oppose to the very utmost the interference by anybody with that right. But the moment an official goes beyond it, the moment he becomes a partisan, then he takes his official life in his hands, and if the fortunes of war go against him he must have to cease to be a public servant in this country. I say, moreover, that if the Government do not do their duty in this regard they will disappoint the Liberal party in this country, and further, they will disappoint certain office-holders because they expected to die officially if we succeeded to power. What is the law on the subject? What are the rights of these

people ? It is laid down in Todd's "Government of the British Colonies," in these words :

But an active interference in political contests in opposition to the existing administration would constitute a sufficient offence to justify the removal of any public officer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. "Opposition to the existing Administration."

Mr. LISTER. Yes. This is the existing Administration. It is right here ; it is on this side of the House. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to argue that because they did not oppose his Administration, but opposed the men who were opposing his Administration, that they are to go scot free. Is that the argument and reasoning of the hon. gentleman ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what you read.

Mr. GIBSON. If that is what the law means, it is all wrong.

Mr. LISTER. In my town we have in the service of this country what are called secret service detectives, under the Controller of Inland Revenue. I say here to-day that these men have nothing to do, and they do nothing officially. I believe they number over two hundred in the country, and they are political heelers and organizers and bribers from one end of Canada to the other. You find them everywhere at every election, strutting about the city of Toronto, drawing salaries from the treasury of this country, while as a matter of fact they are there simply to promote the election of hon. gentlemen now sitting on the other side of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman name one in the town of Sarnia ?

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman lives in the town of Sarnia if you want to know, and you know it and you need not ask it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. Order what ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for a moment forgot himself, and addressed another hon. member directly, not referring to him in the third person.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) need not ask the question, for he knows where I live as well as I know where he lives.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CLANCY. What I asked the hon. gentleman was not where he lives, but——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. Perhaps that is the way they may interrupt in the local House, but it is not allowed here. Sir, what do we find ? In my town the custom-house officer, appointed by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), or the Government of which he was a member, gets leave of absence when the elections came on. He is requested to go to Haldimand and formal leave of absence is given him. He leaves his important duties at the custom-house in Sarnia and he goes to the county of Haldimand to promote the election of the present hon. member (Mr. Montague), and he is away for a month. The Government pays his salary, and I do not know what the party paid him. Then, Sir, we have the superintendent of the canal at Sault Ste. Marie. What did we find in his case ? Instead of being up there attending to his duties during the busy portion of the season, why he is down in another part of the province of Ontario, promoting the election of his political friends, and when the elections are over, Mr. Boyd, the superintendent, returns to the Soo. He expects to keep his position. If he does, these men are not the kind of men I take them to be. Then, Sir, we have in the town of Courtright a man appointed to a position in which there are absolutely no duties to be performed. His principal business was in the township of Dawn, in the county of Bothwell, steering a certain vote in that county for my hon. friend from there (Mr. Clancy). He expects to be kept in the public service. The officer of that port attends the convention of the party ; he helps to nominate the hon. gentleman ; for three years he has been denouncing the Liberal party of this country, saying : "They are not going to get into power ; but if they do, I have my resignation written out to send in, because I would not serve under a Grit Government." He has not resigned yet. I expect that the Government, in the performance of its plain duty, will see that the gentleman resigns or does something else. This is a matter that involves no particular argument. These gentlemen know that in their offices they were working for all the Canadians of this country, not the Tory Canadians alone. They knew that we, as well as my Conservative friend from Pictou, were contributing to pay their salaries, and they had a right to be neutral. They knew that if they were not neutral the consequence would be serious to them ; and if they are not serious, they will be disappointed, and we do not want to disappoint them. Sir, it is plain that every civil servant of this country who attended to his duty, who was neutral in politics, vote or not just as he liked, should not be disturbed at all. His promotion should not be interfered with. There should be no difference made between him and any man that the Liberal Administration to-day might appoint. But the man who forgot his duty as a civil servant and became a partisan, and oftentimes an offensive and bitter partisan—I say the

Government to-day would be derelict in its duty if it did not dismiss such men, not as a revenge, but as a warning to the civil servants of this country that when they accept their positions they are not to interfere any further in political matters. Why, Sir, it is scandalous, simply scandalous, that the hon. member for Pictou should get up in this House and question the Government on that subject, at the same time being bound to admit that the men who have been dismissed were open members of his committee. What right had they to be on his committee? What right had he to allow them to be on his committee? Was it not his duty to have told them: "You are my friends; remember that a political battle is like a real war—we may be beaten one of these days, and then look out." It was his duty to have told them that; but no! The hon. gentleman knew that they were on his committee; he apparently encouraged them to stay on his committee, he accepted their services; and he, knowing that and not warning them, and they knowing it and acting as they did, they must accept all that they get. I say, Sir, and I believe I voice the feeling of this country from one end to the other—that men who became offensive partisans in the recent election are not fit men to hold office in this country. These men became bold. Election after election the Tory party had won at the polls. They read the speeches which hon. gentlemen opposite made over here, in which they said: The Liberal party can never get into power; unless you change your policy it will be fifty years before you get into power; and those poor fellows no doubt felt that they would be dead by that time, and that it made little difference to them what would be done after that. But, as my hon. friend says, the whirligig of time bring its revenges. We have beaten you—beaten you badly. You think you are going to get into power again in two years. Do not deceive yourselves. I tell you, confidentially, we are going to stay here for twenty years, and we will stay longer unless we commit political suicide, as you people did. I want to tell you, moreover, that there is no nest of traitors on our side. We are true to a man to that leader. Hon. gentlemen think they can create a little dissention by naming this man or that man who did not get into the Cabinet. We are Liberals; we are not looking for the loaves and fishes. We are fighting for great principles, and it is a matter of indifference to us whether we are in the Cabinet or out of it. All we want are the principles, and we want a man in whom we have confidence to lead us in fighting for those principles, and we have him here to-day. There is not one man on this side of the House, let me tell you—not one man—who will be found wanting to Mr. Laurier whenever he is called upon. And more than that. In this House there are men who have been elected as independent members. When they find out the party that has been assailing us, when they become familiar with the policy of that party, when they become acquainted with the terrible corruption that has characterized the history of that party, when they know our leader better, and when they know our Liberal friends better, independent though they be, they will be bound, because conscience will drive them, to ally themselves with the Liberal party. Now, the Government is acting in no spirit of revenge. We want the public service of this country to be kept pure. We want public officials to know that the moment they take a commission from the Government, they are to cease to be partisans, and to devote the rest of their lives to the public interests of this country; and the only way to make them know that is to place upon them an iron hand, to make them feel that a departure from this sound principle means that they can no longer serve this country. They have of course the right to return to the occupation they left in order to enter the public service, and to enter into competition with the other people of the country. But as civil servants they have no right to remain; and I only repeat that if the Government falter in this policy, they will be disappointing their own friends, and not only their own friends, but the Conservative party in the country, who knew that if we succeeded to power those men must go out.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I was not permitted by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) the courtesy of setting him right, in the interruption I made when he was speaking. The hon. gentleman was quite wrong if he imagined that I asked him so stupid a question as where he resided. I knew perfectly well where he resided. But I did ask, what seems to me a very simple and pertinent question. I asked him to name one of the parties to whom he made reference. The answer I received was not a very courteous one; and I am bound to say that if any hon. gentleman in this House risks its indulgence, I am afraid that he does, and "Hansard" will give abundant evidence of it in the speeches of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman says that the Liberal party is fighting for great principles in this country, and he has given a striking example of what those principles are. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one principle above all others on which we can hope to govern this country, it is that every public servant of the country does not hold his office at the smile or beck of any political party—that whether he shall retain his office or not shall entirely depend on his respectability and his competency to discharge the duties of that office.

Mr. LISTER. And his non-partisanship.

Mr. CLANCY. I will come to that later, and we shall see whether my hon. friend

has acted on the principles he has enunciated this afternoon. I repeat that no public official in this country should be discharged on any ground except that he is not discharging the duties pertaining to his office or is not qualified to discharge them. My hon. friend, I presume, was going to give us some authority, and I am not going to question his authority, but I would ask him to reconcile his practice with the authority he was about to quote. Just let us see what the grand principles and the practices of those hon. gentlemen are. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the local machinery to which I am about to refer is about the most aggressive that could be instituted—one more overpowering in its influence and capable of helping a political party in a larger degree than any machinery pertaining to the Dominion Government. Just let me take the list. I may begin with the division court clerks and bailiffs. What is the position of those men ? Their position is such that they may not only persuade a man and make public speeches and use the legitimate influences that belong to every citizen in this country, but they can put the screws on those who cannot be persuaded, they can promise the debtor a little longer delay, if he will vote for their candidate. They can say to him : We will not press this execution, or such an execution will not issue ; and there is no influence greater than the one which the creditor can exercise over the debtor. Then take the license commissioners, who are they ? I need hardly call the attention of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) to their influence, because he has these men for his most active canvassers. Are the influences which they wield those of ordinary citizens who go so far as to be abusive, according to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries? That hon. gentleman seems to have been particularly unfortunate in having been abused. Why, Sir, a man who holds a license in the province of Ontario, holds it at the peril of his bread and butter. If he is a Conservative, he is told that if he does not vote for the Liberal party, he must at least be silent ; and he cannot be silent long, if he is silent during one election he must vote for the Liberal candidate at the next or lose his head. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see that they cannot have all the profits that come from that sort of thing without also sharing the odium that comes of it, and they cannot comfort themselves by laying down those grand principles for which my hon. friend is ready to lay down his life while following practices entirely at variance with those priciples. If the hon. member for Lambton's practices are to be consistent with his professions, he should lay down a new rule. He should go to West Lambton and tell his friends that they have not acted properly, he should tell the division clerks that they must cease to be his canvassers, emissaries and heelers, he should tell the commissioners the same thing. For the first time in the history of this country, the Liberal party is prepared to lay down a new rule, and their sole motive is to clean out the offices which are held by Conservatives in this country. I was astounded to hear the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries say that it was not necessary to hold an investigation in such cases. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and I am led to believe a good lawyer. I ask him if that is the means by which justice is done in this country ? I ask him if that is the way persons are treated in the courts of this country ? Let me tell the hon. gentleman that no sound rule or practice affecting the right of any individual may be departed from—I care not whether he be a public official or not, and I care not whether sentence be pronounced against him and carried out by the Minister of the Crown, or one of the courts of the land—such a sound principle cannot be departed from with impunity. If you were to start a practice of that kind, you would at once open the doors to the vicious system that obtains across the line, under which the dominant party makes a clean sweep of the appointments held by friends of the defeated party.

Mr. LISTER. We will cure the evil.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very strange that my hon. friend wants a cure just now. It is very strange that he did not try to cure the evil at home. The hon. gentleman who was leader of the Ontario Government for so many years winked at that sort of thing for many years, and took all the profits that came from it ; and now my hon. friend, when he has got into office, says there is a great evil and that he intends to eradicate it. I say that if we enter upon the system contemplated by hon. gentlemen opposite, it will simply mean that every public official will be in the hands of a dominant political party, and his liberty, as a man, will cease to exist. I would like to ask where we are going to draw the line ? Must a man go quietly and give his vote ? Must he conceal it from both sides ? Is he not to be allowed to say that he belongs to the one political party or the other ? As soon as we open the door for that kind of thing, so soon will hon. gentlemen lay down a new rule and practice in this country. I do not believe in men being unduly active or in any sense offensive in political contests, whether they hold office in either one or the other government of this country. But I do believe that we should take these things as we find them, and be prepared to give such treatment to our political opponents as we would be willing to have meted out to us in similar circumstances. I could point out to you, Sir, that the most active workers in the contest in the county of Bothwell were the officials of the Ontario government. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) wants to know whether I will give him the names. They are very respectable gentlemen, and I have nothing to say

against their character, but I do say that I know they were the most active agents of my opponent. They had the weapons in their hands, and they used them most unsparingly in the contest. I do not propose to go further in this discussion, but I do say that it would be the most unfortunate thing that has ever taken place in Canada if hon. gentlemen on the other side were to lay down and carry out the rule and practice enunciated by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day. What would such a rule mean ? It would mean that any gentleman in an office is disqualified if he has been a partisan and has taken an active part in a political contest, either in the present or the past.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never laid down any such rule. He may have been in years past an active partisan, but I spoke of his having acted in a partisan way after he became a civil servant.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so. Then we will take the case of a man who is an active partisan after becoming a civil servant. That seems to be the reason in the mind of the hon. gentleman why he should be dismissed. But it would appear that the hon. gentleman has found, as specially qualified to fill his place, a man who had been guilty of just the same thing in supporting the party who are in power to-day. I would like the hon. gentleman to justify the rule. I would like him to point out why, if the one man were to be dismissed who, upon the ground of taking an active part in the contest, another should be placed in that position who had offended in the same way against the party going out. These things are absolutely irreconcilable, and show that in attempting to reconcile them the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. He will have to have a very large basket if all the heads are to go into it. It is a custom that has grown up in this country, but I do not say that it is a good custom ; but I say the hon. gentleman has a herculean task before him if he intends to make places for his friends on account of the sins or alleged sins of which his own friends furnished the most striking example.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The matter now before the House is one of considerable interest to a large number of people throughout the country at the present time. But I shall detain the House only with a few words. I am glad to hear the announcement made by the hon. gentleman representing the Government here to-day that no member of the civil service has imperilled his position because he voted in the late election, or even took an honourable part in supporting his party ; and I do think that as a new member, the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has not done justice to himself in misrepresenting the position taken by a member of the Government. I hope the Government will be generous in dealing with this matter, that no postmaster, for instance, will be dismissed without an investigation being made, unless the Government are satisfied beyond any doubt that he has been guilty of improper action of the worst kind. I say that because I want men holding positions in the civil service to feel that, so long as they discharge their duties properly and behave themselves as citizens occupying these positions, they will not be interfered with by any political party. But, Sir, I hold that there is something more than party interest involved in this : we have to consider the public interests of this country. During the last election, and for several elections past, we have found men occupying good positions in the civil service emboldened in doing wrong, not only being active partisans, but being dishonest and corrupt in their actions during the elections ; and that, I say, is against the public interest, and it will be an injury to the country to allow that kind of thing to be backed up by any party. In the interests of the public service I trust that men, when they accept these positions, will understand that they are to be faithful in the discharge of their duties and that, while they have the right to vote and to take an honourable part, as honourable men, in the elections, they are not to be blackguards, they are not to be guilty of dishonesty and corruption. But if any of them are so guilty—and there are hundreds of such cases which have been brought to my notice in the election—then, not only in the interests of a party but in the public interest, their conduct should be taken notice of by this Government. There were men who declared publicly while taking part in the election that they were prepared to give up their positions, and in many cases these were the first men to come around and say that they had not done anything that would justify their being interfered with. I know men who declared that they would resign if the Liberals were successful. But no man who had the courage to give up his position would make use of such methods. Their object was simply to make the electors believe that it was quite impossible that the Liberals could come into power. One of them went so far as to say : Do you suppose that I would serve under a Papist Premier. That is the sort of canvass that we had to meet, carried on actively and openly on the streets.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Hon. gentlemen laugh. I said to one of the men who was talking in this strain : How about your late leaders ? And his answer was : Oh, I forgive them ; they were only trying to humbug the Roman Catholics and get their votes. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to see this Government do, or to support the Government in doing, the slightest injustice to any man in the civil service.

On the contrary, so long as he even more than voted, but acted as an honourable man, I have nothing to say. But where an investigation is held and where it is found that a public servant neglected his duties and was guilty of dishonesty, of corruption, of trying to debauch public opinion in this country, then, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says, the Government will meet the wishes not only of the Liberal party, not only of the civil service, of a great majority of Conservatives who found fault with members of the civil service who were emboldened by the late Government to engage in the operations to which I have referred, if they will punish those officials by dismissal.

Mr. CASEY. I am rather amused at the style of the discourse with which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has chosen to make his first appearance before this House. It would seem that it is entirely impossible for him to remember that he is not sitting in the legislative assembly chamber in Toronto, for the bulk of his speech was made up of an arraignment of the government lately led by Sir Oliver Mowat, for its conduct, or rather for the conduct of its servants, in past elections. So far as that goes, we are not concerned to defend the Ontario officials in respect of their actions in the Ontario elections: that is a matter with which we have nothing to do. But I beg to call the attention of the House to one fact—that my hon. friend who now represents Bothwell, and the Opposition with whom he acted in the legislative assembly, have been trying for twenty-three or twenty-four years to induce the people of Ontario to dismiss what we used to call the Mowat government, on the ground of the interference of its civil servants in local elections, and to this day they have been signally unsuccessful. The Opposition conducted on such picayune lines, conducted in the spirit of the hon. gentleman's speech here to-day, has been successful in reducing its numbers from a considerable percentage of that House to a miserable fraction of it. I hope the hon. gentleman will continue these tactics here, for I feel that such speeches as his will have the same effect on the numbers of the Opposition in this House as they have had upon the numbers of the Opposition in the local House.

But the hon. gentleman has another grievance. He tells us that Ontario government officials, who are mostly Liberals, of course, are wicked enough to interfere in Dominion elections. He says that some of them were bold and bad enough to organize opposition to himself in Bothwell. I do not see any reason why Ontario government officials should not interfere in Dominion elections. They are not appointed by this Government; they are not responsible to any Government that may be in power here. I do not see why the officials of the local government should be disfranchised in connection with Dominion elections, even to the extent of being prevented from taking an active part in these elections.

However, that is a purely speculative opinion on a subject with which this House has no concern. What we are concerned with is the conduct of officials appointed by this Government, and the conduct of the Government. But first I must correct one misstatement with regard to these officials. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) charges that the Ontario government puts the screws on license commissioners, bailiffs and others under their control. He tells you that the men who hold licenses to sell liquor in Ontario, hold them in fear and trembling, and dare not use their vote freely under stress of threats. Well, Sir, we on both sides of this House who represent Ontario constituencies, know that that is simply not so. I cannot put it in parliamentary language any clearer than that. But those from the other provinces may not be aware of the fact, and I think it therefore worth while to deny that statement as directly as any statement can be denied in parliamentary language. We all know that a majority of the license holders in Ontario are Conservatives; we all know that those Conservative license holders exercise their franchise as freely as anybody else, that they take the most active part possible in election campaigns consistently with the fear of injuring their own business by offending political opponents. Every tavern-keeper on either side of politics, takes his side actively, so far as he dare——

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I repeat, so far as he dare, with the chances of losing custom if he makes himself too great a nuisance to his political opponents. Every Ontario man knows, and the member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) knows, that the statement that Ontario license holders are bulldozed by the Ontario government or their commissioners, is simply fictitious.

Now, dropping Ontario altogether we come to the Dominion officials. My hon. friend from Bothwell would have us believe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is introducing a new plan of action when he says that men should suffer for partisan conduct during the election, if the other party should happen to come into power. It may be a new doctrine to my hon. friend from Bothwell, because he has not been long enough in politics to witness a change of administration in the only Parliament with which he has been connected. But it is no new doctrine in Dominion politics, nor British politics, nor in the politics of any country in the world. It must be clearly understood by all public servants that they are servants of the public, and that from the day they accept office, their duty is not to the party who appointed them, but to the public at large,

and that if they make partisan use of their position as public servants, even if while public servants they adopt an offensive and improper partisan tone, if they identify themselves with a party instead of with the public service, they are liable to go out with the party who put them in office and with whom they have bound themselves up. If they choose to commit suicide it is their own business. It is no new doctrine, it has always been the doctrine, though it has not always been properly followed out. Men have been dismissed improperly, and men have not been dismissed who should have been dismissed. But it has always been the accepted doctrine by both sides of the House.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) quibbles with the wording of the quotation read by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) as to the interference of public servants against the Government of the day. He would have you believe that it is all right for public officials to interfere on behalf of the Government, but all wrong for them to interfere against the Government. Well, that has been his doctrine, no doubt, while in office, and the doctrine of his party. They have not only allowed, but encouraged and compelled, public servants to interfere on behalf of the Government, and not one of those public servants dared raise his voice or so much as "cheep," to use a Scotch phrase, against the Government. Now, Sir, has that ever been the recognized policy of any great party? Never. That was an innovation, a malpractice, introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite when they held the reins of power. They simply adopted this, as well as other notions, from our cousins across the border. They adopted the Yankee system of bulldozing public servants, as they adopted the Yankee system of subsidizing minorities in the shape of monopolists. The course they pursued of compelling civil servants to support the Government of the day, was going far to Yankeefy our whole public service, and to put it in that condition in which the uncovenanted service of the United States now is. In that service they have gone of late years a little further than we have; they have what we may call a covenanted or reformed branch of the civil service. But, speaking of the civil service at large in the States, it is expected to be the organ of the party in power. It was attempted to introduce that system and that principle here, and it went as far and continued as long as the country kept the hon. gentlemen opposite in power. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries proposes to introduce the English practice, the doctrine which has always been considered to be sound doctrine, that neither for nor against the government of the day, should any civil servant take an active part in politics. I say it would be the greatest curse to this country if that old system had been perpetuated, if it became to be understood that for all the future the civil service was to be the organ of the party to whom they owed their appointments.

The older members of this House will know that I have urged, and am still prepared to urge, that the civil service should not be partisan, either in its appointment, in its action, or in the promotion of those who are already in that service. It may be too soon to get that reform carried into effect. This does not seem, perhaps, to be the most proper time to talk about it when such a large number of people are looking for places; but in the name of goodness let us take no step backwards. If we must maintain the system of political appointments, let us put every safeguard around the service to prevent it from being made a political machine after the appointment of its members. Now, that is all I understand the Government of the day intend to do. They intend to punish those who have made themselves, or allowed themselves to be made, political tools of the party that was lately in power. I hope they will enforce the same rule upon those whom they may appoint themselves, that they will tell these men: It is not your business to fight for the Government on the platform, or the hustings, or anywhere else, but to do your duty to the public in the position in which you have been placed. I hope and believe the Government will do so.

Now, the hon. member for Bothwell also made the totally gratuitous assumption and statement that this Government proposed to make way for their friends by turning out a great lot of people. Sir, many of us on this side of the House, whose mail is loaded with applications from day to day for positions in the public service, might be very apt to complain rather that the Government of the day has been very slack in creating vacancies for its friends. As a matter of fact, the number of vacancies it has created has been extremely meagre and small. I do not feel myself in a position to attack the Government for their moderation in creating vacancies; I believe they have laid down the proper policy and will follow it out to its conclusion. I cannot tell how many that practice may remove before it is fully carried out, but I think they are showing a grand example to the people of the country and to the members of this House, in not yielding to the pressure which has been undoubtedly put upon them to gratuitously dismiss people for the purpose of putting their own friends in office.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no complaint to make with the principle laid down by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, because I regard it is a proper one; nor with the remarks of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), for his views are very largely my views, that a

public servant, as long as he faithfully discharges his duty, although he may take a part in political contests, if he does it fairly, that man should not be dismissed until a proper investigation is made and sufficient evidence is forthcoming that he did otherwise. But I should like to know how that can be reconciled with the principle laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was very specific and very emphatic. He understood a civil servant could take no part, either active or inactive, against the Government of the day without running the chance of being removed from his position. The hon. gentleman would allow a civil servant the privilege to vote, but no more. If that were the case, it would be practically shutting out men from using the franchise, because under the Ontario law it is easy to tell how a man voted, and so long as the party knew how he voted there is no doubt his public position would be in danger.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) laid down another principle, and I thought it a very good one if it could be lived up to. It was that a man when he took office under the Crown was working for all the people, and that being a public servant he should be neutral. I believe that principle to be a sound one, comparatively speaking; but I wonder if the hon. gentleman considered the public officials in Ontario, of whom he must know so much. I wonder if he is prepared to admit that the principle should apply to Reformers as well as Conservatives. The hon. gentleman could not have considered this point, or he would not have declared that the principle was a sound one, because if it was a sound one, it was flagrantly violated, offensively and audaciously violated by the public servants appointed by the late Mowat Administration. There has not been a provincial election or a Dominion election during the last eighteen or twenty years in which those public servants have not been most active partisans on behalf of their friends in the country. There has not been an election run in my part of the country for the last twenty years in which those officials have not been the most active men on the committees, working day and night, and very often proving the most offensive political partisans in the community. Take the last election in North Grey at which the Controller of Customs was returned. Who took the most active part in that contest? We have heard a great deal about Dominion returning officers being partisans of the Government and not faithfully doing their duty, and it has been frequently stated that if we employed the sheriffs and registrars, as is done by the Provincial Government of Ontario, they would do their duty and nothing more and not act as partisans. Was that the case in the late contest? On that occasion the sheriff was appointed revising officer. The deputy of the sheriff was the most active man in the contest. Even when he was engaged in posting the proclamation he at the same time was putting up pictures of the leader of the Government. I met him over and over again, and he and other officials were engaged not only in trying to influence the electors, but I am informed, and I believe my information to be correct, that they were absolutely buying up votes, and almost incessantly going their rounds day and night.

Mr. GIBSON. Did you sleep?

Mr. SPROULE. I slept sufficiently for my need. But I was alive to the situation. I saw the deputy sheriff. I met him and his myrmidons time after time at hotel after hotel, engaged in influencing men to go out of the riding, to stay at home, or making preparations to haul them to the polls, and in every way influencing them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You did not want a royal commission to ascertain those facts which you saw for yourself?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about a royal commission; I am discussing whether this official was a partisan. I am talking about the principle laid down by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that so soon as a man became a public servant he should not be a partisan. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite: apply that principle to your own friends. Whom did we find actively employed in that county? Division court clerks, bailiffs, license commissioners, the license inspector. The license inspector for North Grey to my knowledge went around day after day influencing voters. He was in the polling booth, officiously dealing with men opposed to the party; and I say there was no stronger or more active partisan than the inspector of licenses in North Grey. What took place in the local election took place in the Dominion election. It does not matter with them whether it is a provincial or Dominion election; at all times these officials prove most offensive partisans in our part of the country. This is a crying abuse. Conservatives sometimes will not employ bailiffs and put cases in the division courts because they are afraid they will not get justice.

Mr. GIBSON. Do bailiffs try the cases?

Mr. SPROULE. They go around and collect the money, and that is more important work than trying the cases. Would the hon. gentleman employ a bailiff to levy an execution when he knew the bailiff would not attempt to collect the debt? What has he to say in defence of men who will not do their duty in that respect. The suspicion that justice will not be done is so strong that in many cases they are not employed; I have heard the statement made more than once.

Men in charge of post offices have been afraid to go to the polls lest they should be subsequently dismissed. I have heard this threat made in my own presence during the last fifteen days. They had been so intimidated that some of the postmasters refused to vote, although Conservatives in principle, and had been so during their whole lifetime. Why? They were afraid they would be turned out of office, because friends of the parties who have been active agents of the Government candidate told them time after time in my own village and in several other villages that if they dared take part in the election they would be turned out of office. That is unfair and unjust. I do not believe the Postmaster General, from what I know of him, would so act; but we are justified in bringing this matter to public notice because the threat has been so flagrantly made by supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite who have taken an active part in the recent election. If the principle is good, that a public servant should refrain from taking an active part in elections, it should hold good as regards provincial as well as Dominion officials, and when the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has applied this principle with respect to his own friends, then it will come with more force when he seeks to apply the principle here. It would be better to let charity begin at home, and for hon. gentlemen opposite to reform their own friends before they attempt to teach a lesson to others in this House. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) pretended to lay down what Lord Dufferin said with respect to this question when he was in Canada. I distinctly remember listening to His Lordship at that time, and I entirely disagree with what the hon. member for Lambton has stated. I think the whole tenor of Lord Dufferin's advice was that we should not adopt the American system,—to the victors belong the spoils, but that so long as a public official discharged his duties faithfully and honestly he should not be removed. I regarded it as a sound principle then, and I do the same to-day. I have been eighteen years in public life, and on many, many occasions, have friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite holding public positions in my riding taken a most active part against me. I refused to ask for their dismissal because they did so. I held it to be the sound principle, that so long as any of these men discharged his duty faithfully no political party should interfere with him. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see a letter published in the press some time ago, written by yourself, Sir, in the year 1878, with regard to this very question, and the principles enunciated in your letter were entirely in accord with my view of what is correct. I rose more particularly to refer to the offensive active partisanship of the public officials connected with the Mowat government in Ontario, either in Dominion or provincial elections, and to say, that there are men supporting this Government to-day who knew these things, and who winked at them, and who never remonstrated with their friends. It is not for these men to-day to read a homily to hon. gentlemen here about the violation of this principle. Take the division court clerks, the division court bailiffs, the license commissioners, the license inspectors, the issuers of marriage licenses, and there is not a political committee appointed in Ontario in which three or four of them are not to be found taking a most active partisan part. That is wrong, and I have always held it to be wrong. The sooner a reform is made in that respect the better, and the greater the credit to hon. gentlemen will be, if they try to set their friends right in this respect rather than to condemn the friends of their opponents.

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House long, but in one way I consider this a very important discussion, and I think it most important that both sides of the House should have a distinct understanding with respect to it. I do not propose like a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House, to discuss the motives of others. I wish as far as possible to get a distinct understanding of what the leaders of the Government think the proper principle is. I am most desirous for that, because I confess that to-day I have been given a different view of it from that which I believed to be the correct one, and from that upon which I have acted for the last ten years, having had some experience in matters of this sort. I did not understand the Minister of Marine to say exactly what my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) understood him. I did not understand him (Mr. Davies) to say that a man had no right to do anything more than vote. He said, that an official had a perfect right to vote, but I did not understand him to say anything more than that if an official acted as an offensive partisan, he thought he should be dismissed. If that is the rule I for my part have no objection to it. The difficulty will arise in all such cases to draw the line as to what partisanship is, and we must depend upon the fairness of hon. gentlemen on both sides to apply that rule. I can understand very well that it is impossible to make such a rule hard and fast. I should regret most exceedingly if the opinion on either side of this House, was, that a narrow construction should be put upon the principle, and that it should be laid down that those who have the right to vote, should be deprived from expressing their opinions like men in an honourable and straightforward, but at the same time not a prominent manner. If men appointed to these positions are fit for their duties, it would be making slaves of them to prevent them expressing their opinions on political questions, always providing that they express them in

a proper way. I do not believe, from anything I have heard yet, that it is the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to prevent men expressing their opinions fairly and moderately. So far as I am concerned I have always acted on that principle. The first time I had the honour of a seat in this House, in 1887, the Secretary of the Reform Association in my riding was postmaster in quite a large village, where the salary was a consideration to him. He was a gentleman; he did not go on the stump; I knew he was in the committee of my opponents, but I knew of nothing dishonourable or discreditable or offensive in any manner in his actions. I was asked by my committee to have him removed, but I told them, that I would not present such an application to the Minister unless they could prove the charge that he had not properly fulfilled the duties of his office. We all knew that he was a Reformer, and he was appointed because he was a Reformer by a Reform Government, but that was the action I took in the case, and in some other instances I took the same view. I believed until to-day that this was the proper view for both of the great political parties to adopt, and I shall much regret if any narrower view is taken. I am quite prepared to concede that occasionally both political parties in applying the rule as to what is offensive have in my opinion made mistakes. I have heard cases discussed in the House and if I had a vote upon them, though it was the action of a Minister whom I supported, I most certainly would have voted against him. I believe that if we give officials the right to vote, they should have the right quietly and calmly to express their opinions. I do not mean that they should go on the stump and become speakers or active men in that sense. But it is the right of an honourable man in connection with his franchise to express his view in a proper and a moderate manner. I am very glad, that as I understood the Minister of Marine, he did not go to the narrow extent that my friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) seems to have understood.

Mr. SPROULE. I must have misunderstood him, then.

Mr. TISDALE. I am sorry that I have to disagree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on one point, and I ask him to reconsider his position in this particular. What he knows of his own knowledge may be sufficient to guide him, but I am entirely against him if he puts himself in the pale of discharging a man even of his own knowledge, without giving that man the right to reply. Far be it from me to make any attack upon the Government in reference to this. It is too serious a matter for the officials concerned, and it is too small a matter for great political parties not to have a fair understanding about it. I do not propose to refer, even to the conduct of Ontario officials, although it is not satisfactory. We will try and redress that. I quite agree that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were justified in bringing forward such cases from the conduct of officers of provincial governments, in answer to my friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) who is always a hard hitter. I ask the Minister (Mr. Davies) to reconsider his position. I ask him to have an investigation and to give an officer a chance to reply even though the Minister knows certain things of his own knowledge. That was always my belief. I have expresed it before in regard to action taken by my hon. friend beside me (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in regard to a gentleman in his department, from my county, and I pressed upon him that the officer should have the right to be heard. I believe that the better sense and judgment of both sides of the House will agree with that, and I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will take off the head of no man without giving him a chance to make his defence.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The charges made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) with reference to certain officials in my department are very serious, and they are not the first accusations that have been brought before me as Controller of Inland Revenue. Now, I should consider it my duty to give a careful investigation to every one of these accusations, and if a public officer is found guilty he will be dismissed at once, whether he is found guilty of neglecting his official duties or whether he is found guilty of taking such a partisan part in elections as his common sense and his feeling of justice should tell him not to take. If he is found guilty after having had a fair chance of defending himself he should be discharged, and I believe that on both sides of the House such an act would be upheld. It is very difficult to define the exact limits within which a public officer can properly exercise his franchise as a citizen; but I think that he ought to have not only such a feeling as ought to characterize a gentleman in whatever position he finds himself, but also the common sense to understand that a public official is not a servant of a party, but a servant of his country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with a great deal of pleasure to the distinguished gentleman who occupies the position of Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), and it appears to me that he has come nearer than any of the hon. gentlemen to whom I have listened in defining the principles upon which he proposes to act. As I understand, he first states that no officer will be decapitated until he has an opportunity of answering the charges made against him. That is the first principle which we have well defined, and it is a very important admission and a very important announcement from the Government

of the day. As the hon. gentleman was speaking, I am sure, with the full authority of the other members of the Government, that opinion is of course concurred in by his leader and the other gentlemen who sit around him.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I must beg the hon. gentleman's pardon if I interrupt him for one moment. I may say that I did not consult any of my colleagues in making this declaration, though I feel sure that every one of them would endorse it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. An announcement made by a member of the Government is an announcement of the entire Government, if I understand the principle of parliamentary government; otherwise the hon. gentleman must retire from the Government that is if, upon an independent matter of this kind, he differs from his colleagues. That is the first principle the hon. gentleman laid down. The second question on which I wish a declaration of principle is this: What is to be considered offensive partisanship? Is the action of a Conservative office-holder working for his party to be considered offensive partisanship?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hear a general consensus of approval. Then I want to ask the other question: Is the action of a Liberal office-holder working for his party to be considered offensive partisanship?

An hon. MEMBER. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Certainly, say some of the members of the Government. Then, I ask, if, on account of the decapitation of Conservative office-holders for working for their party, I bring to the attention of the Government charges that Liberal office-holders, men who for years have held their positions under Conservative administrations, have been acting in support of the Liberal party, will they be dismissed?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There are mighty few of them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not an answer to the question which I am asking the members of the Government. I concur decidedly in the opinion of the distinguished Controller of Inland Revenue that a man appointed to a position in the public service is appointed to serve his country; but, Sir, I do not think that government by party has become so partisan in this country that partisanship on one side shall be considered an offence, while partisanship on the other side shall be considered meritorious and defensible on the part of the Government. Sir, if we are to have partisanship cleared entirely out of the public service, let us have partisanship on both sides cleared out of the public service. I do not now speak of provincial government employees; I speak of Dominion Government employees; and I can give my hon. friends, if they will promise me to act upon them, the names of a number of Dominion civil servants who did their best, both offensively and otherwise, for hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to-day; and what I want from them is an answer to the question, whether, if these facts are laid before them, they will act with regard to them as they declare they will act towards men who hold Conservative principles, and who were men enough to back up those Conservative principles in the recept campaign.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has waxed very warm in the discussion of this matter. He says he can give the names of a number of Dominion officials who acted as partisans on behalf of the Reform party in the recent contest. I would like to know, Sir, where those men got their appointments. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the Conservative party were in power for 18 years, and the men who have held appointments for a longer period must certainly be very few. Not a single Reformer to my knowledge has been appointed to a public position in this Dominion by hon. gentlemen opposite for the last 18 years.

Mr. DAVIN. I can give you some.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the Reformers appointed by the Mackenzie Government who remain in the service must certainly be very few. So that I cannot understand the statement of the hon. member that he can name a number of men in the public service belonging to the Reform party who took part in the elections. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) would like to know to what extent a man is allowed to express his views with regard to a candidate—whether a man merely is permitted to record his vote, and nothing more. I think, Mr. Speaker, that anything beyond the simple recording of his vote as an elector is improper on the part of an office-holder. I do not think any man drawing public money from the Dominion treasury should take any active part, or even go so far as to express his views publicly or privately with regard to the party that should hold office in this country, seeing that the money he draws belongs to both classes in the country. But I can easily understand why hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to have a broad and liberal view taken of this whole matter. A great many of the relations of hon. gentlemen opposite are no doubt office-holders, and these people have no doubt taken a very active part in the last election, not only on behalf of the party but on behalf of their own blood relations; and therefore these gentlemen are very anxious to secure a very liberal construction of the rights of officials

of this kind, so that they may possibly escape losing their official heads under the rule that has been laid down by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). Now with regard to another point which was touched upon by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), namely, that a certain postmaster took a very prominent and active part against him in 1887, and did all he could personally, by the exercise of any little influence he had, to secure his defeat. I can offset that complaint by stating that in the riding where he lived, a postmaster, who was president of the Conservative association there for some time, did all he possibly could against me in the elections, and was a most active partisan. I have not named him and do not intend to, but my hon. friend must know that he is not the only individual who has suffered by an opponent of his politically taking an active part against him, because in many other cases men have taken a very prominent and active part in the elections who hold public offices, and who, I am sure, will not be visited with that punishment that, in many instances, in my humble opinion, they deserve. I think that in this matter the principle should be laid down and applied to both sides, and I am quite satisfied that it should apply to provincial officials if you like. I do not think that we should at all encourage the idea that men holding public official positions and drawing public money should be permitted to take an active and prominent part in the elections. I do not think that this should be tolerated, and I believe that an example should be made of men who take their official life in their hands, by calling upon them to resign, and by dismissing them if they do not resign. We must have an end of this kind of thing. A great many complaints have been made with regard to the conduct of Ontario officials who may have taken a prominent part in the elections; but when it comes to the time of hon. gentlemen opposite to get on the Treasury benches in Ontario, we shall have no objections to their applying the same rule that we apply here. But while we are dealing with officials belonging to this House and Government, we should carry out the principle that men who will publicly take their official life in their hands by entering into a bitter and determined opposition to one of the political parties in this Dominion and by fighting for those who gave them their position, they must be made to realize that they must suffer the consequences. I hope that in every department where men have been guilty of that conduct, there will be some standard of justice by which all shall be judged, and that no exception will be made in the case of any man guilty of impropriety of that kind.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I understood rightly the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) last night, he informed the House and the country that he had left the Conservative party and gone over to the Reform party because everything was not happy and there was not union among the Conservatives, whereas he had found a land flowing with milk and honey and full of peace and harmony on the Government side. Well, Mr. Speaker, after having heard the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) lay down one platform and the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly) lay down another, I could not help coming to the conclusion that all is not peace and harmony on that side. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) comes down with his sledge hammer and declares that if any official has taken an active part in politics, his head shall be cut off and that if the Government did not follow such a course, they would not meet the expectations of their friends in the country. We have the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) making the statement that he himself had dismissed an official without giving him a trial, without judge or jury, although that official had been appointed by Order in Council. And then we find the genial whip, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) laying down the rule which all must obey, as a sound one, and threatening with the lash all who do not obey it. Well, I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the members of the Government, will apply the rule thus laid down in a case which I shall submit to them, and in which that rule is particularly applicable. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) to the case of Dr. Chamberlain, the Inspector of Prisons for Ontario, and would ask him to put that rule in force with regard to that gentleman.

Mr. LISTER. He is not in the Dominion civil service.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are talking of the civil service generally. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the conduct of an official of his, Dr. Chamberlain.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). What has he to do with him?

Mr. TAYLOR. He is an official of the Ontario Government, of which the hon. Minister of Justice was the head for years.

Mr. DEVLIN. The Ontario Government is not here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That makes the difference.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, it makes a difference whose ox is gored. I wished to say that Dr. Chamberlain came to my county on the 16th May last to organize for the Reform party, on behalf of my Grit opponent, Mr. Fredenburg. At the same time he steered the Patron candidate, and managed both

meetings, and presided at the joint meeting. He organized all through the county. He stumped at every meeting held by the Reform candidate. He spoke at the nomination both in favour of the Reform and Patron candidates. He went throughout the country collecting subscriptions, and on the Sunday preceding the nomination, which is what I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) particularly to, he travelled throughout the county with his satchel, visiting every town and village, calling on the leading men, and thus spent the whole Sabbath day. Whether he distributed boodle or not, I do not know. He certainly visited all the headquarters of the gang throughout the county carrying his bag, and the bag, we know, had lots in it. Then he went to North Grey.

Mr. DEVLIN. On Sunday ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No ; I was up in North Grey, and the first individual I met there was the same Inspector of Prisons, Mr. Chamberlain. Now, if public officials are to have their heads cut off for having taken a prominent part in the elections, and an offensive part, such as my friend, Dr. Chamberlain, did in the South Leeds election—for he was very offensive to myself both on the street and on the hustings—I ask my hon. friends to apply that rule to their friends in Ontario. What is a fair law to lay down here ought to be a proper one to apply in the local House. I believe in the principle laid down by my hon. friend and colleague, the whip of the Government, but not the doctrine laid down by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) of chopping a man's head off without giving him a trial. The Conservative party will not dismiss any man without first giving him a fair trial, and will not dismiss him for giving his vote and conducting himself as an hon. gentleman ought to in advocating honourably the claims of his party. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, however, cuts a man's head off first and tries him afterwards.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He does not try him at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I have hundreds of charges made, and have not acted upon any of them except those in which the facts were within my own knowledge.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman knows that he has dismissed one gentleman, who was appointed by Order in Council, without giving him a trial at all, and he did that on his own authority. I ask him and the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue to settle the difficulty when they meet at the Council board. Now, if this medicine is to be applied by the hon. gentlemen who are now in power here, surely they will go to their friends in the local government and ask them to give their officials the same medicine. I may refer particularly to a gentleman who receives a salary of $2,500 a year from the people of this province for services in connection with the prisons, but who spent five weeks away from the prisons of the province, remaining in a riding in which an election was going on, and taking an active part in that election—and this while Sir Oliver Mowat was Premier of the province. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) referred to the license commissioners and bailiffs, and the work they do in attempting to control the votes of the people. And not only did Sir Oliver Mowat allow these officials to do this work, but he put a number on every ballot, so that if the holder of a hotel license did not vote as he was directed and as the inspectors insisted they should, he could ascertain that fact. He would not do as this Government has done—give the people a really secret ballot, but he kept a check on all so that he might know those who did not carry out his directions, and support his candidates. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) made the statement that no license commissioner ever interfered with a man on account of his politics. In this very city of Ottawa, a few years ago, the late John Graham, keeper of the Grand Union hotel, was informed by the commissioners that if he took an active part in the election he would not get his license. His license was cancelled, and only after a letter had been written by the late Alexander Mackenzie was his license restored. I was stopping in the house at the time, so the case came under my own observation. Mr. Mackenzie, who was boarding there also, wrote the letter I refer to, and a permit was granted to Mr. Graham, and the next year he got his license. And there are hundreds of cases all over the country of the license law being made to do duty for the Reform party in the province of Ontario. I merely rose to draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite and of the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) to conduct that I consider outrageous on the part of an officer of the provincial government of Ontario during the last campaign, and to express the hope that when they get around the Council board to discuss this question and agree upon a policy—for it is evident from the statements made by the Ministers that they are not agreed yet—they will decide to commend that policy, it is a fair one, to the attention of their friends in the provincial governments.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If I understand the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) he charged the Liberal-Conservative party with dismissing officials who took part in the elections against that party. If that was the statement he made, I wish to take exception to it with respect to the county I have the honour to represent. This

is the thirteenth successive session I have sat in this House, and during that time I have run five elections. During every election I ran I was opposed by Dominion officials, some of them occupying important positions in my constituency. Yet I never asked the Government, or any member of the Government I was supporting, to dismiss any official on that ground. But as the hon. Minister has made the charge, I think it only fair that I should take this opportunity of stating circumstances within my own knowledge as to the manner in which Dominion officials have been dealt with in my county. I could name a number of gentlemen who occupy the Government positions in my county who took part in the elections against me and against the hon. member of the late Government running in the same county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did the hon. gentleman say that he would mention their names ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I could give the names of several in my county.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will give the names of some of those I refer to, as the hon. gentleman has asked it. One of these is Dr. McGillivray, Marine Hospital physician at Sydney. Another is Captain Lorway, port warden of Sydney.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are not both these officers paid by fees ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No. Dr. McGillivray is the physician for the marine hospital. The hon. gentleman knows that that is a salaried position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Did not the hon. gentleman reduce Dr. McGillivray's salary in order to drive him out ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not. I never attempted it. I never heard about it being done or attempted. I would like to know what the Minister of Finance means by asking whether I reduced Dr. McGillivray's salary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I do accept it. But he has asked me to explain, so I may say that I have been informed that the effort was made to drive Dr. McGillivray out of office by reducing his salary, and he intimated that if they wished to dismiss him, they might do so, but if they reduced his salary even to $10 a year, he would not resign.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This is the first I ever heard of it. As I said before, I never brought the matter of his conduct to the attention of the Minister of the department nor that of any member of the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was his salary reduced ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know nothing as to his salary. I never interfered with regard to it. I never had an application made to me with respect to his salary, so far as I can remember. I will continue the list of names from memory. There is the light-keeper at the west point of Scatterie Island, a Mr. Burke. There has not been an election in which I have run as the representative of the party to which I belong but this gentleman and family have taken a most active part against me. The light-keeper at Low Point has also always been recognized as a strong opponent of the Liberal-Conservative party. I am sure he never voted for me, but he has canvassed and spoken against me and my colleagues. I could name a number of postmasters throughout the county who have also taken part against me. Any person who knows anything about the post office service of the country must know that there must be a large number of postmasters still in office who were appointed by the Liberal party when in power. There are several in my own county who take an active part against me and my colleagues in our election contests in the county. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke a few moments ago about the dismissal of the light-keeper at St. Paul's Island, it occurred to me that I had gone to visit the department and talk to the Minister about it. I know Mr. Campbell who occupied that position. I know him personally very well, we were on the most friendly terms with each other, and I was induced to approach the Minister, and to express my opinion that perhaps it would be as well not to dismiss him.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire now, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on the subject of the dismissal of the late light-keeper at St. Paul's Island, referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Before proceeding with that part of the question, I beg again to refer to the part that was taken by certain government officials in my county in the several elections I have had the honour of conducting during the last thirteen years. I have already given the names of a number of those officials, and the names of some others have come to my mind since, gentlemen who have always taken an active part in my county against myself, and against the candidates of the Liberal-Conservative party in that county since I have had the honour to be in politics. Mr. Christie, postmaster at Little Bras d'Or, has always taken an active part against the Liberal-Conservative candidate in the county, both Dominion and local ; and his sons, acting as

assistants, have done the same thing. Mr. Luke Day, postmaster of George's River, has taken a similar part in all the elections that I know of in the county, and he was appointed postmaster some time previous to my coming into this House. This gentleman, I may say, was at a meeting which I was addressing in a certain section of the county during the recent election, and undertook to get up and interrupt me at the meeting in a most insulting manner. I never made a complaint against him, this is my first reference, in public or otherwise, to the fact, and I would not have referred to it to-night were it not for the manner in which those matters were referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. George Ball, postmaster at Ball's Creek, also took an active part against us in our election, and against my hon. friend and colleague when he went to the county for election last winter. Mr. Thomas Fortune, a postmaster at Victoria Mines, took a most active part in all the elections that our party ran in the county since I can remember. Mr. Fortune could not find words bad enough in the vocabulary of slander to use against the Conservative party and the Conservative Government. Still, I never made a complaint against him, although many of my friends had called my attention to it and urged me to bring about his dismissal for his conduct. A man named Michael McMillen, filling the position of postmaster at Rear of Ball's Creek, was also an active opponent of ours. He was dismissed from office some time about a year ago, but not at my request, and not to my knowledge, as I knew nothing of his dismissal until the Postmaster General requested me to make a nomination for the place rendered vacant by his dismissal. So far as I could understand, the ground on which he was dismissed was violation of duty, or some neglect, or some malfeasance of the duties of the office which he held. There were a number of other postmasters who have always taken an active part against me in the county, but I made no complaint against them, and some of them have died. Now, that is my experience, Mr. Speaker, with the conduct of government officials filling the position of postmaster and other positions in our county. Everybody knows that a postmaster can wield considerable influence in his district, because he is in daily communication with the people who come with their mails and for their mails to the office. He has access to the public papers and correspondence that comes open to his office, that is read in his office by opponents of the Government, and so on. In that way he is the medium by which people who frequent his office get a great deal of information they would not otherwise get. A postmaster is therefore an influential man in a community when he takes any part in politics. In my relations with these men, as I stated to the House before six o'clock, I remember no instance in which I made complaints to the Government, or to any member of the Government, during the 13 sessions I have sat in this House, notwithstanding that they had acted towards me and towards my party in the manner I have described. In regard to the conduct of public officials, I feel that the principle I have always acted upon is a fair one; I feel that a public official has no right to take an active part against the Government under which he is serving for the time being. I feel that if, on the other hand, he takes part beyond voting against the Government whom he has served for the time being, he takes the life of his position in his hands by so doing. That is the view I take of this question.

Mr. LISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Well, I cannot see where my hon. friend gets any comfort from my remarks in view of the way in which gentlemen on the Government side have addressed themselves to this question during this debate. Those officials who took part in the last election, whether on behalf or against the Government of the day, did so in respect of the Government that was defeated on the 23rd June last. Now, I consider that it was quite proper for any official to take part in favour of that Government up to the time that Government ceased to be a government; while on the other hand, I contend that it was highly improper for an official of the Government to oppose that government beyond voting until they were turned out of power, or resigned.

In reference to my remarks made before six o'clock in regard to the conduct of Dr. McGillivray, marine hospital physician at Sydney, the Finance Minister interrupted me, and since then I have been trying to think the matter over which he mentioned, and I cannot recall a single instance in which the salary of Dr. McGillivray was brought to my notice, or that I interfered with it in any respect whatever. Before proceeding further with my remarks, I would ask the Finance Minister if he has come into possession of any facts bearing upon this question which he can give me to refresh my memory in any way after the statement I have already made to the House. If he can refresh my memory by any information that has come to his knowledge since that time, I will be glad to hear it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I was informed by an authority which I believe to be reliable, that Dr. McGillivray had been appointed to the office mentioned by the hon. gentleman some years ago. But after the change of Government in 1878, efforts were made to retire that gentleman from that position; that no substantial charge could be found to have been

made against him; that he has not been an active partisan—and I wish the hon. gentleman to note that remark as a denial of the statement he made that Dr. McGillivray had been an active partisan—but that with the view of compelling his retirement from the office his salary was reduced. I am not in a position to state here—and so far as that is concerned, I can relieve the hon. gentleman from the matter, as I have been informed of it since the transaction occurred, through the agency and by the representation of another gentleman—but I am not in a position to state that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) had anything to do with it. But that Dr. McGillivray's salary was reduced at the time when his duties were not reduced was and is a fact.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to say in reply to the Finance Minister that if there was any attempt made to interfere with Dr. McGillivray in his position, either by a recommendation for his dismissal, or a reduction of salary with a view to his resignation, it was entirely unknown to me, and must have taken place before I had the honour to sit in this House, and that is thirteen years ago. I cannot see in what manner the Finance Minister has strengthened his position by giving this fresh information to the House. The reason why I called his attention to this matter was because I saw him in consultation with the gentleman who opposed my hon. colleague (Sir Charles Tupper) and myself in Cape Breton, and I thought if there was any other information to be communicated in regard to Dr. McGillivray, the Finance Minister would make it known to me if I had made a mistake. I now feel that I did not make any mistake, and the hon. gentleman cannot remind me of any circumstances rendering the position different from that which I presented to the House before six o'clock. As regards this question, my record is before this country and before my constituents with respect to interfering with officials, regardless of whether they acted for or against me. I am prepared to place my record side by side with the record of the hon. Finance Minister in so far as it relates to officials in my constituency and their treatment. I think it is only proper, in view of the discussion which has arisen on this point, that I should give to the House what I know as to the manner in which the Minister of Finance dealt with officials in my constituency. The local legislature of Nova Scotia, in connection with the passing of what is known as the Municipal Incorporation Act, provided that certain county officials whose duties are under the direction of the laws of the legislature should be appointed by the municipal councils. Among those officials are ferrymen. In my county, owing to the number of rivers and bays, there are a large number of ferries. Under the Act the municipal councils appoint the ferrymen and grant them licenses; there is no other means by which ferrymen can obtain licenses or legal authority to act as ferrymen. The Government of the province, at the head of which has been the present Finance Minister for a long number of years, provided from year to year a grant for the ferries. The county or municipality supplements these grants with aid from the municipality, which is derived from the county taxes. What do you think, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Nova Scotia, at the head of which the Finance Minister was, did with respect to those ferrymen appointed by the municipal councils and appointed under the law and holding their licenses? The Government entirely disregarded the appointments made and licenses granted to those ferrymen in every instance where the municipal councils did not appoint a Liberal or one who supported the Government of Nova Scotia. Wherever a ferryman was appointed by the municipal council and given a license to conduct a ferry according to the laws of the province, and it was impossible to put a man in competition with the licensed ferryman, the Government cut off the salary of the ferryman; but where they could put a man in opposition, they gave him the salary and let the man who was properly licensed go. That is the way the present Finance Minister treated officials in that county.

For some time before I became a member of this House I was a representative in the municipal council for the district in which I reside. I continued to be so for some time after I had the honour of a seat in this House. Opposition was put up against me time after time, but without any success on the part of my opponents. The Government of which the present Finance Minister was the head introduced and passed a Bill by which it would be impossible to elect a member of the House of Commons to the position of a municipal councillor. There was only one other hon. member besides myself occupying that position, and he happened to be my colleague from the same county, who represented a district within any of the municipal councils of the province. These are some of the measures to which the Finance Minister resorted with a view to having officials displaced and the will of the people set aside in regard to either Dominion or local officials. I might refer to the Act passed by the hon. gentleman's Government which disfranchises Dominion officials as regards voting at local elections. That to my mind is a very unreasonable and unfair Act, for under it a large number of people in the province are disfranchised because they happen to hold Government positions. With respect to the dismissal of the late keeper of the station at St. Paul, a return was brought down to this House in response to an address in March, 1894, and in this return I find the following correspondence:—

House of Commons, Canada,
Ottawa, March 10th, 1893.

Hon. John Costigan, P.C.,
Acting Minister Marine and Fisheries :

My Dear Sir,—I beg to call your attention to the fact that Samuel C. Campbell, lightkeeper of St. Paul's Island, in the county of Victoria, has ever since his appointment in 1874 taken a very active, violent and outspoken part in politics, and more particularly since the Conservative Government came into power in 1878.

I may say that since that time, as opportunity offered. he has been using his position and influence, and any patronage in connection with his office against the Government and its supporters.

At the time when the relations between our country and the United States were strained, he was then loud in his denunciations of the Government and its supporters, and actually, as I am informed, sold or supplied to American fishermen out of, I am informed, Government stores, against the laws then existing.

In December, 1890, he wrote to one John J. McCharles, who had then been lately elected councillor for one of the municipal districts of the county of Victoria, strongly urging him to assist the Liberals in the council, and thus secure a majority for the Liberals, and, after strongly urging him to do so, he wrote as follows, among other things :

"It would greatly assist Mr. Ross for the Dominion. You can scarcely understand how largely interested I am in Mr. Ross's election. This is becoming an important station, and if I had a friend at headquarters I would get $200 added to my salary.

Then I am getting old and would like to leave here altogether. If Ross was returned, I could be pensioned, as in a few years I shall be thirty-five years in the service. So you see it is almost life or death to me who is returned by the county of Victoria at the next Dominion election. Then again, I would not give up the situation, unless I was assured a friend would get the place, and if it would suit you to take it, I could make you pretty sure of it, as I know of no one I would so soon see in my place as yourself, or one who could fill it better. John A. Macdonald is a sworn enemy of mine, and if he is again returned for the county, will do his utmost to have me dismissed, and I am sure you would not like to see me and my family set adrift without a pension. Now, my friend, you have no personal interest in the matter that could be better served on the Liberal side than on the Tory side. Free trade is going to carry the day everywhere. I see by the papers that the Americans have gone free trade in Congress by one hundred majority at the election last month. It will be so in Canada, and the Liberals will be in power before long."

The Mr. Ross he refers to is the Hon. William Ross, who was a candidate and contested the general election for the Dominion in 1891, and at the by-election in 1892 for the county of Victoria. I am the John A. Macdonald referred to. I may say that his reference to my having any desire to turn him out of office at that time was false, to his knowledge. I never asked for his dismissal, and never thought of doing so up to the time I saw his letter to McCharles, from which I have taken the foregoing extract.

I now think, if the foregoing be true, of which I have not the slightest doubt, and which I am prepared to prove, Mr. Campbell ought not any longer be in the employ of this Government.

I am, &c.,
(Sgd.) JOHN A. McDONALD.

Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, 31st May, 1893.

S. C. Campbell,
Supt. Humane Establishment,
St. Paul's Island.

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant replying to the charges preferred against you by Mr. McDonald, M.P., and with reference to the statement that garbled statements were given from the letter you wrote to Mr. McCharles. I have to request you to state in what respect you have been misquoted or your letter garbled. I have also to request you to inform me as to the subjects on which you wrote twice to Mr. McCharles in November and December, 1890.

(Signed) WM. SMITH.

St. Paul's Island, 26th June, 1893.

Wm. Smith, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg leave to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 31st May last, No. 9805, just received. In reference to Mr. McDonald's charges against me, my letter to Mr. McCharles had reference to the municipal council. I have no copy of the letters or I would inclose them. I understand Mr. McDonald is in possession of the originals ; let him produce them and they will read for themselves. I may here state that I am in the Dominion service for over twenty-two years, and during that time I tried honestly to perform my duty, according to the best of my ability, and never yet had a charge preferred against me until Mr. McDonald made his charges. Since my appointment to this island nineteen years ago, I have taken no part whatever in politics and seldom left this island at all; when I did so, it was on purely business matters. I am happy and proud to say, without fear of contradiction that I can number among my warmest friends a large number of the leading Conservatives in Cape Breton, all of whom would, I am sure, be sorry to have me removed at the request of Mr. McDonald. Feeling confident that the Government will deal justly with me,

I am, &c.,
(Signed) SAM. C. CAMPBELL.

Baddeck, 4th December, 1893.

William Smith, Esq.,
Deputy Minister Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

My Dear Sir,—I received a letter from Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper asking me to forward the letter written by S. S. Campbell to John McCharles in December, 1890, and which is now the subject of investigation. My house with all its contents was destroyed on the 24th November, 1891, including that letter.

As soon as I discovered that it was destroyed, I wrote to Mr. Bertram, the editor of the "North Sydney," asking him to return me a typewritten copy of it I had sent to him during a controversy I had with the Hon. Wm. Ross. I told him that I had lost the original, and he told Mr. Campbell that it was lost. I was not aware of Mr. Bertram's telling him

so until I saw it stated in the Stellarton "Trades Journal," a Liberal paper printed at Stellarton, N.S.

Mr. Campbell knows very well that the original letter was lost by fire in December, 1891.

I am, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN A. McDONALD.

Baddeck, 23rd December, 1893.

Sir C. Hibbert Tupper, P.C.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

My Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of yours of the 20th instant, and in reply may say that this extract contained in my letter to Mr. Costigan is a true extract from Mr. Campbell's letter of December, 1890, to Mr. McCharles.

In that part of it referring to the free trade majority in the States, he at first wrote 1,000, but put his pen through the last cipher. In the same way he wrote the word "office," and put his pen through it and wrote "station" over it. In the line in which the word "service" occurs, there was written over it these words, "20 under the Dominion and 9 under the old Nova Scotia Government." These words were almost illegible, and I believe they were corrections made by him. Every other letter, word and sentence are the same as in the original letter. I compared the original letter with the extract in "Hansard" of July 13th, 1891, page 2169 of Vol. 2, and found it to be as stated by me.

John McCharles, warden of the county, to whom the letter was written; Thomas S. McLean, county treasurer; John McDonald, collector of customs, both of Baddeck; Donald McQuarrie, of Middle River, fishery overseer, and Alexander J. McDonald, of Inlet, with others, were present when I compared the original letter with "Hansard." I am confident they will corroborate what I write. I sent written copy to Bertram from Ottawa. After I discovered the loss of the original, I applied to Mr. Bertram for the copy, but he stated that he either destroyed or mislaid it. I sent others to him also, to whom he gave the same answer. I was not then aware that Mr. Bertram and Mr. Campbell were such warm friends, and I have every reason to believe that he informed Mr. Campbell of the loss of the original. Mr. McPhee, solicitor of North Sydney, informs me that he told Mr. Bertram that the original was lost, and that he believes Mr. Bertram informed Mr. Campbell and his friend of the fact.

I am, &c.,
(Signed) JOHN A. McDONALD.

Baddeck, C.B., 27th December, 1894.

Sir Charles H. Tupper, P.C.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of a note from John A. McDonald, M.P., who is to be absent for a few days, requesting me to forward to you a statement of what I may know regarding a letter written in December, 1890, by S. C. Campbell, of St. Paul's, to Warden McCharles, of South Gut. In compliance with his request, I beg to say that early in January, 1891, Warden McCharles called at my office, and in the course of conversation remarked that he had recently received a very flattering letter from Mr. S. C. Campbell congratulating him on his election as councillor and eulogizing his abilities, and asking him to support the Liberal party in the council, advising him that it would be to his interest to do so as the Liberals would carry everything before them at the ensuing elections, and that as he, Mr. Campbell, was getting old, he was anxious to retire from St. Paul's, and that McCharles could get the situation if he wanted it. On my expressing surprise that Mr. McCharles should have the temerity to write such a letter, and to make promises that he was not in a position to fulfil, Mr. McCharles offered to send me the letter for perusal, that I might see and know its contents. In a few days I received the letter, and it remained in my possession for a long time, and I became thoroughly acquainted with its contents. Extracts from this letter were read in the House of Commons in the session of 1891 and the Grit papers charged that the extracts were garbled. Those of us who had seen the original letter knew that such was not the case, and took the earliest possible opportunity of comparing the original letter with the extracts from it as published in "Hansard," and found that they were exactly the same with the exception of a very few erasures and interlineations which had evidently been made by the writer of the letter, and did not make any material difference between the text of the letter, and the "Hansard" report of it. A number of gentlemen belonging to the county were present when the comparison of the original letter and the "Hansard" was made. Speaking from memory, these were present: John A. McDonald, M.P., John McDonald, collector of customs; Alex. J. McDonald, trader; Donald McQuarrie, fishery officer; Warden McCharles, Alex. C. McDonald, John Patterson and Thos. McOulay, councillors, myself and some others that I cannot call to mind at present. I may say in conclusion that I am familiar with S. C. Campbell's signature, and have no doubt that it was his that was attached to the letter in question.

Yours truly,
(Signed) T. S. McLEAN.

After that correspondence comes a certified copy of the Order in Council, which is as follows:—

Privy Council, Canada.—Certified Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 17th January, 1894.

On a report dated the 28th September, 1893, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, stating that he received a communication from Mr. John A. McDonald, Member of Parliament for the county of Victoria, province of Nova Scotia, an extract of which is appended hereto.

The Minister states that it appears that Mr. Samuel C. Campbell, keeper of the humane establishment on St. Paul's Island, wrote the letter complained of, which contains an offer of a Government office as an inducement for a vote at a municipal election, a scheme for improperly inducing the executive to increase a Government officer's salary, and discloses that this officer was endeavouring to influence public sentiment against the Government of the day.

The Minister is of opinion that Mr. Campbell should no longer be continued in Government service, and he therefore recommends that Mr. Campbell be dismissed and his appointment be cancelled.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

As hon. gentlemen will see, this correspondence extends over a period of about a year,

and I might say that during the time is was taking place, Mr. Campbell called on myself on more than one occasion to ask me to intercede on his behalf with the Government to prevent his dismissal. Mr. Campbell and myself have been strong personal friends for many years, and I had the warmest feeling for him. I took him on his own statement with regard to the part he had taken, and, notwithstanding that he admitted pretty nearly what is contained in this correspondence, I undertook to advise the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries not to interfere with him. I did so on account of the personal feeling I entertained towards Mr. Campbell. I did so because it was not my practice with respect to the patronage of my county to deal in that manner with the officials who took part in elections against me. I repeated my opinion, I think, more than once to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I subsequently recommended granting to Mr. Campbell a superannuation allowance, but I was informed that on account of his dismissal he could not be superannuated, under the rules governing the granting of superannuation. I regretted personally the dismissal of Mr. Campbell; but in view of the claims made by the hon. gentlemen who now sit behind the Government as to what should constitute a sufficient reason for dismissing an official, I cannot help saying that I consider that the conduct of Mr. Campbell comes very strongly within the reasons which they advanced as a sufficient cause for dismissing a public official who had taken part in an election. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House any longer except to say this. Before I came to this meeting of Parliament, I was informed by several people in my constituency that it was the intention of the Liberal party, having got into power, to dismiss every official who had not voted for them in the recent election. I was told further that one of the gentlemen who undertook to run against my hon. colleague and myself in the recent election, had left the county before I left home, to come to Ottawa with a list of those officials who were to be beheaded by the Government of the day. This may or may not be true. I make the statement as I got it before leaving home. I want to say this to the Government, that I know of no instance in which a public official in my county went to any unreasonable extent in canvassing or otherwise on behalf of my hon. colleague or myself; and the extent to which the officials there went, within my knowledge, I consider quite proper. That is, I consider it quite proper for an official of the Government to go to the polls and poll his vote; I consider it quite proper for him to speak in a reasonable manner, or to use a reasonable argument in support of the Government he is serving.

Mr. LISTER. He is serving the people.

Mr. McDOUGALL. He is serving the people, certainly; but I say it is a very dangerous thing for a public official to criticise the Government under whom he is serving. I say it is a dangerous thing, because I do not believe he can discharge the duties of his office properly or with that faith that should be expected from him towards the Government that directs the manner in which he shall discharge the duties of his office. Therefore, I consider it quite improper for a man to take an active part against the Government he is serving under. I also consider it quite proper for him to use reasonable arguments and reasonable means to aid his friends to support that Government, so long as he does not use any misrepresentations or any other wrong or improper means. I do not believe it is proper for a man who is a Government official to take the public platform to abuse and vilify and misrepresent the opponent of the party who is carrying on the Government. Under these circumstances, I only want the Government of the day to treat the officials in my county as the previous Government has treated them since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. If any official, no matter whether he is a supporter of mine or not, goes beyond what I say I consider to be proper and reasonable conduct on his part at the time of an election, then I say, let him take the consequences; but if an official simply goes to the poll and votes, or simply attends a meeting and takes part in it to a reasonable extent, then I say that is not a sufficient cause for turning him out. Rather than to act upon such a principle as that, I would say that it would be the duty of the Government to disfranchise every official. With these remarks I shall not take up any more of the time of the House. I hope that in dealing with dismissals, the Government will deal as fairly with the officials of my constituency as the late Government dealt with them during the time that I have had the honour to sit in this House.

Mr. DEVLIN. I may say that I agree with a little and disagree with not a little of what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He has made the statement that he has heard it is the intention of the Government to dismiss every official who did not vote for a candidate of the Government during the recent election in his county. I venture to contradict that statement at once and to assure him—and in this I am confident that I express the views of the Government—that no man will be dismissed because he has voted. I think that the assurance was given out this afternoon that the conscientious convictions of men shall be respected by this Government, but there is a big difference between voting and taking an offensive part in an election. The hon. gentleman tried to draw some special distinctions, but I think

he was mistaken in the manner in which he put them before the House. Complaints have been made to the Government, and will be made to the Government again in regard to members of the civil service, not because they voted but because they appeared upon the public platform, and, in the speeches which they addressed to the electors from the platform, were abusive, and denounced the leader of the Government as a traitor to his race and his faith ; and because they absented themselves for weeks and weeks from the departments here in Ottawa, drawing pay all the time from the Government, and, as was pointed out this afternoon, also drawing pay perhaps from the sources that employed them as well. I admit that the case which the hon. gentleman has just cited, that of S. C. Campbell, is one of the saddest that could be brought before the House. But the dismissal of Mr. Campbell was not made by a Liberal Government but by the Government which the hon. gentleman supported so many years. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I think he put forth an unwholesome doctrine when he said that the civil servants should not only vote for the Government but should be allowed to go out and advocate the claims of the Government. The civil service is not the special service of the Government, but the service of the masters of the Government, and the civil servants are the servants of the people. They are paid by the people to do the people's work, and are not paid by politicians to do political work for any political party. They are paid to do the work of the people, and their place is not out upon the public platform but in the departments to which they are appointed ; and when a civil servant comes out upon the public platform, and attends committees and makes himself offensive by taking part, in a very marked and pronounced manner, in a campaign, he should be dealt with just as Governments are dealt with, and punished by the people. That is the doctrine which should hold. It must not be imagined for a moment that all the dismissals which have taken place since this Government have been in office, are due to political reasons. Far from it. A number of gentlemen's services have been dispensed with, I believe, in the Department of Public Works. Were these gentlemen dismissd for political reasons ? No, but simply because they should never have been there, simply because there was no work for them, simply because they were idle and drawing pay for work which they did not perform. And if the stories that are in circulation are to be believed, Liberals were dismissed just as freely as Conservatives. At all events, it is notorious to-day that many of those who were removed from the Public Works Department are declaring that they are Liberals ; but so far as that goes, I need not dwell upon it, because there is not a Tory in the whole civil service to-day. I am not going to deal with the cases brought up by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). I think those cases have been all justified. As far as I am personally concerned, I know that if at any time during the next five years I should recommend to the Government the advisability of dispensing with the services of public servants, I shall, in this House, when the Government are challenged, be only too happy to justify the course of the Government. I am bound to accept the statement which has just been made by the hon. gentleman with regard to certain officers, and I do accept it, and I hope he will accept my statement as well. My statement is this, that I am informed that Mr. John Peters, of whom he spoke, is keeper of the Low Point Light, that Mr. Peters has been non-partisan in the elections, that he has taken no active or offensive part in them, and that at no time did he speak from any platform or make any canvass.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not say that he did.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Peters was appointed before confederation. I believe that his father-in-law was appointed to the same office by the British Government. At all events, during the last two elections this man, who was supposed to be a violent partisan, who was left in his office through the generosity and magnanimous spirit of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, is supposed to have voted Conservative, if he voted at all, and has not been credited by the Liberal party of Cape Breton as being a Liberal. I take up the hon. gentleman's next point, that Mr. James Burke, of Scatterie, was an active partisan.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Most violent.

Mr. DEVLIN. The information which I have to give to the House is that Mr. James Burke, of Scatterie, hardly ever leaves his home to vote. Now, a man who will not even take the trouble of going to the poll to vote cannot be a very violent partisan. The next one the hon. gentleman mentioned was Captain Lorway. He has been looked upon as one who was not a violent partisan. I do not think it can be said that even in this last election, he appeared upon the public platform or attended Liberal committees or canvassed or made himself in any way offensive to the Conservative party of Cape Breton and the Conservative Government.

Mr. McDOUGALL. He was active enough to drive a horse and a sleigh to the poll all polling day.

Mr. DEVLIN. When did he do that ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. At a very recent election.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you have snow down there on the 23rd of June ?

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend who has just interrupted me has stated something

I was going to state. My hon. friend well knows that the statements I have just made are perfectly accurate, and that during a great number of years Capt. Lorway took no part in the elections.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I say he took an active part in elections. The hon. gentleman knows nothing of what he is talking about. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to give his authority.

Mr. DEVLIN. If my hon. friend will give me his authority. I will be only too happy to give him mine.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am the authority myself. Having represented the county for eighteen years, I am in a position to know the facts.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have in my opinion even a better authority, the hon. gentleman's opponent.

An hon. MEMBER. He is not here.

Mr. DEVLIN. But he is not far from here, and he is a good authority on this subject. He tells me that the late election was the first in which Capt. Lorway took any part and the only part he took was to express his opinion, not upon the public platform but privately. And what was the treatment meted out to Capt. Lorway He had the Port Wardenship of Sydney. Some years ago the office was divided and that portion which virtually brought no salary was left with Capt. Lorway and the other and remunerative position was given—to whom ? To a violent partisan of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). With regard to his charges against Dr. McGillivray, who is the physician to the Marine Hospital at Sydney, my information is to this effect : At the date of his appointment Dr. McGillivray received a salary of $400 a year. Later on, when Messrs. McLeod and McDonald represented the county of Cape Breton—two friends of the hon. gentleman—the salary was reduced to $200. Generous treatment, this ; some of the generous treatment the hon. gentleman was speaking of. And still, Sir, Dr. McGillivray was non-partisan and took little or no part in the elections.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I was not referring to the time before I had the honour to represent the county.

The FINANCE MINISTER. This is the record of the Conservative party on the question.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not go so far as to deal with the record of the Liberal-Conservative party ; I was dealing with my own record.

Mr. DEVLIN. We will deal with that afterwards ; and it is worse than the other. My information is that this salary was reduced from $400 to $200 by gentlemen supporting the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs. That cannot be denied. The hon. gentleman will not attempt to deny it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know nothing about it.

Mr. DEVLIN. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman undertook to speak for nearly an hour about Dr. McGillivray. And this is the manner in which Dr. McGillivray was treated. It is true that a portion of the salary was restored to him. Was it by my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) ? No, not at all. It was when Mr. Dodd represented the county. The real facts are these —gentlemen opposite were most anxious to get this position from Dr. McGillivray in order that they might replace him with one of their friends. But Dr. McGillivray told them that he would not resign if they reduced the salary to ten cents per year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Dollars.

Mr. DEVLIN. No ; ten cents a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Finance Minister said $10 a year.

Mr. DEVLIN. The Finance Minister is a good authority—$10 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. If you always obey as well as that they will be satisfied.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think it will not be difficult to obey such gentlemen. It will not only be not difficult, it will be pleasant, because it will be following in the line of duty. As I was saying, Dr. McGillivray's salary was afterwards restored to $300. But was that a salary to give to a man in such a position ? Everybody who has visited Sydney and is acquainted with the duties which Dr. McGillivray must perform knows that those duties are onerous. Dr. McGillivray has charge of the sick seamen who come from Cow Bay, Glace Bay, Victoria mines, and, in fact, all those portions surrounding Sydney. He has charge of the Marine hospital at Sydney, and not a day in the year passes when his medical attendance is not required at that hospital. And, Sir, I venture to say that there are Tory physicians down there receiving from the Government for services less than those performed by Dr. McGillivray, salaries of from $700 to $800 a year. So you perceive that when this boasted generosity is honestly analysed it presents a very different appearance. I venture the statement that the iron heel of Tory despotism, whether political or commercial, is felt in no part of Canada so severely as in the county of Cape Breton.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How do you know ?

Mr. DEVLIN. I have travelled through Cape Breton. I know that no man employed on the Intercolonial Railway during the last two years was free to call himself a

Liberal. I know that if he called himself a Liberal that moment his services would be dispensed with.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I challenge the hon. gentleman——

Mr. DEVLIN. Let the hon. gentleman keep his seat.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I challenge the hon. gentleman to name one man dismissed within the last thirteen years on political grounds.

Mr. DEVLIN. I know well that the authority of the hon. gentleman is very great; it is so great and is so thoroughly respected that even the Intercolonial Railway bows to him, and stops at his very door for from twenty minutes to half an hour to do him honour. They not only pay respect to him, but perhaps they pay a few odd dollars into pockets that are not far from his own.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not want the hon. gentleman to misrepresent me in this House. I want to say that I defy him to find one single syllable written or spoken by me asking that the trains should stop at that place. The train stops there because it suits the public interest to have it stop there.

Mr. DEVLIN. The train stops; and I would like the hon. gentleman to stop for a little while too. The hon. gentleman cannot deny the statements I have made.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I deny that I had anything to do with the train stopping at that point.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman knows the facts, and he knows better than I do why the train stops there.

Mr. MILLS. He gives the reason.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Mills) comes from Nova Scotia, and he must know the reasons. I will let him give them afterwards.

Mr. MILLS. You admit that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) knows better than you do.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would never admit anything that you admit.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEVLIN. I was in error, Mr. Speaker. I was called to order once and I do not want to be called to order a second time. I only wished to say that I would accept none of the hon. gentleman's admissions. But what I have stated is known not only to members of this House but throughout the county of Cape Breton, and I stand by that statement. Not only has despotism of the worst kind been exercised by representatives of the Government in the county of Cape Breton, but the system prevails throughout the whole province of Nova Scotia. Travel where you would, you could hardly find, before the 23rd June last, an employee belonging to the Intercolonial Railroad that could call himself a Liberal. And, Sir, not only were they brought to the polls, but they were driven to the polls. Since we are upon this question, I venture to state that not only the employees of the Intercolonial Railroad, but the employees of the departments here were employed for the special purpose of sending out political literature, free. Take the county which I represent; that county was flooded with letters, signed by whom? Signed by my opponent. Stamped by whom? With a three-cent stamp of this country? Not at all; stamped by and sent free by the then Minister of Agriculture, sent free by the then Minister of Railways and Canals. And the country was robbed, not only robbed because of the stamp, but robbed because of the time which was taken up by the employees of the Government in that department in sending out that literature. I know instances where employees of the Government were obliged to go out and work against their will in favour of the party in power. And we hear of the generosity displayed by the late Government! There was no generosity displayed by them, there was cruelty displayed by them, tyranny displayed by them, and now they make a lame attempt to defend it.

I come now to a statement made this afternoon by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in regard to certain licenses given to hotel-keepers by officers of the local government in Ontario; and as well as I could understand him, the statement was to the effect that if a hotel-keeper worked against the local government of Ontario, he was most likely to lose his license.

Mr. CLANCY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am glad to hear my hon. friend cheer. I want to know if the same hon. gentleman, the member for Bothwell, did not make on the floor of the local House the same charge a few years ago; and I want to know further more if the Premier of Ontario at that date, who is now Minister of Justice, did not at once say that if the hon. gentleman could make good his charge, the inspectors and the commissioners would be dismissed; and he never could make good his charge. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that his statement is unfounded. If he had made good the charge which he made on the floor of the Ontario legislature, he knows well that the Premier of that province would have acted up to his word, and that justice would have been done in the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the Minister of Justice would scarcely care to be bound by the statements made by the hon. gentleman. I say that on no occasion did the Minister of Justice make any such a state-

ment as mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I can tell my hon. friend another thing, that the Opposition at that time made these charges in the House and asked for a committee to investigate them, and they were refused.

Mr. DEVLIN. The statement I made was this, that the hon. gentleman, upon the floor of the Ontario legislature, made a charge similar to the one he repeated this afternoon, and that the Premier of Ontario then and there gave him an opportunity of proving the charge which he made, and promised that if he could make it good, those men against whom it was made would be dismissed. I know whereof I speak. I have taken the trouble to find out the facts, and I give them to the House. Will the hon. gentleman say that in the province of Ontario to-day the license holders are confined to the Liberal party? Will the hon. gentleman pretend that in this city of Ottawa, which is in that province, only Liberals hold licenses? I venture the statement that if he will look into the facts he will find that the licenses of this city are held in a great majority by Conservatives. I am perfectly sure that if he goes to the city of Toronto, which he knows better than I do, he will find that the great majority of the hotel-keepers there are Conservatives.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, I make that statement; aye, and with respect to the town in which the hon. gentleman lives, I make that statement, and I know perfectly well that I am right. Now, my hon. friend the whip of the Conservative party, the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) wanted us to see that Dr. Chamberlain should be dismissed. I have taken the trouble to look up the records of the Department of Justice, and I could not find the name of Dr. Chamberlain in it. Dr. Chamberlain is not an officer of the Department of Justice, does not belong in any way to that department; still, that hon. gentleman spoke nearly an hour this afternoon in explaining to us the case of Dr. Chamberlain. I would like to know from my hon. friend whether, if his friends got into power to-morrow in the province of Ontario, they would retain the services of Dr. Chamberlain? Not much. Dr. Chamberlain would go, and nobody would find fault.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. DEVLIN. Because of the doctrine which the hon. gentleman is putting before the House. Why, Sir, he refers to cases belonging to the provinces. How cruel he was to some of his own colleagues! How cruel he was to the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), the late Attorney General for the province of Quebec. When the Hon. Honore Mercier, who was Premier of that province, fell from power in 1893, were those appointed by him and who were supposed to have been friendly to him, retained? Far from it. The political axe was applied at once, heads disappeared as fast as they could. I know that even in the county which I represent, during the late contest the registrar of the county, a man holding a high office, a judicial office, appeared upon a public platform and spoke as strongly as he could in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the hon. gentleman finds fault with one party in the province of Ontario, let him find fault with his friends in the province of Quebec. But no danger of him doing so. And does he forget what occurred only 18 years ago—and these are the facts with which we have to deal. We have not to deal with acts of the Ontario or the Quebec governments, but we have to deal with matters belonging to the Government of the Dominion. Does he forget that when Alexander Mackenzie's Government was defeated, although he had been in power for a little more than four years, and had made very few appointments, the very first act of the Government which succeeded that of Mr. Mackenzie, the very first act of his own political associates, was one which was not an act of generosity? Did we then hear of those beautiful sentiments, those magnanimous sentiments, of justice and generosity which we have heard poured out to us here this afternoon? No, Sir. But when they found men who were supposed to entertain Liberal opinions, they chopped off their heads; and when they could not suit their own political friends by making ordinary dismissals, they passed Acts repealing other Acts which enabled them to dismiss officials by the hundreds; and, Sir, within a short time afterwards, they re-enacted those Acts in order to appoint their own friends to the same offices. Let them recall that history, history as sad as ever was recorded in any country, history as sad as that which was related here this afternoon by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), when he referred to the case of Campbell, Poor Campbell, dismissed by his own friends. Sir, I hope the Government, I am sure that the Government, will deal with this matter in a generous spirit, in a just spirit. But so far as I am concerned, I will not ask mercy for a man who has gone about and blackguarded the Government of Canada; I will not ask mercy for a man who has gone out and abused that Government, canvassed against that Government, vilified that Government in the newspapers, and upon the public platform. Sir, I say that the men who compose the civil service of this country must be men who will respect the Government of Canada. They must be men at all events in whom the Government can have confidence, otherwise it would be impossible for the Government to treat with the service or the service to treat with the Government of Canada. I am satisfied that the statement which was

made by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), this afternoon, is a correct statement, and a correct representation of the position of the Liberal party. We have not fought for offices; but what we have fought for is the triumph of the great principles which constitute the basis and foundation of the Liberal party. We have fought for tariff reform, and tariff reform we will have. We have fought for the reform of the civil service, and the reform of the civil service we shall have. We have fought for the improvement of our trade and our commerce, and the improvement of our trade and commerce we are sure to have. We have fought for retrenchment and economy, and before we are many months older those hon. gentlemen will perceive that the time of extravagance and of corruption came to an end on the night of the 23rd of June last, when the people of this country, understanding their duty, placed in power the Government now occupying the Treasury benches. With respect to the charge made a moment ago by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I know as a matter of fact that when he made his several charges in the Ontario legislature, the then Premier of the province, who is now Minister of Justice, informed him that if he would name and designate one official who had ever interfered in the manner indicated, the hon. gentleman would be given a committee of inquiry.

Mr. BRITTON. It seems to be pretty nearly agreed that the policy which should be pursued is not to interfere with those whom the law does not disqualify from voting at the elections, but that some action should be taken with respect to those who are active partisans, who act on committees, who appear on public platforms, and who are ordinarily called active political campaigners. If that is so, then I think we are pretty well agreed as to what ought to be done in respect to those who so acted during the last electoral campaign. I, for my part, agree pretty nearly, as well as I understood the remarks made, with what was said this afternoon by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and I appreciate what that hon. gentleman said in regard to the difficulty of dealing with cases of this kind, because no doubt difficulty will arise on the question to what extent a person has become an active partisan. It seems to me we have wasted considerable time this afternoon, perhaps I shall be accused of wasting a little more, in dealing with this question of Ontario officials and those who took part in the last election while holding office under the Provincial Government. The Ontario Government has certainly acted very liberally with their officials. It is very well known that, although the Ontario Reform Government has been in power a very long time, there are more Conservatives in the employ of the Provincial Government than there are Liberals in the employ of the Dominion Government. There is no doubt about that; and those Conservatives in the Ontario Government have been allowed to do, both as regards speaking and acting, just as they liked at elections. I am aware of the Act disfranchising Dominion officials in provincial elections, but I am speaking of active campaign work done by Dominion officials. An hon. gentleman this afternoon, in speaking of Dominion officials included the division court clerks and bailiffs. I will ask hon. gentlemen, and no doubt they will be candid in the matter, to say if in their experience, they do not know that there are more Conservatives holding positions as division court clerks and bailiffs than there are Liberals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BRITTON. Even in the constituency of the Whip of the Opposition, a Conservative, a worthy man, occupies the position of division court clerk, and I simply give that as an instance where an office holder has not been disturbed notwithstanding action taken against members of the Ontario Government party at elections; in this way very great liberality has been shown towards them, and I am sure they would be as willing as any hon. members to have some well defined rules adopted in matters of this kind. If the discussion to-day should result in bringing about that result a good end would be accomplished. I may say in regard to my own constituency that there are unquestionably very great difficulties to be met. We there have not only the officials of the penitentiary, but a large number of officers in the Inland Revenue Department, at the Custom-house, in the post office, including letter carriers, and further there is the battery and other Government employees. So it is hard enough for any Liberal to stand a show of victory if these men vote,—and no one can complain of their voting,—but when they enter on the canvass, and abuse not only the candidate and his friends and supporters but members of the Government, then it requires, as happened at the last election, some question which will sever the party ties that generally hold men together in order that a Liberal may carry an election there. It amounts to this, that if those men are allowed to act at coming elections as they did at the last election, no Liberal can be elected. All we ask is that those men should have done to them just what they expected when they were taking part in the election; at all events that some action should be taken in regard to them because of their conduct. Take the action of the officers of "A" Battery. The men of that battery have no interest in Kingston except as regards drawing pay from the Government. They are on the voters' list as income voters, and some of them were put on the list unfairly. These men are marched in a body to the polls, and the polls were

blocked until all these men had polled their votes. When any conversation was had with the men they were silenced by the peremptory command of the officers. You know your duty. I do not ask for any action to be taken, but conduct of that kind should be spoken of, so that the Liberals in the House and the people of the country should know the difficulties against which the Liberals had to contend at the last elections throughout the whole of the province. In regard to the case put this afternoon with respect to the deputy sheriff's conduct in Grey, I desire to state that the deputy sheriff is not an officer either of the Ontario or Dominion Governments, and in that case he was merely acting as clerk for the returning officer. For the purposes of the election and as returning officer the sheriff was a Dominion Government official. He is an Ontario official, and the policy laid down and acted on by the Liberals is that it is better that elections should be conducted under some person who holds a judicial position, either sheriff or registrar, and that if those officers are employed the elections are more likely to be fairly conducted. Unless you understand whether this terrible work was done according to the account we had of it this afternoon, the deputy sheriff was either sheriff's officer appointed by the sheriff and paid by the sheriff, or he was the officer of the returning officer, and therefore perhaps to that extent may have been a Dominion official. I do not know anything of course of the facts of what he did. Mr. Speaker, if the House is agreed in regard to what ought to be done, then good will be accomplished by this discussion. Before I take my seat I want to call attention for a minute or two, to another class of officials that it seems to me this Government ought to deal with. There are two classes that they ought at all events to say some thing to and have some rule in reference to them. There are in the first place, those who sat and voted in the last Parliament and who held offices in their pockets. These men were told during last session that if it was true they had offices in their pockets and were therefore violating the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act, they would be remembered if new men came into power. Now, Sir, they did have their offices in their pockets. They boasted themselves that they had the promises of these offices, and one or more of them said they had the promise for two years previously, yet they sat during two sessions under these conditions. These promises have been redeemed for them, and these gentlemen now sit in very comfortable and valuable offices. It seems to me that some action ought to be taken in reference to some of these at least. In stating this I do not wish to state anything against them as men, nor anything against them in reference to them in their offices since they held them. I only mention what everybody knows, and that is, that during the last session of the last Parliament there were men who in violation, at all events of the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act, sat here and voted. There is another class against whom I have nothing personally to say—especially not against one of them—but I refer to the class who were active campaigners in the last election doing a great deal of most effective election work, and taking part in the elections on different platforms, and these men since the last election have been appointed to very lucrative offices. It seems to me the question is germane to the subject under discussion. Notwithstanding the difficulties I had to contend with in my campaign, I for my part wish that every man shall be justly and fairly dealt with. I want to see that if an officer has been doing what we have agreed upon this afternoon he should not do, he should be asked to give up his place. Many of these men must themselves admit that they have taken an active part, because as has been stated this afternoon, I have heard it said by officials in my hearing: I do not care for your office, I am an office-holder it is true, but your party are rebels and traitors and everything that is bad, and I do not want to hold office under such men. I think every hon. gentleman in this House will agree that persons who have acted in that way towards Liberal candidates and the Liberal party—and we are not rebels but loyal men—can expect nothing else but that their heads should come off.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to prolong the discussion upon the question of the dismissal of public officials who took an active part in the recent campaign, nor do I wish to speak at length as to the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite intend to adopt respecting that matter. However, I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without making reference to the position which hon. gentlemen opposite have assumed in laying down the policy which shall now guide them in dealing with these officials. It has been said that it is not germane to this discussion to refer to the conduct of Ontario government officials during the recent elections. But, in my humble judgment we can by reviewing and comparing their conduct, have a better opportunity of examining into the sincerity of the professions which the supporters of the Government are giving expression to now. The officials of the Ontario government have been the appointees of the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and these hon. gentlemen in their respective constituencies have not hesitated to take advantage of the services of these officials. I think I am correct in saying that there is not on record in any department of the provincial service, a protest made by a single gentleman opposite against the employment of Ontario officials in the work of advocating their in-

terests. Under these circumstances we may look with some suspicion, at least, upon the new found zeal of hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party, for the purity and efficiency of the public service of the Dominion. The officials of the province of Ontario are public officials in the same sense that the officials of the Dominion are. They are paid from the public funds of the province of Ontario contributed to by Liberals and Conservatives alike. The taxpayers of the province of Ontario have a right to demand from these gentlemen opposite, if they are honest and sincere in the expressions they profess on the floor of this House, that they shall use their influence with their political friends, who have been in power in Ontario for twenty years, to see to it, that the great majority of the officials of that province shall cease to be the active agents and political partisans and supporters of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and of their friends who are in power in Ontario. For twenty years past the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite have ruled in Ontario, and during that long period they have made hundreds if not thousands of appointments. Many of these appointments are excellent ones; they are gentlemen who do their duty faithfully and efficiently and who do not act in a partisan manner at election times. But I may say, Mr. Speaker, and I say it without fear of successful contradiction, that in every centre of population in Ontario there are to be found in the provincial service, as violent partisans as can be found in the public service of the Dominion, or of any other province in the confederation. It is hardly consistent for hon. gentlemen opposite to take the position they do to-day, and to state that public officials should only vote—we are thankful that they are permitted even to vote—and that they should not take any active part in the elections; while at the same time the political fortunes of those gentlemen had been helped by the active and untiring exertion of officials who are appointed by the Liberal administration of Ontario. Take the case of West Toronto in the recent elections. A public servant of the province of Ontario was selected as the standard bearer of the Liberal party in that constituency. He was a paid official when he accepted that nomination—I am sure that neither my colleague nor myself had any objection to his being our opponent—but I point to that case, because since the time that gentleman became a candidate for a seat in this House, the gentleman who was then the Premier of the province of Ontario has become a very important member and holds a very important portfolio in the Cabinet of the Prime Minister of Canada. Let me ask: what view did the present Minister of Justice entertain as to the propriety, or the impropriety, of a public official of the province of Ontario becoming a candidate for a seat in the House, and taking an active part in the campaign? Did he offer any objection to it? No, Sir. After the campaign had closed and the electors of West Toronto had rejected the candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite, how was he dealt with for his violent partisan conduct on that occasion? Was his head cut off? Was he treated as hon. gentlemen now propose to treat some Conservative officials of the Dominion, who took an active part in the recent campaign? Not at all. He resigned his office—a lucrative and most important one in the province—the day after he received the nomination for West Toronto, and the day after he was defeated for West Toronto he was reappointed to that office. And that, Sir, is the condign punishment that was meted out to the gentleman who opposed my colleague and myself, and who tried to obtain the representation of West Toronto. Sir, I am bold to say that if hon. gentlemen will examine the lists of delegates who composed the conventions of the Liberal party in the city of Toronto, they will find in those lists the names of many gentlemen who occupy positions in the civil service of the province of Ontario; and before they can expect the country to believe that they are sincere in their profession that the civil service should not be composed of political partisans and heelers, they should see that where their party have control of public offices, the officials should be models of public propriety—voting as their consciences dictated, but abstaining under all circumstances from partisanship or from taking an active part in political elections. The statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has been questioned as to the state to which the liquor traffic of the province of Ontario has been brought by partisanship being introduced into it. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that not on one occasion only, but on several, on the floor of the legislative assembly of this province, the Government were challenged to appoint a commission to examine into the operation of the liquor license law. Not only have the commissioners and inspectors acted as partisans, but the mouths of the licensees have been closed in many cases, and they have been afraid to exercise their franchise freely lest their licenses should be taken from them when the time came to renew them on account of the heavy hand laid upon that traffic by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I entirely concur in what the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) has said, that it would be well, in the interest of the public service of the Dominion, that some clearly-defined line should be laid down as to how far public officials should have a right to interfere in political contests. I am one of those who believe firmly that the civil service of the country would be better than it is if there was not so much activity displayed by public officers at election times. Those officers are public servants, paid by the people of all classes and creeds, and they

should first and foremost attend to their public duties. But the public will not believe that gentlemen opposite are honest in their condemnation of civil servants who are or have been Conservatives when they refuse to condemn civil servants who are Liberals, and who are as violent partisans as can be found anywhere. I will not take up the time of the House any further, for I have already made arrangements to leave on the night train. I will heartily co-operate with hon. gentlemen opposite in supporting any measure that will remove the civil service of the Dominion from the political arena as far as it is possible to do so; but I repeat that it would be unfair and unjust, and would be playing a dangerous game, now that hon. gentlemen opposite have got into office, if they should introduce the guillotine, and attempt to cut off the heads of those who, simply exercising their franchise as they had a right to do, voted want of confidence in them, and stood by the Conservative party with whom they had been identified before they accepted office, and in whose policy they still believed when in office. If hon. gentlemen opposite proceed fairly in this matter, they will not be found fault with by those who sit on this side of the House; but if they attempt to decapitate public officials by wholesale merely because they did not approve of the policy of those hon. gentlemen, they will make a mistake, and be guilty of an act that will undoubtedly sooner or later recoil on their own heads.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, I will occupy the time of the House only a very few minutes, and in doing so I wish to say that I entirely endorse the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). I also endorse the latter portion of the speech of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), in which he said that great care should be taken in dismissing officials who are supposed to have taken part in the last Dominion election. In the beginning of his remarks, however, he said that he was afraid that the time of the House was wasted in discussing this question. I do not think that the time of the House has been wasted in discussing it, and why? The day before yesterday a question was asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) and in consequence of the answer given on that occasion, my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) found it necessary to-day to bring this question before the House. In the question asked the day before yesterday, I find these words:

> Have their services been dispensed with? If so, upon what ground, and what notice, if any, was given them that their services would be no longer required?

The answer to these two questions was this:

> The agent, being a political partisan, who actively interfered at the general election, the department, in the public interest, deemed that a new agent in whom they could have confidence should be appointed.

Mr. CLARKE.

Now, what has the hon. Minister said to-day? He has said that he dismissed these gentlemen because they were active partisans. Now, Sir, personally I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would not intentionally do an injustice to an employee. But, Sir, that is not the point we have to consider now. The point we have to consider is this, whether or not the head of any department, simply by noticing any Dominion employee taking part in any election, should have the power, without a proper investigation, the report of which would be available to the hon. members of this House, to dismiss that employee. That is the principle which I understand is discussed here to-day. Some heads of departments may not take the view of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They may not be quite so careful to do justice to the Dominion employees who have taken an active part against them in the election. Now, there are three or four different classes of Dominion employees. There are members of the civil service who are paid sufficient salaries to keep them all the year round. There are employees who receive $100, $200, $300 or $400 a year, and who are engaged in other lines of business. There are a large number of employees of that kind in this country who, while receiving small salaries from the Government for certain services, decline to sacrifice their interest in political affairs, to keep their mouths closed, or to abstain from taking part in elections. That rule applies to Reformers as well as Conservatives. Now, it has been said here to-day that some established rule should be laid down. I am one of those who believe that there should be some established rule laid down We have heard Liberal members say what they believe should be done, but we have yet to hear one word from the hon. First Minister as to what his policy is on this particular question. It is important that the civil service of this country should be placed in the very best possible position. Reference has been made to the manner in which the civil servants of Ontario take part in elections. It is a well-known fact that they do take an important part. But I have no intention of taking up the time of this House by complaining of the conduct of some of the Ontario officials. It has been stated that the hotel-keepers of Ontario are largely Conservatives, and hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to base an argument on that fact. I say, however, that one of the curses of the Liquor License Act of Ontario, is, is this, that there is a large number of Conservatives engaged in the liquor traffic in that province who are coerced by Ontario officials to support Liberal members. And why? Because the supposed secret ballot of that province is not really a secret ballot, and the hotel-keepers are told that if they support Conservative candidates, their vote will be found out, and

they will not receive a license in the future. So far as the officials of the Dominion Government are concerned, I agree with the hon. gentlemen in this House who have taken the stand that if a Dominion employee or an Ontario employee, or any other employee, paid out of the public fund, takes any part on the political platform of this Dominion, or in any of the provinces, he has no right to be continued in the employ of any government. I believe that an employee has a perfect right to vote for whatever candidate he chooses; but if he goes beyond that, then I say that his conduct should be open to investigation, and that investigation should be had in a straightforward and honest manner, and those who are interested in the dismissal of these employees should have the opportunity of seeing the records in connection with that investigation. This matter was discussed at the first session of the last Parliament, and it is now being discussed in the first session of this Parliament. Why is it discussed today by a number of our friends on this side? Because the word has gone forth that a large number of Dominion employees are to have their heads cut off, and it is important that the people and the employees of this country should know whether that report be true or not. If it be true, we ought to know whether these employees are to have the chance of defending themselves or not, and I should be very happy to hear the hon. First Minister state what his policy is on this important question.

Mr. HACKETT. I think it only due to those men who have been dismissed from office that their cases should be brought before this honourable House and discussed. I regret that the agents of the Fishery Department, whose cases were brought up by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) Messrs. Noonan and Davies, should have been dismissed, as they have been for many years in the employ of the department, and have always given great satisfaction to the people in the discharge of their important duties. The people of Prince Edward Island are very much interested in the winter service between the island and the mainland. These gentlemen were acting as agents of the department, and it is just as necessary that these agents at that point should be experienced and able men as it is necessary that the captain in charge of a ship should be a man of skill and experience. The people of the island feel that the maintenance of this winter service is of the greatest importance. Under the care of those gentlemen, that service has been carried out efficiently and well, and if others with less experience are appointed in their place—able though they may be—it will take them some years before they can obtain equal experience to assist in the maintenance of that service. I therefore regret, on account of this important service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, that these men have been dismissed. I know that the hon. Minister himself desires very much that that service should be maintained efficiently, and I think it was not from any personal feeling that he dismissed these men, but simply because of the pressure that was brought upon him by political partisans to exercise his power of dismissal. There is another matter to which I wish to refer, and that is the dismissal of the fishery overseer for Prince County, P.E.I. I asked a question the other day with regard to the dismissal of that gentleman, and I was told by the Minister that Mr. McBride, the overseer, was removed to promote the efficiency of the service. I asked also if any one had been appointed in his place, and the hon. Minister replied that no appointment had been made. Then I asked him if Mr. McBride had been appointed by Order in Council, and he said, yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was he dismissed without Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. HACKETT. I saw Mr. McBride a day or two before he left Prince Edward Island, and he told me that he had received a letter, not from the department at Ottawa, but from the agent of the department at Charlottetown, Mr. Lord, no doubt, acting under instructions, informing him that he had been dismissed because of the change of Administration. That is the statement made by Mr. McBride to me a day or two before I left the Island. I could scarcely believe Mr. McBride. I said he must have been mistaken, that a reason of that kind could never have been given. You were appointed by Order in Council, I said, and I have always believed that a servant of the Dominion who was so appointed should be dismissed by Order in Council, and that before being dismissed he should have an opportunity of having the charge made against him investigated, and be given a fair trial for his life. In this case Mr. McBride assured me that the letter simply said it was on account of the change of Administration he was dismissed. I say that that is the introduction of the spoils system. We have in the Dominion, in the service of Canada, as fine, able, intelligent and prudent body of citizens as you can find in Canada. To what is that due? It is owing to the permanency of the service. It is owing to the fact that these men were appointed because of their ability to fill those offices, and, having been appointed, they have been continued in office, and it is a serious matter indeed that the permanency of the service should be disturbed and those gentlemen dismissed at the word of the Minister, and without a moment's warning. I say that will lower the standard of the civil service and have a bad effect upon the

interests of the country at large. The Minister referred to the efficiency of the service and, as I said before, inefficiency would be a good reason for dismissal. I know that the hon. gentleman would desire to protect the fisheries of Prince Edward Island. We have on the shores of that island a very valuable fishery—the lobster fishery, which annually brings in about half a million dollars. It is most important in the interest of the whole province that that valuable fishery should be protected. Knowing that the hon. Minister desires to protect the fisheries I can quite believe that he did not make this dismissal of his own free will, but that he must have acted under extreme political pressure to dismiss the only active officer he had in the midst of the fishing season when the greatest vigilance was required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman tell me whether in all the years this gentleman was an officer of the department he ever prosecuted a single case except one in which he was found to be entirely wrong and had to withdraw the prosecution, or ever made a report to the department ?

Mr. FOSTER. What has that to do with the question ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member is speaking of this being an active man who faithfully discharged his duties. Now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) was inspector of fisheries, and this man was an overseer under him. I ask him can he recall a case in which this gentleman acted efficiently in the prosecution of offenders ?

Mr. HACKETT. Yes. I am well acquainted with Mr. McBride. For eight years we have been associated in the protection of the fisheries. He was not required to report to the department, but to the inspector his superior officer. But he has made reports to the department and these remained in the records of the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Was it not in the county for which this gentleman was overseer that there were flagrant, notorious violations of the law ?

Mr. HACKETT. I can assure the hon. gentleman that no such thing as open and flagrant violation of the law took place under Mr. McBride. But it is going on at present. I was going on to say that the hon. gentleman made a great mistake. I know that he would not do such a thing intentionally, because he desires as much as any person to protect the fisheries of the province. Therefore, I say, political pressure must have been brought to bear upon him, as it would be contrary to his own good judgment to cut off this officer's head in the middle of a season when he should have been closely attending to his duty.

Take the case of the Dunk River, one of the most important fishery streams in the province. Mr. McBride resided on the banks of that river and it was his duty to protect the fishery there during the trout season, and the run of the salmon in the fall. But his services were dispensed with and no other man was appointed. And what is the result ? That river is being netted day by day, until there is practically nothing left. Here is what a local paper in Prince Edward Island says on this subject :

> The action of the new Liberal Government, in cancelling the commissions of the fishery officers who were charged with the protection of Dunk River, has already had a serious result on that river as a fly-fishing resort. No officers have yet, we are credibly informed, been appointed to replace those whose services were lately dispensed with, the reason being, we understand, that the candidates for the vacancies are about as numerous as the fish in the river now are, and the meetings called to select wardens have ended in disagreement and total failure, so far as any practical results are concerned. Meantime the river is being ruined by netting, and for angling it is at present almost valueless. For the past three or four weeks, during which time the river has been without protection, netting has been carried on wholesale. It is said that smelt nets are being used, by which the small fish, as well as the large ones, are taken, and it will be years before the stream, even with the most careful and strict supervision, will recover from the injury it has sustained this season. Under the watchfulness and care of the late officers, Mr. McBride and his assistants, instances of netting were rare ; now, however, with no protection, the stream is being netted at a rate that must soon, if persisted in, leave it with trout as scarce as doubloons on the Queen's highway.

Here we have the result of the dismissal—the illegal dismissal, as I believe it to be—of this officer at a time when strict supervision was required for the protection of the river as well as other important fisheries on the coast.

Now, Sir, with regard to another matter that came up, the dismissal of employees on the railways. Two men who were working as trackmen on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and who have been so employed for many years, were dismissed. No cause was assigned. The Minister said they were dismissed because they were not satisfactory men. I am well acquainted with both of them. They are young, active men, accustomed to hard work and willing to work, and they have been performing their duties to the entire satisfaction of their foremen. To take these men off is a dangerous proceeding. The men who have taken their places have had no experience in railway work. It is most important that the track should be in good condition. The slightest carelessness or neglect may occasion an accident, and lives may be lost. It has not been the practice in Prince Edward Island to dismiss men occupying such positions, without a moment's warn-

ing. Some section men have been removed, but they were first granted an investigation, charges were preferred against them, which charges were inquired into and only those men dismissed who were found guilty of neglecting their duty. But men were never dismissed before in this manner. This marks the introduction of a vicious system which must tend to lower the tone of the civil service. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke of dismissals in 1878 and said that when the Government of the late Sir John A. Macdonald came into power there were wholesale dismissals, men being turned out simply because they were Liberals. My experience is very different from that. I was a candidate in 1878 in the Conservative interests in Prince County. My most active opponent, except the candidate on the other side, was a gentleman who occupied the position of sub-collector of customs in the town of Alberton. He attended and spoke at meetings and canvassed energetically for my opponent and went all over the county with him doing everything he could to gain support for him. I felt much annoyed, as also did my friends. They said: This is a public officer, and he should stay at home and attend to the duties of his office. He should not go through the country and act the part of a political heeler. When I came to Ottawa I went to the Minister of Customs and he said to me, I can do nothing in the matter, you have no charges to lay against this man. If you can show me that this man has neglected his duty by attending these meetings and taking part in politics, I will have him dismissed, but otherwise I cannot dismiss him. I replied that I had not been watching the work of his office, and could not tell anything about it except that I knew he had taken this active part in politics. I was so annoyed about the matter that I had a private interview with Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the party in this House at that time, and Sir John told me the same thing. He said: This is a free country, we allow a man free speech and a free vote. Although we want to keep our civil servants as efficient as possible, and attending to their duties as well as possible, yet we are not going to close their mouths or to deprive them of the rights of free men. But he said, as the Minister of Customs said, if you can establish a case, give us one instance where this man neglected his duty, where the duties of his office were not faithfully performed on account of his taking part in politics, he will be dismissed; but I am not going to dismiss him because he exercised the right of a British free man. So nothing was done in the matter. Now, Sir, in 1873, in the province of Prince Edward Island, when the Mackenzie Administration came into power, and when that province came into confederation, it was believed that the gentlemen who occupied public positions in that Island would be reappointed to the civil service of Canada, but they were nearly all dismissed, and so we had on the Island the spoils system. Now, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also made some remarks this evening, saying that there were very few men now in the service who were appointed by the Mackenzie Administration. Sir, that is not the case. The hon. gentleman did not seriously consider his statement. I know that in the province of Prince Edward Island we have railway agents, we have postmasters, we have collectors of customs, who were appointed by the Mackenzie Administration, and who have been retained in office from that time, although they are strong Liberals, and some of the most rabid opponents I had in my last election were railway station agents appointed by the Mackenzie Administration. But those men are being retained in office because they are good officers, they faithfully discharge their duty, and therefore it would be improper to remove them. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) made an attack upon the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) because the railway train happened to stop where that hon. gentleman lives. He says that the hon. member's word is so powerful on that Island that he made the railway trains stop at his door. Now, that is not an argument to use in this House. The railways of the country are run for the accommodation of the people, and if the hon. gentleman happens to live in a town or village where the railway stops to accommodate the people, I think it would be a very extraordinary thing for the Government to run that railway five miles further on in order not to stop in his town. That was an absurd argument to use, and I do not think the hon. gentleman considered what he was saying. I, therefore, trust with regard to these civil servants that none will be dismissed until charges are proved against them. But where you find men are actively and intelligently discharging the duties of their office, leave them there, do not remove them; and if you remove them, do so only after investigation and after proof that they have neglected their duty. By doing that you will promote efficiency in the service, and by not doing it you will degrade the service to the level of the American system, and with every change of Government you will have a change of the service.

Mr. YEO. I rise for the purpose of correcting a statement of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Hackett). He has said that no officials had been dismissed in Prince Edward Island without their conduct having been inquired into. Now, he is quite mistaken in that respect. The hon. gentleman must remember that shortly after the election of 1891, two competent men who were employed on the railway there, were dismissed without any reasons being assigned, and without any in-

quiry of any kind. They were capable men, had been a long time in the employment of the railway, they gave good service, and no complaint was made against them ; but because they were suspected of voting for the Liberal candidates they were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. YEO. Those are only two instances. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the sub-collector at Alberton, who was appointed under the Mackenzie Administration, and who, he says, ought to have been dismissed. Well, he may have been a strong Liberal, perhaps a partisan, but the hon. gentleman says that he could not be dismissed without some cause being assigned. Well, I do not think they were very long in making out a good reason, at least assuming they had good reasons for dismissing this gentleman. He was only allowed to retain office for a very short time before he was dismissed. Then there is the case of the section foremen on the railway who were dismissed in 1891. They were told one evening that after the next evening their services would be no longer required. Although I was one of the candidates in that county, I did not know how those men voted, but I knew they were inoffensive to either party, and fulfilled their duties well. That is the only reason I have heard assigned for their dismissal. We know as a fact that in Prince Edward Island no Liberal was employed to even shovel snow on the railway in the winter. A train may be blocked there and men may be required to shovel snow, but if they are supposed to have Liberal proclivities, they cannot get work. The system which has obtained in Prince Edward Island has been disgraceful to the Government. That is a well known fact to Liberals and Conservatives alike, and it is condemned, I may say, by every respectable Conservative who knows what has taken place there in this respect.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask whether the hon. gentleman was referring to the dismissal of the fishery officers of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but to the section foremen on the railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is with great diffidence, after so many gentlemen much more experienced than I am in public affairs have dealt with this question, that I venture to submit a few ideas to the House on this subject. I was much pleased with the way in which the Controller of Inland Revenue, the member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) and one other gentleman on the same side of the House, dealt with this question. It seems to me that, in the first place, we have to consider it in the light, not of the interest of any particular party, be it Liberal or Conservative, not in the light of the interest of any office holder, not in the light of any influence which may be brought to bear upon the members of this House, but entirely in the interests of the civil service of Canada. Looking at the question from that standpoint, it seems to me, with all deference to gentlemen more experienced than I am, that the fact of the payment of the public money to public officers for their services, ought not to enter very largely into the question as to how far these gentlemen should participate in election contests. It is not the money of the Liberal party or of the Conservative party which is paid these gentlemen for their services ; it is the money of the country, and the fact that these gentlemen worked for either party, so long as they worked openly, honourably and fairly, ought not to weigh against them if, at the same time, they do not neglect their duty as public officers. It seems to me that those gentlemen who are in the civil service of this country ought to have the same right, as other electors not only to vote, but to work during elections, subject to certain limitations which I shall endeavour to submit to the House. In the first place, I entirely agree that if any such official is guilty of any corrupt or dishonourable conduct in an election contest while working for one party or the other, such conduct ought to have only one result. In the second place, if, for the purpose of supporting one party or the other, he neglects his duty in any way as a public servant, and employs the time for which the country has paid him in furthering the interests of either party, it seems to me that such conduct is reprehensible and ought to be punished. I would be willing to go a little further than some of the hon. gentlemen opposite and have a further limitation, namely, that if an officer is in confidential relations with a Minister or with a superior officer, he ought not to take such part in an election as would interfere with the discipline of the office which he holds. I would be prepared to concede that ; but it does not seem to me that a consideration of that kind would apply in the way the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to indicate it would apply in his judgment. I can well understand why it is impossible that a Minister of the Crown should meet on a public platform a subordinate officer in his department for the purpose of discussing public questions with him, but it does not seem to me that a public officer discussing in an honourable and straightforward manner a public question of absorbing interest with a gentleman who afterwards succeeds to office as a Minister of the Crown ought necessarily on that account to lose his office. I should think, indeed I believe, that the hon. Minister is too large a man to deal with any question of this kind in a spirit of revenge, although he did use the expression that the whirligig of time brings its revenge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not in regard to an officer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, and I should hope that the hon. gentleman would not deal with a question of that kind in such a spirit, although if one were inclined to give literal meaning to some of the expressions that he used such a meaning might be extracted from his language. But I do not believe for a moment that the hon. gentleman had any such idea in his mind. If you say that the question of the payment of public money to an officer is to control questions of this kind, where are you to stop? I am a taxpayer of Nova Scotia, and interested in the money paid to the employees of the local government of that province. I have just as much right to complain when those gentlemen go out and fight political battles against me as if they were employees of the Dominion Government doing the same act; but I think it would be a little difficult to carry out the scheme of dismissing such officials for such reasons so long as they conduct themselves fairly and properly in advocating views which they are endeavouring to put before the people. For example, at the last Dominion election in Halifax a very prominent officer of the local government of the province, who is a warm personal friend of my own, although a political opponent, took the stump against me. I would not for a moment suggest that if the Conservative party came into power in local politics in that province that gentleman should be dismissed for that reason. but if you applied some of the arguments put forward before the House to-night, the necessary and logical result of those arguments would be that that gentleman should be dismissed from the office he holds. I do not go that far. Unfortunately, as I think, in some of the municipalities, if not all the municipalities of Nova Scotia, and even in the city of Halifax, politics enter to a greater or less extent into municipal affairs and the result is that the officers of those municipalities and the officers in the city of Halifax, to a certain extent, I think, are selected on political lines. I as a ratepayer in the city of Halifax am interested in the moneys which go to pay the officials of that city, and I think I may say, if I can at all rely on what has been told me by gentlemen in whose veracity I have every right to believe, that the officials of the city of Halifax did work and did use the civil machinery to some extent against me during the last Dominion election. I would not venture to say that those gentlemen, so far as any expression of their views is concerned, who worked against me in that contest, should suffer in any way, even if the administration of the city of Halifax should be selected on party lines and be Conservative instead of largely Liberal, as it is at present. I venture to say that if the question of an official's politics is to be considered when the new government make up its mind whether or not it will dismiss him from office, or if a government ventures to deal with these questions from the standpoint only of an official's political opinions, or if an official has given expression, even on a public platform, to his views on any public question—if these things are to control in determining whether or not a man is to remain in the service, we shall have approached very closely to the American spoils system, which I for one hope will never be introduced into Canada. I venture to submit to the House a statement made by a very able man with respect to the effect of that system throughout the United States. He says—I am reading from Mr. Leckey's latest work, "Democracy and Liberty":

> The evil of the abominable spoils system in the United States is not so much the incompetency of the officers—an American's adaptiveness enables him quickly to learn the routine duties of an office—nor in the waste of public money (because in a community so rich in productive power as the United States the amount which peculation can take from it is a burden easy to be borne)—but the main evil is that the spoils system demoralizes both parties, and makes contests which should be for principle mainly for plunder.

And to show how far they seem to be ahead of us in England on this question, I may take the liberty of reading another sentence from the same work of that writer. He says:

> The gigantic corruption which exists in America under the name of the spoils system has not taken root in England, though some recent attempts to tamper in the interest of party with the old method of appointing magistrates in the counties, and some claims that have been put forward by members of Parliament to dictate the patronage in their constituencies, show that there are politicians who would gladly introduce this poison germ into English political life.

Sir, I should welcome the day in Canada when this question of patronage would occupy much less of the time of members of Parliament than it does at present. I know from what has been said in this House, that a good deal of the time of members on the Government side must be taken up with matters of this kind, and I for one sympathize a great deal with them on that subject, and particularly with my colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell), a constituency in which a very great amount of patronage exists. I also venture to believe that a good deal of pressure which may come upon the Government with regard to dismissals, comes, not so much from members of Parliament who would be content, in many instances, to allow matters to remain as they are, but comes from certain elements of the party which are not, in all cases, the very best elements. I shall welcome, as I have no doubt many of us would welcome, the day in Canada when members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown would

have more of their time to devote to the business of the country, and would require to devote less of their time to matters of this kind, which ought to be dealt with in Canada more upon the lines on which they are now dealt with in England. Mr. Speaker, I have not attempted in these remarks to be very practical so far as my own constituency is concerned with respect to these matters, and I do not intend to do so at present. I hope and trust that the new Administration will deal with this question in a way which will be in the best interests of the country, and inexperienced as I am in public life, I venture to suggest to these gentlemen, that if they do deal with these matters in the best interests of the country, they will also, at the same time, deal with them in the best interests of the Liberal party as a party. I believe that, politically speaking, it would be far better for the Conservative party, that the Liberal party in Canada at the present time should make wholesale dismissals, but I would regret that such a step should be taken, because, in the end, it might result—we are weak, human nature is weak—it might result in reprisals in the future. I for one should most sincerely deplore a condition of affairs in Canada which should have any such results as that. It would be bad for the public service, it would be bad for the public interest, and it would have a most injurious effect on public opinion and on public morals.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon this subject. I was very glad, indeed, to hear the remarks that fell from the Treasury benches upon this important question, because all over Canada, after the 23rd of June, there were evidences that some persons scattered all through the Dominion, thought that we had entered on an era when the old policy, the English policy of a permanent civil service would be abandoned and the spoils system adopted. When that idea was expressed out west, I ventured to say myself that I had confidence that with the present Prime Minister at the head of affairs, and with other members of his Cabinet whom I knew in authority, there was no danger whatever of such a degrading step being taken. The language which we have heard to-night from leading members of the dominant party, and from leading Ministers, is calculated to give assurance that the worser course is not likely to be adopted. Mr. Speaker, it is only right to say, in defence of a body of men—the major part of whom we may assert with confidence earn well whatever money is paid them by Canada—it is only just to say that it is cowardly, it is wanting in fairness, to speak of our civil servants, as some gentlemen speak of them, without an opportunity of reply being given them on their part. To speak of these gentlemen, because they are in the employ of the public, as though they are not to have opinions of their own, or are men to be driven into a certain course by the mere idea of self-interest—as coarse and vulgar minds are apt to speak of them—is to do a great injustice to a body of men, whether in the permanent service or in the outside service, who are a credit to Canada. Any view that would denude these men of their political manhood, any view which would necessitate Canadian civil servants taking a lower position as citizens than their fellow men, is not merely unjust to the civil service, but it is unjust to Canada, and inimical to the public welfare generally. When we look at the action of civil servants, in the elections, we meet with cases like this: Here is a man who, for instance, has held certain opinions. He has been appointed on the recommendation of a politician connected with the dominant party, or we will suppose connected with the party out of power. He has been appointed before the dominant party came into power. The election is on, and this man not merely votes, which it is admitted he has a right to do, but he expresses his opinions in private, which it is admitted he has a right to do. It has been admitted to-day from the Treasury benches that an official has a perfect right to exercise his citizenship in the fullest possible manner, and not merely to vote, but to express his opinions as a free man in a free country, and the only barrier put around his liberty of action is: You are not to become an offensive partisan. It is not that he is not to be a partisan, not as I understand, that he is not to advocate his views, but he is not to offensively advocate them. Well, Sir, in defining what "offensive" is, the Minister who has to do it should certainly, from the point of view of justice, consider the whole circumstances of the case.

I can easily understand what the course of a Minister should be in the case of a man who says, Not merely am I to have the advantages which belong to the civil service, but I am also to have the privileges which belong to public life, and who insists on going into public life. I do not think there can be a doubt as to how that man should be treated. But take the case of a man who has been appointed to office on the recommendation of a public man. I do not care now whether he works for the dominant party or for the party that is trying to storm the seats of power. Provided his action is merely an expression of what might be called exuberant zeal, provided he has only shown himself zealous for the cause of the person he has tried to serve, surely no Government or Minister who has any justice in his heart would punish any man in such a position as that. I may say that I have very little interest in this question personally, because I do not think that any of my supporters in Western Assiniboia erred in any way that will call for a large stretch of mercy at the hands of any Minister. But I have heard of a case of dismissal of a man, a teamster, who had been accustomed to team from the Indian Office

to Regina, and who never took the least part in public affairs so far as I ever heard. I think that was a very unworthy circumstance. Perhaps it is susceptible of an explanation not so sinister as that it was actuated by political motives. I may say to the Government that in the North-west Territories we have not applied the strict rules of patronage to the public service. I have had something to do with the patronage there, for something like twelve years, and during those years men have got into the service who were Liberals, who were outspoken, and properly outspoken, in their advocacy of Liberal views; and we never resented their zeal or their activity or their outspokenness, and never cancelled their appointments. In the election of 1891 some of my Liberal friends who were in the public service did not scruple to show their leanings or to express their opinions; but that never caused the least political resentment in my bosom, nor did it mitigate or militate against our friendship. It is a matter of great gratification that such sound opinions should have fallen from such leading statesmen on the Liberal side as we have heard to-night, because the fact entirely throws to the winds the views I had heard freely expressed outside. Now, Sir, reverting to what my own knowledge enables me to speak of in regard to the conduct of the Conservative party towards those who had taken part in elections, when I ran in Haldimand in 1878, officials there were active against me, spoke on the platform against me; and I may tell you what happened when I heard that we had won. You will remember that the first little shower showed a loss for the Conservatives. One Conservative seat after another went, and when I got to Cayuga and heard how things were, I merely said, "We are scooped." But the next morning, when I learned that we had won, I at once drove to Caledonia, where I met a man who was as active against me as one public man could be against another. I saw that he was very much afraid of what might happen to him, and I said to him, "You may go in peace; if every hair in your head was an offensive official not one of them should fall." Not a man in Haldimand was dismissed for taking action against me in that election, and so far as I heard there was not anything like a vengeful course pursued by the predominant party in 1878. So far as my own experience and my own action has gone in the North-west Territories, we have not applied any strict rule. We have been very liberal towards the Liberals there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not know you had any Liberals in office there. I thought they were all Conservatives.

Mr. DAVIN. Then you do not know much about the North-west Territories. One of the leading government officials in Regina is one of the most active—I am not saying improperly active—and one of the most astute and enlightened Liberals in Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Who is he?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister knows who he is as well as I do. He is a personal friend of my hon. friend. But during the time I have had something to do with the patronage there, two gentlemen, strong Liberals, who were active against myself in the last election, and also in 1891, were appointed, and I did not object to it. I may say that I myself gave the patronage to leading Liberals in Regina. In one department the whole patronage was given to Liberals. I just say that because I think it is desirable that it should be known what course we have taken in the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman might be accused of trying to seduce the allegiance of those gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, no. The best answer to the suggestion of my hon. friend is this, that I never said a word to either of the gentlemen I speak of, and in fact it would be useless, because they are very strong and very zealous Liberals. Mr. Speaker, I merely rose to make these few remarks on a subject that is of great importance, and to express my gratification at the sound views, true to the best traditions of Canada, true to British traditions, and I believe in the best interest of the country, which have fallen from the Treasury benches this evening.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as the hour is late, and a large number of members have gone home over Sunday, and as the subject under discussion evidently arouses a great deal of interest, I beg, with the indulgence of the First Minister, to move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I cannot agree to that.

Mr. BENNETT. In the somewhat protracted debate upon the Address from the Throne, a large number of hon. gentlemen complained that the manufacturers of this country were not being properly treated, that no pledges were made and no intention evinced by the Government as to the position they proposed to take on the question of the tariff. It will now be, I think, a further most reasonable complaint to make that while no intention is evinced by the Government as to what they propose to do with the tariff, a large class of the community, the office holders of the Dominion, have had some intimation of what the Government propose to do in their regard. This has not been so much perhaps evinced by words as by acts, and it is only fair perhaps on this occasion to the civil service of the country—

and when I say civil service, I do not refer alone to those who may be in the employ of the Dominion in the different offices in this city, but to the civil service throughout this whole Dominion—that we should draw attention to the fact that they have had intimations given to them, to at least a certain extent, as to how the Government propose to deal with them. It is a most serious thing that men who have worked in the civil service for years and made it their only means of livelihood, should be summarily dismissed because they may have taken some part in the elections which have just taken place. And I think it would be a matter of consolation to the service to know that the intimation which has been made to-day from the back benches of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that to the victors belong the spoils, does not convey the sentiments of the Ministers. The hon. Minister of Public Works has not seen fit to express his intentions or ideas as to how he proposes to move in the premises, but if the newspaper reports are correct, he has, at least by his actions, shown how he is disposed to deal with those in his department whose services he considers should be dispensed with. Not being conversant with the facts, I will not allege that the hon. Minister of Public Works has seen fit to dispense with the services of clerks in his department by reason of their political proclivities. But if the reports are correct, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works has not done what he should have done in the premises. He has sheltered himself behind the defence that these officials were dispensed with, not on investigation by himself but by reason of reports made to him by those who are their superiors, but who are subordinate and inferior to himself. I contend that that is a very unfair principle to follow and very unjust with regard to those employees who have been thus dismissed. It must of necessity follow that if one of his chiefs be actuated by animus or ill-will towards a subordinate and has vested in him this very large power, he has every opportunity of venting his spleen on the officials under him, and I think that the principle adopted by the hon. Minister of Public Works in this regard is not one that should commend itself to the sense of fair-play of any one. I would compare his action in that regard with the statement made to-day by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). I think I was an honourable and manly statement which was made by him, and one which will commend itself to both sides of the House and the public at large. The Controller of Inland Revenue announced to-day that his policy would be this: If any complaint were preferred against any one in his department, it would be his duty and he would make it his duty to at once inquire in a most searching manner into the matter. It is a principle which should be conceded by all to be fair and proper and which we must all admire, that no man should be first convicted and afterwards tried. The hon. gentleman has said fairly and courageously that he proposes in every instance where a charge is preferred against any subordinate or official in his department, that an investigation shall be conducted into the charge, fairly, openly and above board, and if it be shown that the accused acted in a manner not proper or consistent with his position as a public officer, then he will decide upon the merits of each individual case. I would wish that the hon. gentleman had gone further and said that no matter whether an official was of Liberal or Conservative proclivities, the same measure of justice would be accorded in each and every case. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken a course which I am sure, on mature consideration, will not be followed out in the future. I am sure that he must see that in the cases which have been cited here to-day, fair-play has not been accorded to those men. Now, so far as I have heard the debate—and I think that the facts are not disputed in some, at all events, of the cases—complaints have been made by political antagonists of these officials, and after the preferring of these complaints, these men were, in the most arbitrary manner, decapitated. They were politically guillotined without ever being permitted the opportunity of meeting their accusers face to face. I say that this discussion will be read with the very deepest interest by a large number of people throughout the Dominion. It will be read, not only by the office holders themselves, but by their friends, irrespective of party, and more particularly in the province of Ontario. We always claim that in Canada we are guided by precedents, and I believe it is well that we should be guided by precedents, and it is an admitted fact that in the province of Ontario, both in federal and local elections, a great deal of interest is evinced by the officials in political contests. I am not going to contend, and have never contended, that political decapitation should be inflicted on those who may have politically opposed the Government. During the term of the past Parliament, I have had in the constituency which I represent the active and most unqualified opposition of men holding positions under the Federal Government. I recall one case in particular in which, had I permitted vindictiveness and a wish for reprisal to rule, I had opportunitiy to do great injury to another and could easily have deposed him from an office under this Government which he held. The man to whom I refer occupied the position of light-house-keeper. It was a notorious fact that he was much opposed to me in my elections. There was not only his own influence, but a large family influence was, in a most hostile spirit, thrown against me. That man was convicted by the fishery overseer of harbouring through the winter—and it was a notorious fact that he did it—some two or

three men for the purpose of illegal fishing. He was rightly convicted before a magistrate and justly fined. Every hon. gentleman here will admit that a man holding a position of lighthouse-keeper having been convicted and rightly convicted, as the records show, of having been a law-breaker, might naturally look to be dispossessed at once of the office of which he was the incumbent. But, while I had the pleasure to participate in the patronage of my riding, I never felt that my duty in life was to endeavour to do harm to those who might be politically opposed to me. If there is nothing more in politics than giving vent to one's spleen against political opponents, then I can only say that there must be but little in politics. I had hoped that during this long debate some hon. gentlemen opposite would have justified the principle of dispossessing men who are in possession of offices otherwise than on the principle, as it has been argued, that if we ever attain power in the province of Ontario we shall have full leave and license to retaliate upon the office-holders of that province. There is a principle at stake in this matter, and it is this—first to be just, even generous to all; and, in the next place, if you have the advantage, if you have the power, use that power in a merciful manner. So far, in my constituency, I have no cause to complain, because there have been no removals; but I know that if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to give full sway to my political opponents in that riding there will be an emptying of a great many saddles of the present office-holders there. If the principle followed out by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the cases referred to is to prevail in that riding, I think it will be contrary to the spirit of fair-play, of justice, and a sense of right as between man and man. And I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and every other hon. gentleman who has charge of a department, that before any dismissals are made in that constituency—or in any other constituency, for that matter—a spirit of fair-play should be shown by bringing the accused face to face with those who believe that they have cause of complaint, and giving him an opportunity to defend himself fairly and above board. To believe the statements made here to-night one would believe that the greatest possible horror is manifested by the Ontario government at the interference of office-holders in election matters. There was an election the other day in North Grey; and not only those holding subordinate positions participated in that contest, but, Sir,—and I say it was a most regrettable thing—the First Minister of the province, Premier Hardy went upon the public platform in the town of Owen Sound and made use of language such as should never have been heard upon the public platform and such as I trust will never be heard again. In the exercise of his privilege, Mr. Hardy went to Owen Sound on behalf of the Controller of Customs and, addressing a large meeting of the people of that town, which is much interested in shipping and in marine matters, said:

> I am not talking politics to you to-night, but business. I want to know what you Owen Sounders have to lose by electing Mr. Paterson. (Cries of "Nothing.") What have you to gain by electing Mr. McLaughlin? (Cries of "Nothing.") Some of you say "Nothing." That is the point you must keep before you. Do you want a feeble commerce and a decaying population, or do you want the opposite? Shall Owen Sound stagnate for five years to come or perhaps ten years to come, or will you put yourselves in a position to be in sympathy with the Government.

I say it would have been more fair if he had given them fair promises if they would support the candidate he favoured. But he goes out of his way to threaten the town that the influence of the Government would be thrown against the town, damaging it and causing it to stagnate if at all possible. When that example is set, do you stand in amazement to know that every official in the province, whether his position be a humble one or whether it be an exalted one, takes a strong interest—aye, more than a strong interest, as has been stated here to-night by hon. gentlemen who preceded me. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) cited the case of Mr. Preston, who resigned the position of Librarian of the local legislature in order to become a candidate in the Dominion election, and, after his defeat was at once replaced in his position. Why, there sits in the House here to-day as representative of the city of Ottawa, a gentleman who held a position of trust under the Ontario government, which he resigned in order to become a candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite. And I have little reason to doubt that had that hon. gentleman been defeated, he would at once have been restored to a position he had vacated. Not only that, Sir, but a gentleman whom I had the honour, and I may add the pleasure, of defeating in my constituency, was also an employee of the local government. Going through the whole chapter, going through the whole list, it may be said, as has been alleged here by hon. gentlemen to-night, that the whole power, the whole machinery of the local government is used in federal elections and in elections for the legislative assembly, in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite should, I think, be fair. I think they should be prepared, as I said before, to accord that principle of British fair-play to all officials. If an official has voted against the Government they admit the principle that he is perfectly within his rights in doing so. They admit furthermore that if he has acted in a fair manner—and it is hard to determine what is meant by a fair manner—that then, too, he should not be interfered with. Why, Sir, who is to be the judge? Who is to decide as to the

extent to which an official under this Government or under any Government may interfere in election matters? The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) complained—after all when the complaint is sifted I think there is but little in it—that the officers and men in the Battery at Kingston marched to the polls in a body against him. Now, had it been an election contest for the local legislature, I would say there was something in the complaint of the hon. gentleman, because, with a friendly returning officer and numbered ballots such as they have in the province of Ontario, every facility would have been given to the party in power to see exactly how these men voted. But under the rights of the ballot which is in vogue for members in the House of Commons, every secrecy is provided, and though the men may have gone in a body to the polls, each one had the privilege to vote as he pleased. Now, before this discussion closes I trust the First Minister will announce to the House what the intention of the Government is in regard to these officials. The hon. gentleman is credited, and I believe credited rightly so far as my intercourse with him in the past extends, with being of generous impulses and of kindly nature. Now, the hon. gentleman must know that throughout the whole country there is a large number of men holding positions under the Government, and not only are those men keenly interested in the tenure of the office they hold, but they have wives and families, and these are dependent upon the sweet will of hon. gentlemen opposite. Therefore, before the debate closes, I trust the First Minister will announce that not only will he accentuate the statement made by the Controller of Inland Revenue, but that he will go even a little further, and will announce to the office-holders of this country that before any dismissals from office are made, each case shall be fully and impartially investigated. It is not a pleasant task for any Government to dismiss officials, because it must of necessity carry in its train a large amount of hard feeling. I trust that before the debate closes the hon. the First Minister will repel the insinuation which has been made by hon. gentlemen, ministers of the exterior, if I may so term them, that the principle shall be carried out that the Liberal party having been successful at the polls, shall adopt the motto, "To the victors belong the spoils," and a wholesale decapitation shall ensue of those holding positions under the Government.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) moved the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that I cannot accede to his demand. We must go on.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a subject that concerns every constituency.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is an important subject, and my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out its importance. But I do not think we can adjourn at this hour.

Mr. FOSTER. Before my hon. friend makes up his mind, I would like to be allowed to say a word. One reason I have for voting for the adjournment of the debate is this: I do not think we can overrate the importance of the subject we have been debating to-day. I have listened with the greatest pleasure and interest to the discussion, so far as it has gone, and to the expressions of opinion which have gone forth from both sides of the House, and which, in the main, I think, have been very reasonable opinions. But it is undeniable that the country is looking with a great deal of interest to the action that will be taken by the incoming Government on this subject. It is being widely discussed throughout the country. Claims are being advanced of a very preposterous nature which I do not think any Government in this country would allow; others of a more moderate nature, and there is a great deal of discussion and a great deal of curiosity aroused in the country with reference to the matter. Now, it is not for the purpose of lengthening the session or preventing supply that we have thought it right to provoke a discussion upon this subject. Certainly the interest in the debate has not been confined to this side of the House. We have not yet come to any conclusion, neither have we got any authoritative statement from the leader of the Government and the important members of the Government, in reference to this subject. We are now face to face with the Estimates for the whole of the civil service and the contingent employees of the country, and on the eve of entering into the consideration of those items it is not unreasonable that we should discuss a matter of this kind and that we should have some reasonable expression of opinion from the leader of the Government and the prominent members of the Government as to the policy they propose to pursue. For my own part I should like to say something on the subject in hand, as I am pretty certain would a large number of other members. The leader of the Opposition is not present with us to-day, but he will be at the next sitting of the House, and he will have something to say on this subject. It will not add to the length of the session, or detract from the rapidity of Supply, by having a reasonable discussion on this matter, which is a most important one. It is not raised for the mere purpose of discussion, but for reasons entirely different from that. So I would like to press upon the leader of the House whether it is not reasonable to adjourn the debate at the present time.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has spoken of dismissals. I should like to bring to his

notice the case of a postmistress in his own county, or what was his county, or what might be his future county. Why was Mrs. Nase dismissed from office and the position given to his friend Mrs. Waters, a schoolmate of his early days. The hon. gentleman is always surprised. When I met him in Queen's the other day, before he cleared out as he did from King's, he was surprised at everything. He expressed surprise when I endeavoured to cut adrift some of the statements made by him that were not directly to the point in issue. The hon. gentleman talks about officials interfering with elections; and yet his nominee, Mr. Morton, who holds the office of Judge of Probate, was trotted out to fight me in the constituency that the Minister had left, because it had left him. I shall have something more to say when we get further into this debate, and then I will be able to give the House, if necessary, sufficient evidence to show that the hon. gentleman's speech to-night is as untenable as his position has been during his previous history.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has asked me a question, and I suppose it is necessary to answer it. The question he asked was, why I had dismissed Mrs. Nase, who was postmistress in King's, and appointed a Mrs. Waters, who was an old schoolmate of my own. In the first place, I never was aware that Mrs. Nase was postmistress, and to my certain knowledge she never was. In the second place, Mrs. Waters was never a schoolmate of mine. I hope when the hon. gentleman proceeds with his further disclosures he will try to keep a little nearer to accuracy than he has done now.

Mr. DOMVILLE. When I make a further statement, I shall be able to prove that Mrs. Nase was postmistress and also that Mrs. Waters was a schoolmate of the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the leader of the Government has now obtained a reason from the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville) why this debate should be adjourned, namely, that he may have an opportunity of looking up these important facts and reporting to the House at its next sitting.

The PRIME MINISTER. That, perhaps, is a good reason for adopting the motion to adjourn. But I must insist that next week—and I hope I shall have the support of hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter—the House shall sit at least until 12 o'clock. I do not want to quarrel so early in the session, and I shall therefore agree to an adjournment for this week, at all events.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st August, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LIBERATION OF CONVICT HAYES.

Mr. DAVIN (for Mr. Bergeron) asked:

Is it true that Walter C. Hayes, a convict who was undergoing a sentence of seven years in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, has been liberated by order of the Department of Justice? If so, when, and for what reason?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Yes, an order was sent on the 21st instant to the warden of the penitentiary to release Hayes. The prisoner had by good conduct earned all possible remission (448 days) allowed under the prison rules upon a seven years' sentence and had actually served five years, five months and three days, and his sentence would have by lapse of time expired on the 6th November next, and it having been represented to the Minister of Justice and established by statutory declaration that the convict's mother was on her death bed, and from the best advice of physicians could not live more than one or two weeks; that she was expressing great anxiety to see her son before her death, and that it would be an act of humanity if the sentence could be commuted or the prisoner released in order that he might see his mother before her death, and it being further represented to the Minister that Hayes would go directly upon his release to Chicago where his mother was, the Minister thought fit in recognition of the prisoner's good conduct during his imprisonment to recommend the remission of the two months and sixteen days remaining of the sentence.

THE CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the prospective injury to Canadian shipping and other interests by the construction of the Chicago Drainage Canal? What steps does the Government intend taking for the protection of Canadian interests in this matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Yes. The late Government appointed Mr. O'Hanly, civil engineer, to report on the effect of the Chicago Drainage Canal on the levels of the great lakes. His report has been printed, and will at once be distributed. The whole subject will receive from the Government the consideration its importance demands.

MILITIA CAMPS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Have arrangements been definitely concluded for the holding of the militia camps this year,

and have any expenditures therefor been yet incurred or any payments therefor been made ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Arrangements have been concluded for the holding of militia camps in September next, in accordance with general order, a copy of which I lay on the Table of the House. No expenditure except what is absolutely necessary has been incurred, and no payments have been made.

Mr. FOSTER. I am to understand, then, that some expenditures have been incurred ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Authorized, yes.

THE SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the Government received any information as to the proceedings of the commission appointed by the late Government to inquire into the best means of coming to a satisfactory settlement with the Indians on the Songhees Indian Reserve ?
2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to instruct their commissioner to report forthwith ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In a despatch of the 31st January last, the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia transmitted a minute of his Executive Council embodying a resolution passed by the legislative assembly of that province during the then ensuing session, which resolution requested that the question of the removal of the Songhees tribe of Indians from their reserve to a more suitable locality be referred to a special commission. By an Order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council of the 1st April last a commissioner was named to act for the Dominion Government. By a despatch of the 3rd June last from the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia the Dominion Government was apprised of the appointment of a co-commissioner ; but it was at the same time intimated that the definition of the scope of the proposed special commission, as set forth in the aforesaid Order in Council of the 1st April, was not sufficiently clear. No instructions were given to the commissioners named by the Governments to proceed, and consequently no report has been received from them. The question of defining the scope of the proposed commission is at present under consideration, and no instructions can be sent to the Dominion commissioner until an understanding is come to between the two Governments as to the scope of the commission.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to ask Parliament during the present session to grant a subsidy to a railway running from Bute Inlet, northward ? If not, why not ?

Is it the intention of the Government to ask Parliament during the present session to grant a subsidy to a railway running from Nanaimo to Comox, and thence northward ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to vote any railway subsidies during the present session.

THE VICTORIA AND CARMANAH POINT TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to take steps at once to improve the telegraph line from Victoria to Carmanah Point, either by taking the line by another route or by doing more clearing on the present one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This matter is under serious consideration.

HATCHERIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to erect a new fish hatchery on the Fraser River, and also one on the Skeena River this year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No. Steps are being taken toward the selection of sites for hatcheries on both rivers.

PUBLIC WORKS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to ask Parliament this session for the necessary funds to erect the following works in British Columbia :—
   (1.) Fog alarm at entrance to Victoria Harbour ?
   (2.) Light beacon on Fiddle Reef ?
   (3.) Lighthouse at entrance to Vancouver Narrows ?
   (4.) Light on Sisters Island ?
   (5.) Pole light in Chemainus Harbour ?
   (6.) Light beacon on Botchie's Ledge ?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to have those works carried out this year, at once ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The necessity for the erecting and constructing of these public works to which the hon. gentleman's question refers has been lately pressed on the Government by the members from British Columbia, and also by memorials which we have received from Messrs. Templeman & Milne, of Victoria. The arguments used in favour of the construction of many of these public works are very strong, and I am in hopes that when the hon. gentleman sees the Supplementary Estimates his heart will be somewhat gladdened—perhaps not as much as he expects.

SMUGGLING BETWEEN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to provide by purchase, or otherwise, a steamer to be used for the purpose of putting a stop to the smuggling now going on between the United States and British Columbia; also to protect our deep sea fisheries in British Columbia from American poachers?

2. If so, will the vessel be ready for use this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The question of fitting up the steamer "Sir James Douglas" for the purpose of patrolling the coast was under the consideration of the late Ministry. It would require $10,000 at least to make the necessary repairs to the hull and machinery and no appropriation has been made for the purpose. Consequently no action can be taken in the matter until the present Ministry have the opportunity of fully considering it.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked:

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails from the Canadian Pacific Railway station, in the village of Gorrie, Ontario, to the Gorrie post office?

2. When was the contract given, and when will it terminate?

3. Was the contract given by tender or by private agreement?

4. What is the amount paid annually for carrying those mails?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. Henry Perkins. 2. Contract was given on 1st January, 1893, and will terminate on the 31st December, 1896. 3. Contract was a renewal on the same terms and conditions as the prior contract. 4. $160 per annum.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked:

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails from the Canadian Pacific Railway station, in the village of Fordwich, to the Fordwich post office?

2. When was the contract given and when will it terminate?

3. Was the contract given by tender or private agreement?

4. What is the amount of the contract annually?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to give him the following information:—1. Robert Mahood. 2. The contract was given on the 1st January, 1896, and will terminate on the 31st December, 1899. 3. The contract is a renewal on the same terms and conditions as that immediately prior to it. 4. The rate is 18 cents per trip; the annual payment will be $112.68.

BONAVENTURE RIVER MONEY ORDER OFFICE.

Mr. FAUVEL asked:

1. At whose request was a money order office established at Bonaventure River post office, in the county of Bonaventure?

2. What has been the amount of receipts from the said source since its opening?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: Establishment of money order business applied for on 8th April, 1895, by Napoleon Poirier, Alfred Arsenault and fifteen others. Made a money order office, 1st July, 1895. Number of orders issued—5. Amount—$75. Amount paid, nil. Money order business discontinued 30th July, 1896.

POSTMASTER AT QUEENSTON, ONT.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Gibson) asked:

The name of the postmaster at Queenston, Ontario, the date of appointment and the salary paid?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The name is Charles Lowrey, the date of his appointment, 7th July, 1896, and his salary, $156.

THE CRUISER "ABERDEEN."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (for Mr. Casgrain) asked:

Whether the Government are aware that the cruiser "Aberdeen" was placed at the disposal of the leader of the Opposition, in the legislature of Quebec, F. G. Marchand, Esq., and Mr. Dechesne, M.L.A., during the present month of August to convey them to the Magdalen Islands?

Who, if any one, gave instructions to the commander of the "Aberdeen" to convey these gentlemen to the Magdalen Islands?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). In reply to the first question, No. In reply to the second, the usual permission was granted by the department, subject to the customary conditions that it would not interfere with the duties upon which the vessel was engaged and that the daily charge for subsistence while on board should be exacted.

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

Mr. CRAIG asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to ascertain the mind of the people on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite? If so, when?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). As my hon. friend is aware, this is a part of the programme of the Liberal party. The Government intend to take a plebiscite, but the date cannot be fixed at present.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS.

Mr. LISTER (for Mr. Britton) asked:

Was the material as specified in the contract for six locomotive boilers for the Intercolonial

Railway, two of which boilers were to be delivered on the 1st July, 1896, two on the 1st August, 1896, and two on 1st September, 1896, actually used in the construction of said boilers? If not, what change was made? When and by whom was such change authorized, and what allowance, if any, was made by reason of such change?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). In the absence of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, I beg to reply to the hon. gentleman as follows:—There are two contracts for locomotive boilers for the Intercolonial Railway. One for six boilers with Carrier, Lainé & Co., Lévis. Two to be delivered on July 1st, two on August 1st, and two on September 1st, 1896. None have yet been delivered and when the inspector visited the shops a week ago, work had not been commenced on them, and the material was not on hand. No change of material has been made, and no change has been authorized or any allowance made. The contract is with John McDougall & Co., Montreal, for six boilers. Two to be delivered on July 1st, two on August 1st, and two on October 1st, 1896. None of these have yet been delivered. The inspector was at the John McDougall's works on the 24th August instant, and reports one will be ready for delivery in about a month—the material specified in the contract was actually used in the construction of the boiler. No change of material has been made and no change has been authorized, or any allowance made to contractors.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. McINNES asked:

Whether the Government are aware that Hon. Theodore Davie, Chief Justice of British Columbia, was engaged in canvassing during the late election? If so, is it the intention of the Government to inquire into the matter?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government is not aware that Mr. Justice Davie was engaged in canvassing during the late election. The facts have not been brought to the attention of the Government yet.

SENTENCE OF SHORTIS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to investigate the commutation of the sentence of Valentine Cuthbert Shortis to be hanged on the 3rd of January last, into imprisonment for life, as promised by the Minister of Public Works during his campaign in Beauharnois?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). This subject is now engaging the attention of the Government.

FREIGHT RATES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether the First Minister was rightly reported by the Moose Jaw "Times" as having said at Moose Jaw, on the 28th September, 1894:

"I understand the freight rates you have to pay are outrageous. This condition must have a solution. I speak here as an honest man and any pledge I make to you will be carried out to the letter. There must be competition. There must be a solution for this unbearable condition, and I promise and pledge myself that at the proper time the solution and remedy shall be applied."

Does the hon. the First Minister intend to inaugurate legislation respecting freight rates?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I may say I cannot answer for the language at this distant day, but the sentiments are sound, and it is very likely that I gave utterance to them. If I did I must have added—I am pretty sure I did add—that one of the causes of the present high rates of freight in the North-west Territories is the present tariff, which, instead of promoting trade, is contracting trade, and that the reform of the tariff by forcing an expansion of trade, would also force the lowering of freight rates, as the reform of the tariff on lumber in 1894 has already produced a lowering of freights on that class of article, as my hon. friend knows. It is the intention of the Government, not this session, but next session, to introduce that legislation respecting the tariff which will compel the lowering of the freight rates as well.

SUB-COLLECTOR FOR THE PORT OF LOUISBOURG.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) asked:

1. Is the Government aware that Mr. Patrick O'Toole, of Louisbourg, Cape Breton, sub-collector for that port, is engaged in business as a general merchant?

2. Have the Government had any communication with any parties in reference to this matter?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). In the absence of the Controller of Customs, I give the answer to the hon. gentleman's question as follows:—1. The Government is aware that Mr. Patrick O'Toole, of Louisburg, Cape Breton, sub-collector, at a salary of $150 per year, at that port, is reported to run a general supplying store. 2. Communications from W. H. McAlpine, of Louisbourg, have been received in reference o this matter, in May and June, 1896.

LAND TRANSFERS.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Have all the lands earned by the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, Regina, Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company, Manitoba North-western Railway Company and the Alberta Railway and Coal Company been transferred to these companies, and are the transfers recorded so that the record is available to the public?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier.) 1. Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company. The lands earned by this company

are not yet all selected. The company's officers and agents, however, are at the present time engaged in the work of examination and selection, their selection being subject to approval by the Governor in Council. 1,590,288.98 acres have been scheduled by Orders of the Governor in Council, and the balance of 298,-159.02 acres will be similarly dealt with as rapidly as possible. The record in this case is in the Department of the Interior and open to the public. 2. Regina, Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company. The Government and this company have not yet come to an agreement as to the lands which are to be scheduled and conveyed to the company under the statutes and Orders in Council providing a land subsidy in aid of the construction of this road. 3. Manitoba North-western Railway Company. A tract of land sufficient to provide for the land subsidy to which this railway company is entitled has been under reservation since 4th of October, 1884, the schedules of the townships out of which this grant may be made having in the meantime been altered and amended, but the area under reservation not diminished. The whole of the area to which the company is entitled on account of construction has not yet been transferred to them, but land warrants to the full amount of the area earned have been issued by the company, endorsed by the Government, and on selection by the holders of the warrants the lands are patented to them. 234,-293 48-100 acres of land have been patented to the company or their nominees, and 1,-267,082 52-100 acres remain still to be patented. Under an arrangement with the government of Manitoba, however, from which aid was obtained by the company, under the Provincial Railway Subsidies Act, the Government of Canada has undertaken not to issue patents for more than 5,000 acres per month, without the express consent of the Manitoba government. The provincial government in each month are furnished with a schedule of the lands patented to the company or their nominees. The record of these patents, in the Department of the Interior, is available to the public, and so, presumably, is the record in the possession of the government of Manitoba. In so far as concerns that portion of the land patented which is situated in the North-west Territories, the registry office at Regina and Prince Albert, from which the certificate of title issue, also contain a record which is open to the public. 4. The Alberta Railway and Coal Company. This company is entitled, in consideration of the construction of their line of railway from Dunmore to Lethbridge, to 700,000 acres, of which 691,872.58 acres have been scheduled to them, leaving a balance of 8,928 yet to be selected and scheduled. In consideration of the construction of that portion of their railway from Lethbridge to the international boundary they are entitled to 413,568, of which they have selected 409,756, leaving a balance of 31,812 acres to be selected. The record in this case also is in the Department of the Interior and open to the public. All these railway companies are required to pay at the rate of 10 cents per acre to cover the cost of survey before patents can be issued to them.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

What amount of land in the North-west Territories, earned by the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of grant has not yet been transferred to that company? If any land so earned has not been transferred, why has it not been, and when will it be?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is still engaged in the selection of the lands earned by the construction of the road. The original land grant was 25,000,000 acres, reduced by 6,793,014 acres under the operation of the Act 49 Victoria, chap. 9. Of the 18,206,986 acres of which the company were still entitled after the settlement under this Act. 13,844,871 have already been selected, and the company and the Government are together prosecuting the work of completing the company's land grant as rapidly as circumstances permit. No specific portion of the company's land grant is under the statute to be found in the North-west Territories, but 11,338,187 acres of the selections already made by the company are situated in the Territories. Only a small percentage of the land in the Territories has been patented to the company or their nominees, and the balance of their land grant is still subject to the mortgage created under the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 32, under which the hon. the Minister of Finance of Canada, John Turnbull, G. M. Clark and R. B. Angus are the trustees. Any patents that are issued to the company direct are subject to this mortgage, and patents can only be issued to purchasers upon a form of release of the mortgage being recorded in the Department of the Interior. The lands are not available for sale to settlers or others until released from the mortgage.

UNOPPOSED NOTICES OF MOTION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was going to suggest to the hon. leader of the Government whether it would not expedite business to take the unopposed motions, as we sometimes have done, and in that way reach all those that are not opposed, and, later, have an opportunity for discussion on the others.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER. By the consent of the House the notices of motion will be called, but only those which are not subject to debate and which are unopposed will be taken for the present, and the list will again be gone over when that portion has been eliminated.

SUPPLIES FOR REPAIRS OF VESSELS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence since the 20th of July last between the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Ottawa and the officers thereof or others respecting supplies for repair of vessels and steamers under the control of that department which are in the habit of visiting at the port of Charlottetown, Georgetown and Pictou, and are employed either for the protection of the coast fisheries or in the supervision and maintenance of lights.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection at all to the motion, but I do not understand that there are any papers. Would the hon. gentleman indicate more definitely what he refers to?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For instance, there were instructions in regard to supplies which those vessels should take at the different ports of distribution, and in regard to the patronage connected with those vessels, at the time those gentlemen took office. Since then, I understand, these vessels do not take supplies at Pictou: and in connection particularly with one ship which went in there to coal; she was ordered out of the port after coaling, and sent over to Charlottetown to be supplied there. I take it that in connection with that matter there must have been instructions cancelling previous instructions, though I know nothing of it. But, as the hon. gentleman has no objection to the motion passing, if there is correspondence, it will be brought down; if not, there can be no harm done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection.

Motion agreed to.

CULLING OF TIMBER.

Mr. QUINN moved for:

Return showing the number of cubic feet of square, round and waney timber of every description and the number of standards of deals and other lumber exported from the port of Montreal, in each year from and including 1890 to the 30th June of the present year 1896, giving the names of the exporters and the quantity of each kind of timber or other lumber shipped by each exporter and the amount of culler's fees paid by each exporter; and in cases where fees have not been paid, the return to show what amount should have been paid and by whom.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). There can be no objection to that motion, but I would make a suggestion to my hon. friend, in order to save a good deal of useless work in copying some letters which, though they may indirectly allude to this matter, are really of no importance. I hope my hon. friend will do me the pleasure of calling at the office, and I will look over the papers with him in order that we may agree upon those that he may consider indispensable.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER.

SUBSIDIES TO NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. OLIVER moved for:

Copies of all memorials, resolutions or other documents from the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories for an increase of subsidy, and all correspondence in connection with the same.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to listen for a short time to an explanation of the object for which this motion is made. The motion is moved in order to afford information to the House on a subject of considerable interest to the House and to the country. It is a subject in regard to which efforts have been made for the enlightenment of the House in the past, or rather for the enlightenment of the late Government, but the information never reached the House, and it seems to me it would be well to take up a short time of this sitting in order to arrive at an understanding of this question. The motion relates to the financial condition of the legislature of the North-west Territories in its connection with this Government. The position occupied by the Territories at the present time is very similar to the position of a province, that is to say, the territorial government and legislature have all, or nearly all, the responsibilities of a provincial government or legislature, and at the same time they have much greater responsibilities than the government of any province, owing to the immense area of country they are expected to govern and the difficulties of carrying on that government. While the North-west government and legislature have almost equal power and greater responsibility than the government of a province, the government and legislature are confronted with the position that they have not adequate finances, and those finances have been inadequate for some years past. The area under the government of the North-west Territories is, roughly speaking, something like 600 miles square; it is very much larger than the settled area of all the eastern provinces of the Dominion, and settlement being scattered more or less over this great area, the expense and difficulty of carrying on the government are proportionately increased. It is not only that there is a great area over which settlement is scattered, but there is also diversity of interest. There is the wheat raising interest in the east, the cattle raising interest in the west, the coal mining in the mountains, and the trading interest in the far north—a diversity of interests that renders legislation and government in that country more difficult probably than in any province, or, at all events, in any province having a similar population. The population of the Territories in 1891 was stated as 66,799, and the subsidies at that time derived from the Dominion Parliament amounted in 1892 to $211,200. Since that time the

population has increased, so that in 1894, according to the census then taken by the police, the population was 86,000, and taking the same rate of increase down to the end of the current fiscal year, it may be placed in the neighbourhood of 112,000. While the population has increased from 66,000 to 112,000, the subsidy on which the government of the Territories is based, has increased only from $211,000 to $242,000: that is to say, that while the population has nearly doubled, the subsidy on which the government of the Territories is conducted, has only increased by 15 per cent: to be more accurate, while the population has increased 70 per cent, the subsidy has increased only 15 per cent. There was difficulty in governing those Territories in 1891 with the then subsidy, but the difficulty is much greater now, with not only a larger population, but a population that has gone into new portions of the country, while at the same time the Territories have received comparatively less subsidy. The duties of the government of the Territories are much the same as the duties of the governments in the older provinces, and one of the first charges on the treasury, both in the Territories and in the provinces, is the maintenance of education. In 1892 there were in the Territories 245 schools in operation; in 1895 there were 395 schools in operation, and in 1896 there are 489 schools organized, of which nearly all are in operation, so that in connection with that particular charge on the treasury there has been nearly a doubling of the expense. The cost of education in the Territories is now nearly double what it was a few years ago, while the grant out of which that cost has to be paid has only increased to the extent of 15 per cent. I admit that the grant in aid of education in the Territories is comparatively large, that is to say, the aid granted by the territorial legislature to the school districts in the Territories is relatively large, but it has to be large in order that education shall be carried on there at all. This is on account of the system of land grants which have prevailed in that country. It is provided that twenty sections out of every thirty-six, that is twenty square miles out of every thirty-six, shall be reserved from settlement. Instead of schools being supported by people settled on every quarter section in a township, they have to be supported by such settlers as may be on sixteen out of the thirty-six sections. The scattered settlement in that country, is what makes it more necessary that there shall be a large grant in aid of the schools. Without that large grant these schools could not be conducted, and without schools you cannot hope to attract settlement, nor can you even expect to retain the settlement you have. When a settler is not sufficiently interested in the education of his children to demand a school as one of his first requirements, the chances are that such a settler is no good to the country. The school expenditure which in 1893-94 was $97,000, has increased to such an extent that it will amount to $120,000 this year. These are the amounts that have been granted to schools out of the subsidies allowed to the Territories. It therefore will be plain to the House, that the greater proportion of the total subsidy voted to the territorial legislature by this Parliament, has been expended on education. Although at first sight the grant would appear to be large it will be found upon inquiry that it is not larger than the case requires.

Public works are the second great charge on the revenues of the Territories. As we all know, in the case of the organized provinces, the greater part of the expenditure upon public works is borne by the municipalities, and the provincial legislatures bear only a small proportion of the cost of such works. In the Territories, owing to the scattered settlement of the country, and owing to the nature of the country, it is simply impossible to have such an organization as you have in the older provinces, and as a consequence the territorial legislature has to bear a larger proportion of the cost of works which is usually borne by the municipal organizations in the provinces. There is therefore a special charge upon the territorial treasury, which does not bear upon the treasuries of the provinces, and that charge exists because of the peculiar condition of the Territories. This peculiar condition in its turn is a result of the administration of this Parliament in holding in reservation from settlement such a large proportion of the lands. Parliament having taken upon itself a certain responsibility in regard to that matter and having laid down a certain policy, must certainly be held responsible for the results of that policy. When Parliament has absolutely, as may be said, prohibited settlement in the greater part of that country, it seems to me that Parliament must be prepared to make good the deficiency in the revenue necessary to carry on the proper business of the country. As in the case of schools it is in the case of public works, especially roads and bridges. These roads and bridges which would be kept up if there was settlement on every section, simply cannot be kept up when settlement is on less than half the sections. If we are to have public improvements in that country, the burden must be borne to a very great extent by the treasury of the Territories, which again must be supported by a subsidy from this Parliament. There are not only roads and bridges to construct and maintain, but there is also the question of the water supply throughout a great portion of that country. Without an improved water supply, which can only be secured by the expenditure of money, settlement cannot increase as it ought to or as it otherwise would. There are other special expenditures which have to be made, expenditures which

are not needed in any of the older provinces. For instance, during one year, $8,000 was paid for wolf bounty, in order to protect the cattle in the ranching country against wolves. This is an expenditure peculiar to the Territories, and it is one which has to be incurred in the interests of the cattle industry. There are also special expenditures in the wheat growing country, such as the money which has to be paid to try to keep down the gopher pest. This gopher pest exists chiefly by reason of the fact that there is so much vacant land. The gophers do not propagate on the cultivated land but on the land that is unoccupied, and the protection of the cultivated land from the gophers has cost $4,000 in one year. There is also the question of the relief of distress which has to be provided for by the Territories. There has to be provision made sometimes for the relief of distress, and to compensate for losses of crop by hail storms and otherwise. In the older provinces the municipalities take care of distressed persons, but in our country, on account of there being no municipal organizations, that must be done at the expense of the territorial government. The cause of humanity must prevail in the Territories as well as in the provinces, and people cannot be allowed to suffer or to die for lack of pecuniary assistance. We have also a number of hospitals which have to receive governmental assistance. These hospitals receive $4,000 a year. When that grant was made the idea was that each hospital should receive 40 cents per day for each non-paying patient treated. However, owing to the increase of patients and the increase of hospitals, the grant now only amounts to 27 cents per day for non-paying patients. This is a charge that has increased from year to year and it is a charge that must be provided for. There has also been $3,000 paid out for the encouragement of the creamery industry, and this, I may say, is a most desirable policy and a wise expenditure. I allude to all these matters for the purpose of showing in the first place, the necessity for them, and in the second place, the advantage of the money being expended in the manner in which it is expended. The expenditure is not only of advantage to the Territories, but it is of advantage to the whole of Canada, for I need not remind hon. gentlemen that whatever assists the improvement and development of that country is also of advantage to the entire Dominion.

While large sums have been used for education and public works, and these sums have been on the increase from year to year, those charges which are for what you may call the running of the machine, have not increased in proportion to the increase of population. The grant for clerical assistance in 1892 was $16,701, and in 1895 it was $12,460; so that that expenditure has been decreased very materially under the present North-west administration. The cost of the executive, or cabinet, has stood at $5,500 a year for the last five years; the expenditure on printing account, which was $6,000 in 1892, was reduced to $4,000 in 1895. So that, if a question is asked as to how the assembly expends the money which is granted by Parliament, I think it can be shown that the money is expended judiciously, both in matters of improvement and in matters of routine.

There are two grounds upon which the territorial government or legislature are entitled to an increased grant. One is that the territorial government is a creation of this Parliament. It was at one time merely a branch of the Department of the Interior, and money was provided through that department for the purpose of carrying on the business of the Territories. Now, Parliament, having created a certain institution in the North-west Territories, is in duty bound to provide the funds necessary to carry on that institution. On the other hand, the people of the Territories are entitled to stand in exactly the same position as the citizens of any province. They are citizens of this Dominion as much as are the people of the provinces. They contribute their share to the revenues of the country, as do the people of the provinces; and, having been granted control of their local government, they are entitled to fully as much subsidy for their local purposes in return for the amounts they have paid into the general treasury as are the people of the provinces. Calculating on that basis, I will give you a few figures to show that in asking for an increase on the moderate amount that has been granted during past years, they are not asking for more than they are entitled to. Taking the increase of population that occurred from 1891 to 1894, and assuming the same percentage of increase until the end of the present fiscal year, we would have a population of 113,000. In the case of Manitoba, the amount payable per head is based, not on the actual population at the time, but on the supposed or expected population, two and a half years in advance, that is to say, the subsidy per head is readjusted every five years, and the amount is fixed at what it would be on the basis of population when half the term of five years is up. Applying the same calculation to the North-west Territories, it would give us a supposed population of 141,000, which, at 80 cents per head, would entitle us to $112,000 a year. On debt account, the present actual population would entitle us to $156,000 a year. Taking the amount allowed to Manitoba for the cost of government, that is to say $50,000 a year, and an allowance on account of the land, such as given in Manitoba, say $125,000 a year, the Territories would be in a position at the present time to claim, in a readjustment of the subsidy, in the neighbourhood of $440,000 a year. They are not asking for that amount at the present moment; but they are asking for a substantial increase in the amount

which has been granted in past years, so as to catch up to some extent with the present requirements. Let me say that the manner in which the subsidy has been calculated in the past has been this. The territorial government made up an estimate of what was required. The Department of the Interior granted either that amount or as much less as it saw fit. The territorial government was compelled to keep within the amount voted. When the territorial government, next year, sent down an estimate for an increased amount, the department here, I suppose, argued: "Well, you got along with so much last year; you can certainly get on with the same amount this year." So the amount has been kept at about the same figure for the last five years. This, it appears to me, is putting the matter on a false basis, which is neither in the interest of the North-west, in the interest of this Dominion, nor in accord with the dignity of this Parliament in its dealings with the institution which itself has created.

In regard to the grant on account of the land, I would say a word or two. The province of Manitoba has been granted $100,000 a year in consideration of its public lands having been administered by Parliament. In the Territories there is, I suppose, four or five times as much land as there is in the province of Manitoba; and, while it may be argued that the land is not profitable to the government, that the administration of it has not returned a financial profit to the Government, let me put the matter to you in this way. Parliament has seen fit in the past to grant off these lands to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is a national work and not a North-western work simply, to the extent of 25,000,000 acres. I understand that that land has been bonded to the amount of $1.25 an acre; so that its value stands, under these bonds, at something like $31,000,000, which, at 4 per cent, is equivalent to a million and a quarter dollars a year. This is not any fancy calculation, but a calculation on the basis of actual cash. So that, when we say that the Territories are entitled to consideration on account of the amount of Government land there, we are not going beyond the mark when we say that we should be dealt with at least as favourably as the province of Manitoba, particularly when we call your attention to the fact that the province of Prince Edward Island has received a specieal grant of something like $40,000 a year, in consideration of the fact that at the time of entering confederation it had not any public land at all; and that the province of British Columbia has been granted $100,000 a year, in consideration of what is known as the railway belt, in which belt the province still holds the precious metals, which, I suppose, are really the most valuable part of the land. Now, a statement has been made by the local government, asking for a certain increase in the annual subsidy, based on actual requirements. Not that they do not want a readjustment of grant on the basis of the provincial subsidies.

The papers I asked for are for the purpose of showing what is absolutely required for the carrying on of the government of the North-west Territories during the current fiscal year and not for the purpose of making a permanent arrangement. The government of the Territories, however, as will be shown by the papers, are prepared at any time to enter into an arrangement for a permanent subsidy on a provincial basis suitable to the special position and circumstances of the Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad my hon. friend has made this motion and brought the claims of the Territories before the House. I do not know whether I understood him to say that he was bringing these matters before the House for the first time.

Mr. OLIVER. I said that I understood that these papers have never been laid on the Table.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I am exceedingly glad that my hon. friend has brought this matter before the House. As the House is well aware, I have annually brought before it the claims of the Territories, and made an argument in favour of an increased subsidy, somewhat in the line of that which my hon. friend has made. There cannot be any doubt that not merely now but, as I pointed out, either last session or the session before last, the North-west Territories were long ago entitled to far more money than was given them year after year, and in fact I think it was either last session or the session before last that I argued that there was something like a million dollars or more of arrears due the North-west Territories, bearing in mind what should have been paid, on the basis of the calculation made by my hon. friend in his able speech this afternoon and comparing that with the amount which has been given. In 1889, the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories submitted a memorandum to the then Minister of the Interior in which they submitted the argument that, with an estimated population of 150,000 as a basis to go on—and that was not too much even then, taking what had been done for Manitoba—the subsidy at the rate of 80 cents per head, which was allowed the provinces, would amount to $120,000. They further submitted that on debt account the Territories are entitled to 5 per cent interest on $27.77 per head on an actual population of 100,000, which would amount to $138,850, and that the specific grant for governmental purposes should be at least as liberal as that made to Manitoba, that is to say, $50,000. And they, further submitted that:

Owing to the vast area of the Territories and the widely scattered nature of the settlement, all the local business of the government is ren-

dered more expensive proportionately to population than in any of the provinces.

For these reasons they asked a specific annual grant for the five years term of $100,000, and claimed an aggregate sum of over $400,000. Any man who has listened attentively to my hon. friend this afternoon will agree that with the population they then had, and proceeding on the ratio that had been dealt out to Manitoba in 1870, the North-west Territories in 1889—that is several years ago—were entitled to a grant of $400,000. On the 27th February of that year, I made a motion in this House somewhat similar to that made by my hon. friend this afternoon. I moved for copies of all memorials addressed to the Government by the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories which had then sat recently at Regina, and I presented, as best I could, the claims of the North-west Territories, as set forth by the legislative assembly of which my hon. friend was then a member and had been for some time. As will be seen by reference to page 355 of the "Hansard" of 1889, I pointed out that the old council of 1887 petitioned for responsible government, and I stated what the memorial set forth, and I pressed for a subsidy very much larger than what had been given up to that time or than what has been given since. And I pointed out that we might take a leaf out of the book of the United States and follow the example set by that country in dealing with its territories. I pointed out that Minnesota, Wyoming, Dakota and Montana each got in lands, a large extent of territory for subsidizing branch lines. That is something which this Government has never contemplated doing for the government of the Territories, but I contend that the sooner we give the giant in the North-west its limbs the better. The sooner we give that North-west people, now far in excess of numbers of what Manitoba was in 1870, what it is entitled to, the better; and as anybody will see who visits the giant, as the hon. Prime Minister did, at the time when the legislative assembly was sitting, the representatives in that assembly will compare well with the representatives of any assembly in the provinces. What is the reason this Government should keep that giant in leading strings all these years? I appeal to the hon. Minister to cut those strings. He is fond of regarding himself as a breaker of manacles, let him break those manacles that are on the limbs of the North-west Territories, let him give the Territories provincial autonomy and the annual subsidy to which it is entitled by reason of its population, according to the calculation so ably set forth by my hon. friend this afternoon. I would go further than was done in the case of Manitoba, and would give the young man, so to speak, when I set him up in life, all the implements of manhood. I would give him the means of building his own railways. Here is what happened in these Territories which have been very successful, as I need not say, below the line. Minnesota with 83,000 square miles (Assiniboia has 93,000 square miles) received land for subsidizing 1,800 miles of railway, and with the swamps, started in possession of one-third of the territory. What does that policy enable these Territories to do. I read from my speech seven years ago:

It gives them, while young, that nutriment and vital force, without which anything young cannot thrive. As the Right Hon. the Prime Minister is now acting Minister of Railways, I should like to call his attention to this fact. At this hour the government of Minnesota receives an income of $600,000 a year, 3 per cent on the gross earnings of the lines of railway that it chartered and subsidized since 1849, when it was organized. But it may be said: "Ah, but those territories were very populous." Not at all. In 1849, when Minnesota was organized, it had only a population of 6,000——

I think my hon. friend said our population in 1894 was 84,000, and it is more to-day.

—and the aggregate population of all the four territories at the respective dates of their organization did not equal by five or six thousand the population of the North-west to-day. That is the point which I submit as well worthy of the consideration of the Government, because I think we may err on the side of keeping the strings too much in our hands here in Ottawa, and not giving sufficient scope for the young giant, for which I plead here to-day, to develop his limbs. Now, it will be said to us, no doubt, you have got the mounted police. So we have, and we are very glad to have them; but elsewhere you have batteries, militia, and military schools, and we pay for those just as well as you pay for the mounted police; and before you know where you are, I believe in the next five years, you will find we shall have a population in those Territories which will be subscribing to your military schools, and batteries, and militia just as much as you are subscribing to the North-west mounted police. And remember that in any case the cost of defence would fall on the Federal Government; so that you cannot fairly make anything of our having the mounted police.

Now what I point out there is of great importance—that the United States government, in dealing with territories is more generous than the Government of Canada. And as I repeat the argument, I repeat to the hon. gentleman opposite the appeal I made to the Government of Sir John Macdonald, and I say to him that not only will these facts justify him in complying with the demand made by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) this afternoon, but they will justify him in going further. They will justify him in giving to the Territories responsible government. They will justify him in giving the Territories not $260,000 as a grant, but $400,000 a year as a subsidy, and they will justify him in going still further—in giving them lands by which they will be able to build small local railways, so that in ten years from now, they may be in the position that Minnesota is found to be in to-day—drawing a large income from investments in these railways. My hon. friend very

properly pointed out that the government of the North-west Territories really has a more difficult problem before it than any provincial government. As he told you they have a great area—a far greater area than any province—they have scattered settlements and diverse interests. I was very glad to see that he is a supporter of a policy that, before I came to this House at all, I pressed upon the attention of the Government and which, since I have been in this House, I have on several occasions, pressed upon the attention of Parliament. I refer to what the hon. gentleman said concerning the odd sections which, as now dealt with, work a very great evil. They cause a scattered settlement; they enable, as my hon. friend pointed out, the gopher to have a great hunting ground; and not only that, but to-day, half a township minus four sections has to do the work of a whole township. For supporting schools, for making roads and bridges, for all the work of a township, you have not half a township, but only the settled even-numbered sections, minus the four sections, two for the Hudson's Bay Company and two school sections. I have advocated a radical change, and I am glad now to note that I shall have my hon. friend's support, or—which is the same thing to me, if he proposes the reform—he shall have my support. It is a matter of perfect indifference to me who proposes or who carries out anything for the North-west Territories, whoever proposes anything for the good of the Territory will have my strenuous support in this House; and, if a proposition to deal with the odd sections should come from my hon. friend, he may be perfectly certain that he shall have my strong support. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the idea occurred to me of dealing with these odd sections, I went and saw Sir William Van Horne, then Mr. VanHorne. I told him what the conditions of the North-west Territories was and what I believed would be the advantage to the Territories and to Canada if these odd sections were thrown open to settlement. For I apprehend that nothing could be done so far as the land that has been granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway without the co-operation of that company. I pointed out to Mr. Van Horne that if he was ready to agree to reconvey these lands to the Government—or what would probably be the literal truth, if he were ready to forego selecting this land—it would pay his railway to do so even on a very small, or what might seem a small, consideration. For it is palpable that if these odd sections are thrown open for settlement and if they are taken up by settlers the result must be the Canadian Pacific Railway will get double the quantity of freight and double the number of passengers. And not merely that, Sir, but, as we know very well, if you had a whole township instead of half a township the increase in business would not be measured by the mere multiplication by two, as the business would become certainly much more than double what it has been. Sir William Van Horne, who, as we know here, is an enlightened and far-seeing man, and knows well what is for the benefit of his railway, said to me that the proposal seemed to him a good one, but he said I am, of course, in the hands of my directors. I ventured then to say what I think is probably the case, that if Sir William Van Horne advised his directors in a course that, in his opinion, would be for the good of the railway, the chances are that his directors and himself would see eye to eye. My idea was this, that the Government might buy back the lands for $1.25 an acre, and, if they did so, the money paid would be well spent by the Government, it would be a proper use of public money, and it would be a profitable transaction to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, what happened during the late election? One of the planks in my platform was the settlement of the odd sections, and the gentleman who was running against me, held me up to opprobrium, held me up to popular condemnation, because, as he said, I wanted to get the Government to give vast sums to the Canadian Pacific Railway for these odd sections. To my surprise, I found in many parts of my constituency, settlers who took the view that they did not want the odd sections thus disposed of. It is only fair that I should tell Parliament this. It would not be just to Parliament if I stated an argument in favour of the Government reassuming those odd sections, it would not be just to the hon. gentleman—and I could not be unjust to him—it would not be just either to the Government or to Parliament, if I stated an argument in favour of the Government assuming control of those odd sections once more, if I did not also mention the fact that I found, in going through my constituency that a number of settlers took a strong view against that proposal. Not only so, but a very prominent and active gentleman in the neighbouring constituency, Mr. Hawkes, has written, I think, to the Regina "Leader" a long letter, taking my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and myself to task because of the views we are known to hold on this subject of the settlement of the odd sections. So my hon. friend who is at the head of the Government will be aware that a prominent supporter of his considers that it will be a dreadful course to take to expend vast sums to get hold of these odd sections. However, that supporter is not in this House, and is not likely to be; but the other supporter, who urges him here to-day to do something with these odd sections, is in the House, and his vote has to be considered, and I hope he will have more influence with the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government than any person who denounced the proposal when made by myself. It is desirable, as the House knows is my own opinion, that we should

have a great deal more help than we have had in the Territories for creameries, and I think it is desirable that all that should be done by the local government. But how in the past, or how in the present, could the local government do it, when the grant to them is so contemptibly small and so utterly inadequate to the needs of the situation? But if an adequate sum is given them, the local government, being on the spot, could attend to all needs. For instance, we know that in a vast area like the North-west Territories we may have good crops in one part extending over hundreds of thousands of square miles; and in another part we may have a failure of crops. Now, the proper government to deal with that question is the government of the North-west Territories; but how could the government of the North-west Territories deal with it, when, up to the present, the amount doled out to them has been weighed, as it were, in an apothecary's scales with the utmost nicety, so as to measure it out as regards the admitted needs of these Territories? Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure to me to hear my hon. friend's voice once again, and I hope that in this House he and I, while we are colleagues, whether for a long or a short time, will use our united efforts for the good of the Territories, and for the support of any proposal, come from whatever side it may, that will be for the good of the Territories, and let us not turn our efforts against each other at the bidding of either party or faction.

Motion agreed to.

BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Copies of all returns, reports, papers and documents, showing the branch railways connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, the capital invested, subsidies contributed, gross and net earnings and earnings per mile of each railway.

Also, reports and other information showing the effect upon the receipts and expenditures of Government railways by the operation of the Rivière du Loup, St. Charles Branch, Oxford and New Glasgow, Eastern Extension, Cape Breton and other additions to the Intercolonial Railway as originally constructed and operated.

Also any report or papers dealing with the policy for acquiring all connecting branch lines not already owned by the Government.

He said: I simply want to add a few words in explanation of the object I have in view in making this motion. The subject of the operation of these railways has been for some time engaging the attention of the communities touched by the Intercolonial Railway and by the various lines connected with the main line. Many of those branch railways—and there are quite a number of them, particularly in the province of New Brunswick—are, I fancy, in considerable difficulty in connection with the management of those lines, and the people are not served as they would be served, nor is the business of that district of country in such a condition as it would be, if they had anything like the advantages arising from such an operation as obtains on the Government line proper. I think, if the Minister of Railways, for the purpose of meeting this return, would direct the attention of his officers to the whole subject, a very interesting report could be prepared for Parliament, and in that connection we would obtain information as to the effects, partially, of the policy suggested in this motion. For instance, the line to which I refer, including the Eastern Extension and the Cape Breton road, before they were taken over by the Intercolonial Railway, were supposed by many to be likely to involve a very heavy expenditure and lack of revenue; whereas from the best information I can gather those lines have contributed to the business of the Intercolonial Railway and proved of very great financial benefit to the Railway Department in the handling of business along the main line. It is obvious in connection with such branches as the Albert Southern, 16 miles, the Baie des Chaleurs, 80 miles, Caraquet, 68 miles, and Joggins, 12 miles, and various other companies operating short lengths of roads, that the expenditure in connection with the rolling stock is so heavy as to hamper them in the efficient management and control of the roads; whereas if many of those lines could be acquired by the Government, it would not be necessary to increase to any extent the regular rolling stock as regards those branch lines, and therefore it goes without saying that many of those lines could be operated by the Government more efficiently and with less cost to the people who require those transportation facilities. So it occurred to me that before going into this question, which involves very serious consideration indeed, it would be convenient and useful to obtain at the earliest possible time a report dealing with the subject that I have outlined. For the benefit of the Minister of Railways, or whoever represent him at the present moment, I will mention the different lines that would be affected by this proposal, as follows: Albert Southern, 16 miles; Buctouche and Moncton, 32 miles; Baie des Chaleurs, 80 miles; Central Railway, 75 miles; Caraquet, 68 miles; Cumberland Railway and Coal Company, 46 miles; Elgin and Havelock, 27 miles; Joggins, 12 miles; Kent Northern, 34 miles; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, 36 miles; Salisbury and Harvey, including Harvey Branch, 52·25 miles; Temiscouata, 113 miles; Canada Eastern, 136 miles. I do not suppose it possible to obtain all those lines, even if the proposition were favourably entertained. I desire, however, at least to point out the lines that are actually connected with the present system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). What is the total mileage ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. About 700 miles ; but a considerable number of these are independent and self-supporting. Several of the companies, as is known to the Minister of Finance, coming as he does from the province of Nova Scotia, are in financial difficulties and are very much hampered by the expense involved in providing a large quantity of rolling stock for a very short mileage.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I did not quite understand from the language of my hon. friend if he had made up his mind as to the wisdom of the policy of the Government acquiring those lines. I did not understand him to express any definite opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A tentative opinion ; but perhaps I did not make myself clear. From the information in my possession, which is by no means thorough, I thought it was a wise policy, but before coming to any conclusion and asking the House to express an opinion, it seems to be desirable to seek for the very best information that possibly can be obtained in connection with the proposal.

The PRIME MINISTER. In my judgment it would be rather premature to express an opinion on this subject, which is a very important one. There is no objection to bringing down the papers asked for, but my hon. friend will admit that we may not be able to submit all the information sought. In the second paragraph the hon. gentleman asks for :

Also, reports and other information showing the effect upon the receipts and expenditures of Government railways by the operation of the Rivière du Loup, St. Charles Branch, Oxford and New Glasgow, Eastern Extension, Cape Breton and other additions to the Intercolonial Railway as originally constructed and operated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It would be merely an approximate statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. It would not be an approximate statement, but it would be largely a matter of speculation ; however, the Government will furnish the hon. gentleman with the best possible information on the subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This question is a very important one, and it is one to which no hon. member would perhaps feel disposed to commit himself unreservedly as a question of public policy. The fact remains that the Government has expended very large sums of money in aiding those branch lines. Subsidies have been granted, very large expenditures made by Parliament, and considerable sums of money have also been expended from private sources and from local subsidies. The result taken as a whole has been very disappointing. The very important object the Government and Parliament had in view in promoting the extension of branch lines was that we should bring an increased volume of traffic to the Intercolonial Railway, and thus while benefiting the various sections of the country through which those lines were constructed, we would at the same time largely increase the traffic on the line of railway in which the country is directly and immediately interested, and in which the Government has so much at stake. The result has been to a large extent that the expenditure has been unproductive, either of benefit to the particular localities or to the Government by increasing the volume of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, for the reason which has been stated, that the operation of the various lines as separate organizations in regard to management, has been attended with considerable expense, which would be saved to a large extent by using the central organization of the Intercolonial Railway. The fact has been referred to that a very much smaller amount of rolling stock, supplied by the Intercolonial Railway, and a central organization, would effect the object in view and accomplish it more effectively than by working these different lines as separate and different branches. If it be found in a large number of cases, as I am quite sure it will be found, that the country is not well served owing to the inability of those companies to operate their roads vigorously and successfully, and also that the Government has not obtained increased traffic over the Intercolonial Railway from them, and if it be found, as I believe it will be, that the parties owning those branch lines would be only too glad to make an arrangement with the Government by which the roads would be amalgamated with the Intercolonial Railway, and the parties interested would receive some return, those companies would then be placed in a much better position than they now occupy. I think it would be well worthy the attention of the Government to ascertain upon what terms these lines could be obtained ; not perhaps to become absolutely the owner of them, but that they might be placed under the management of the Government. I am inclined to believe that if the Minister of Railways directed his attention to that subject, he would find that the communities would be only too anxious, and the parties now owning the roads would be only too anxious, to meet the views of the Government, and bring these various lines into such communication and co-operation with the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway, This, I believe, would greatly benefit the district in which these roads have been constructed, and at the same time cause a much larger return to the Intercolonial Railway, because of the greater volume of traffic which would thus be obtained. Therefore, while it is very desirable to obtain this in-

formation, I think the Government might well be warranted in going further, and in making a tentative investigation into the question as to the most favourable terms on which these lines could be placed under the organization of the Intercolonial Railway. The Government would thus be in a position to form its own judgment as to the wisdom of adopting that policy with the objects that have been indicated.

Motion agreed to.

THE LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. CAMERON moved for :

1. A copy of all contracts between the Government and the contractors respecting the construction of the Langevin Block.
2. A copy of the tenders and specifications relating thereto.
3. A detail statement, with dates, of the various amounts voted by Parliament for this work.
4. A detailed statement of the various sums paid on such contracts, with dates.
5. A copy of the Order in Council of the 6th July, 1896, and of all other Orders in Council relating to a claim made by Charlebois on the Government for $296,257 and of all other papers relating thereto.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss for a short time the history of what is known as the Langevin Block ; one of the public buildings erected in the city of Ottawa for the convenience and benefit of the people. I make bold to say, Sir, that the history of the construction of the Langevin Block discloses a most startling condition of affairs. I think, if hon. gentlemen follow my observations which I will arrange in chronological order, they can arrive at but one conclusion, and that conclusion is, that from the moment the Government of Canada undertook to construct the Langevin Block, there was a conspiracy as clear and distinct as ever was revealed in any court of justice, to defraud the public treasury of the Dominion of Canada. I desire to say, Sir, that the papers already submitted to Parliament, and the information placed at my disposal, will exhibit a most shocking condition of affairs in relation to the construction of that block. I believe, thoroughly believe, they will disclose an attempt to raid the public treasury ; and an attempt that in the end proved successful to the extent of very nearly half a million of money. Sir, some of us who were in the Parliament of Canada some years ago, know something of the history of the construction of the Langevin Block, and of the terrible frauds that were disclosed before the Public Accounts Committee. It is known, Sir, that in 1883 tenders were called for for the construction of this building. It is known that several tenders were submitted to the Minister of Public Works of the day. I am not concerned with the discussion of any of those tenders except the one, that of Mr. Charlebois, to construct the main building for $295,000. That tender was accepted by the Government of the day, but it did not cover more than the construction of the main block. The iron roof, the iron joists, the heating apparatus, the elevators, and the staircase, were all subjects of separate tenders called for by the Government. The tender of Mr. Charlebois for the construction of the main block at $295,000, was accepted by the Minister of Public Works of that day. Tenders were subsequently called for, for the construction of the iron roof on the building. Several tenders were submitted. The tender of Rousseau & Mather for $42,975 was accepted by the Government. Tenders were also called for, for the iron joists, and the contract was awarded to Carrier, Lainé & Co. for $16,627. Subsequently, tenders were called for, for the heating apparatus, and the contract is awarded to Garth & Co. at $15,500. Subsequently tenders were called for, for the elevators, and the contract was awarded to John Fenson for $39,877. Subsequently tenders were called for, for the iron stairs, and the contract for that work was awarded to Charlebois, the man who had secured the contract for the construction of the main building, at $11,040. Now, you will find that all these tenders for the construction of the Langevin Block, from the attic to the cellar, aggregated the amount of $421,519. But a deduction of $27,113 must be made from that aggregate amount, for the following items : Work not done under the old contract, $22,113 ; and work not done by Fenson, $5,000 ; in all, $27,113. Deduct that from the $421,519, the aggregate amount of all the tenders for the construction of the building from the cellar to the attic, and you will find that the building was to cost us $394,406. That does not include the price of the land for the site. That land, I find, with commissions and so forth, cost $95,000. So that the whole building, including the land, cost $489,406. Now, I have stated that the history of the Langevin Block reveals as rank a conspiracy between the contractor and the Government of the day as ever was disclosed in any court or as ever was revealed before a committee of any Parliament. I propose to make good every word I utter on that subject, and then I will leave it for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who were then sitting on the Treasury benches, and were parties to this transaction, to explain how it was that the public treasury was raided by those men for nearly half a million of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh.

Mr. CAMERON. Oh, half a million of dollars is nothing—a bagatelle, especially if it is raided in the interest of a favoured contractor. Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what the building really did cost us. I will tell you

what we have expended so far. On the 30th April, 1883, as will be found in "Hansard" of that day, page 907, the then Minister of Public Works declared in his place in Parliament:

> The lots will cost some $83,000 to $85,000, and the building between $400,000 and $500,000.

And on that day Parliament voted $200,000 for the work. I find that subsequently, on the 28th March, 1884, as will be found in "Hansard" of that year, at page 1190, the Minister of Public Works stated:

> When the work is complete, it will cost $593,000, including the site, which cost $85,000.

On the same day Parliament voted towards the construction of this building $150,000. On the 26th of June, 1885, as will be found in "Hansard" of that year, page 2916, the Minister of Public Works stated:

> The total cost is estimated at $503,000.

On that day Parliament voted for the purpose, $175,000. I find that on the 7th of May, 1886, as recorded in "Hansard" of that year, at page 1154, the Minister of Public Works in his place in Parliament declared:

> As I stated last year, the total cost, including the site, will be $594,000.

On that day Parliament voted $110,000 for the construction of this building. I find that on the 11th June, 1887, as recorded in "Hansard" for that year, at page 916, the Minister of Public Works told us:

> The total cost including the site, heating, furniture, etc., will be $650,000.

Parliament on that day voted $200,000 for the construction of this building. It will be observed that in 1883 that building, including the site, was to cost between $400,000 and $500,000, while in 1887 the amount had run up to $650,000, or $150,000 more than the Minister had declared before, would be the total cost. I find that on the 22nd of March, 1889, the Minister of Public Works, in answer to an inquiry respecting this building, as recorded in "Hansard" of that year, at page 799, declared:

> The total cost, including the land, will be $707,000.

Or an increase of over $200,000 over the amount he had declared in 1883 the building would cost. On that day Parliament voted for the construction of this building, $90,000 more. I find that on the 13th of March, 1890, as recorded in "Hansard" of that year, at page 1859, in reply to a question put by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the Minister of Public Works declared that the Government had paid on the building to the 1st March, 1890, $608,096, exclusive of the site, and that there were claims for extras made by Charlebois for $393,954; that there were extra claims made by a man of the name of Garth, who got a contract for one of the minor portions of the building amounting to $9,233; and by a man of the name of Fenson, amounting to $3,015. You find that on the 9th of May, 1890, page 4096 of "Hansard," the then Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin, told the House that the amount which had been expended up to the 1st of March, 1890, was $711,000, or $211,000 more than he assured Parliament in 1883 the building would cost. Will anybody explain, will the hon. leader of the Opposition or any member of the late Government explain how it is possible, when there were no contracts under the Great Seal signed by the contractors to construct this building for $486,000, including the site, that in 1890 we had already paid the contractors $600,000 and that there were claims amounting to $393,000 not settled for. Sir, on proceeding further I find that in the same year the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked the then Minister of Public Works what the total cost was. The hon. member for South Oxford summed up, from statements made by the then Minister of Public Works in Parliament, what had been paid up to that date, and he found it amounted to the enormous sum of $867,000, upon which he went on to remark that this building, upon which we had up to that time expended $867,000, the Parliament of Canada had been assured would only cost $486,000. Sir Hector Langevin, who was then Minister of Public Works, replied:

> I cannot say that we could hardly make an estimate at the beginning because we did not know what the land would cost.

Now, I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, whether any responsible Minister of the Crown ever made such a ridiculous and misleading statement? The then Minister of Public Works and every member of the Government at that time knew perfectly well that the contracts were let in 1883 and that the whole cost, including the site, was only to amount to between $84,000 and $500,000, and yet we were told that the Government could hardly make an estimate at the beginning because they did not know the price of the land. Why, the then Minister of Public Works declared, in 1884, from his place in Parliament that the price of the land was from $80,000 to $85,000. It was really $95,000, but that included $10,000 for commission and conveyancing and extras. The statement of the then Minister of Public Works was misleading. The whole thing was, so far as one could judge, a wholesale raid on the public treasury up to that time of over $300,000. But that does not finish it. On the 24th of March, 1894, Sir Hector Langevin said:

> When the building is complete it will cost $593,000, including the site, which cost $95,000.

Why, we were told in Parliament that up to the date I have previously given, we had

paid on this building the enormous sum of $867,000. On the 9th of May, 1890, as you will find in "Hansard" of that year, page 4696, the hon. Minister of Public Works, in detailing the various items of what had been paid on the contract, said that they brought the expenditure up to $867,000. On the same date Parliament voted $150,000 for the construction of the building. Now, let us see what the Parliament of Canada has voted in cash to pay for that building which was to cost $486,000 ? It voted the following amounts :—

On the 17th of April, 1883	$200,000
On the 28th March, 1884	150,000
On the 26th of June, 1885.....	175,000
On the 7th May, 1886.....	110,000
On the 11th of June, 1887	200,000
On the 22nd of March, 1889	90,000
On the 9th of May, 1890.....	155,000
Session of 1891..	6,000
Total	$1,086,000

Voted by Parliament to construct the building which was to cost, including the price of the land, according to the tenders and the statement of the then Minister, $486,000. I cannot find in "Hansard" that the hon. gentleman who then administered Public Works gave any explanation of this wholesale robbery from the public treasury. And I challenge any member of the late Government to account for it. I challenge them to show where the money went to and who got it and how the difference between the contract price and the sum voted by Parliament was disposed of. I do not mean to say that the whole $1,086,000 was paid to Mr. Charlebois and the other contractors, although in "Hansard" and the Estimates we can find no re-votes except one of $100,000 which I have not calculated at all. If it is true that the late Government did not spend it all, but only spent $867,000, according to the statement of the then Minister of Public Works, that is still over $300,000 more than they assured Parliament the building would cost. Is it possible that we cannot construct a public building in this country without the estimates being overrun by 50 to 100 per cent ? That appears to have been our experience under the late Government. The history of the Langvein Block discloses it beyond all reasonable doubt. Supposing that we only did pay Mr. Charlebois $867,000, we find that the contract price was $489,000, which left $378,000 that, in my judgment, was a direct steal from the public exchequer. Hon. gentlemen may laugh and call it what they like. When hundreds of thousands of dollars are squandered and purloined, hon. gentlemen laugh, and that is all the satisfaction one gets.

I find that not only in the case of the Langevin Block itself, but in connection with other portions of the work let to other contractors, there are clear and unmistakable indications of a huge and gigantic steal. I find in "Hansard," the late Minister of Public Works making this statement with respect to a portion of the work on the Langevin Block :

> I am informed by my chief architect that there is very little painting connected with the building and what there is is included in the contract of Mr. Charlebois, who was the lowest tenderer for the whole work. The oil and varnishing, of which there is a good deal, is also included in the contract.

Will it be believed that when this matter was investigated briefly before the Public Accounts Committee, the sum of $19,281 was found to be charged for painting ? Although the Minister of Public Works of that day, in his place in Parliament, declared that the painting was included in the contract with Mr. Charlebois, yet $19,281 are found to have been paid over and above the contract. Is it possible that the late Government paid for this work twice ? They cannot account for it otherwise. That sum was found to have been paid apart from the contract, and yet Sir Hector Langevin declared that it was included in the contract.

There are two or three other contracts on which I wish to say a word or two. The contracts so far, of which I have spoken, only deal with the main building, and I have shown that there was a clear raid on the public treasury to the extent of over $300,000 in that connection. But tenders were called for for five other contracts. I have pointed out to you what they were for. Three of these, by a system well known to the late Administration—the system of freezing out—passed into the hands of Mr. Charlebois and there remained two independent contracts. Now, I shall deal with those, and show that although there was a huge steal somewhere in connection with the Langevin Block on the main contract, there were besides some minor steals, amounting to a very considerable sum in the aggregate, in connection with the other contracts. Several tenders were submitted. I am concerned with the consideration of only two of these. The lowest tender was that of Rousseau & Mather, and their tender for the construction of the iron roof was $42,975. There was a tender by the same precious Mr. Charlebois, which amounted to $77,500. In the call for tenders and in the specifications upon which Rousseau & Mather based their tenders, there were two conditions and two only which it is important to consider here. The first was "That the contractors shall find the piling ground which may be required for the storing the roofing materials ;" and the second condition was "That the contractors shall be required to sign a contract containing the ordinary conditions as now issued by the Department of Public Works." These were the main conditions upon which the tender was called for, passed and accepted, and Messrs. Rousseau & Mather so understood it. They were the lowest tenderers, and, of course, the contract was awarded to them—although they

did not do the work, as I shall presently show. Now, Mr. Speaker, right here it is well for us to consider for a moment how it was that Rousseau & Mather, who were the lowest tenderers by $35,000, did not secure the contract for the iron roof. How is it that they were passed over and the contract ultimately given to Mr. Charlebois? One would naturally suppose that in the interests of the public the lowest tenderer, other things being equal, would secure the contract. What is the object, pray, Mr. Speaker, of calling for tenders at all, unless you award the contract to the lowest tenderer? Mr. Mather, one of the partners, in reply to a telegram from the Minister of Public Works, appeared in Ottawa on the 12th August, 1886. He had an interview with the Minister of Public Works with respect to this contract. The Minister told Mr. Mather that before he could award him the contract, he (Mr. Mather) would have to make some arrangement with Mr. Charlebois having the contract for the main building, the contention being that Mr. Charlebois having the contract for the main building, he was in absolute possession of the land upon which the buildings were being erected and all the land in the neighbourhood belonging to the Government, and that the other contractors could not get access to the building to carry on their work unless they made arrangements with Mr. Charlebois. Well, Mr. Charlebois was an accommodating man. He was willing to make an arrangement with them. But the terms upon which he was willing to make an arrangement were that they should pay him 25 per cent of the amount of the contract before he would allow them on the land. Now, was there ever a more scandalous or more outrageous piece of rascality? I think I am using moderate and modest language in thus describing such a transaction. I say there never was in the whole history of public contracts a more scandalous conspiracy between the Department of Public Works and the main contractor for a building to make a raid upon the contractors for the subordinate parts of the work. Here let me observe that this statement that Mr. Charlebois was entitled to exclusive possession of the land until the buildings were completed was submitted for the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Justice of that day declared that the claim was wholly inadmissible, and that Mr. Charlebois had no right to exclude from the building the other men who had contracts for the heating apparatus, the iron roof, and so on. Is it not as plain and clear as the smiling face of my hon. friend opposite, is it not self-evident, that the other contractors must be impliedly entitled to access to the building? Else how could they carry on his contract? Well now, this matter has been partially investigated, and perhaps it will be best explained by a reference to the sworn testimony of one of the contractors. He is asked by the present Postmaster General:

814. You came to Ottawa?—Yes, sir.

615. And saw, I suppose, Mr. Fuller?—Saw Mr. Fuller——

That was the architect.

—and saw Sir Hector Langevin.

616. What did they tell you?—Well, we were told that we had to make arrangements, I think, with Mr. Charlebois.

What had Charlebois to do with the contract for the iron roof?

617. What arrangements did they say you would have to make with Mr. Charlebois?—Well, I understood we were to get permission to get on to the building, and get on the grounds—that he had full control of the grounds, and would not allow any other one to go on there without his consent.

618. Did you make that arrangement with Mr. Charlebois?—We tried to, but could not come to any settlement.

* * * * * *

620. I believe that at a certain stage in the negotiations you withdrew your tender?—Yes.

621. Why was that?—Because we could not come to any arrangement with Mr. Charlebois.

Now, under pressure, you see, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Public Works of the day, to carry out the conspiracy that, I charge these people had made to defraud the public treasury, under coercion, this man Mather, who was not, as I am informed, a keen, active business man—under the pressure brought to bear upon him through telling him that his firm could not get access to the buildings without the consent of Mr. Charlebois, and that Mr. Charlebois would not give access to the buildings except upon the payment of the outrageous sum of 25 per cent of the amount of the contract—wrote the following letter to the department:—

Ottawa, 11th August, 1886.

A. Gobeil, Esq.,
Secretary of Public Works.

Sir,—By reference to the specification, and after seeing Mr. Charlebois, the contractor for the new Departmental Building, we have come to the conclusion that we cannot execute the work tendered for by us without interference with Mr. Charlebois, and that we should have to pay such a remuneration as would prevent us from fulfilling satisfactorily the contract; and under these circumstances we prefer, before any decision is arrived at by the Government, to beg leave to withdraw our tender and the accepted cheque accompanying the same.

Your obedient servants,
ROUSSEAU & MATHER.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mather was not the only member of the firm. The other member was a keen, level-headed Frenchman by the name of Rousseau, who was not to be humbugged, or trifled with, or toyed with. He was not present when the Minister of Public Works declared to Mr. Mather that he would first have to make arrangements with Mr. Charlebois before the contract would be awarded to him.

He left Montreal on the night train the day after the letter was written, and reached Ottawa at midnight. He had an interview with his partner. He said to his partner: You have no business to make such an arrangement. We have that contract, it is awarded to us. There were no conditions imposed upon us that we should make arrangements with Charlebois, and we will not submit to the imposition of any such conditions, and we insist upon getting the contract. The result was that they had an interview with the Minister of Public Works and with Charlebois, and with what took place upon that occasion I shall trouble the House with reading, because it is detailed there under oath better than I can give it. He said:

I took the night train on the Canadian Pacific Railway and arrived here at midnight. I went to Mr. Mather's room at the Windsor Hotel and knocked at his door. I was admitted, and asked him if he had closed with the Government. He looked discouraged. I said: "What is the matter?" He said: "I think I have done wrong," I said: "What have you done?" He said: "I have cancelled our tender." I said: "What was that for?" From one word to another he gave me to understand that Mr. Charlebois took him to his office with Mr. Duval, Clerk of the Supreme Court, and, as we say, "scared him out of his pants," and that he made him write a letter. He told me: "I saw from his talk that we would have a lot of trouble and I thought it better to cancel the contract." I said: "Mr. Mather, you had no right to cancel the contract." I says: "You have not the right, and it is not valid until it has my signature." I went with Mr. Mather in the morning to see Sir Hector Langevin, and I told him that the letter was not valid. He said: "You come in the right time, because I was going to grant the contract to Mr. Charlebois." So I said to him there and then that we were ready to sign the contract."

You see, Mr. Speaker, that on the 12th he frightened the man out of his pants. At midnight on the 12th he came to Ottawa and insisted that he had a right to get the contract, because the signature of one party was not sufficient. On the morning of the 12th they went to Sir Hector Langevin's office, and he said: Oh, you just came in the right time, as I was going to award the contract to Mr. Charlebois. Then the witness goes on:

Were you allowed to sign it?—No; we were not.

Why?—There is, if I remember right, two drafts of the contract made. The first was, as we say in French, a 'brouillon,' that was presented to me by an Englishman there who has large whiskers, and he showed me that by clause 7 the right of way was not inserted. The second draft, which took some two or three days, had clause 7 inserted. I went to Sir Hector Langevin, and I said: "It is not according to specification. We are not prepared to buy the right of way from Mr. Charlebois."

Now, you see in the Department of Public Works they had two contracts prepared, one without the obnoxious clause that he should bargain with Charlebois for access to the buildings if he had the contract; and the other, after a day or two deliberation and consultation with Charlebois, had that obnoxious clause inserted, and of course the contractors stood upon their rights and refused to sign the contract with the obnoxious clause. Then, Mr. Chapleau asks the question:

Those are not the words?—I am positive in these things, and I told you about it before, you remember. I was here two or three days, and I went to Sir Hector and said: "We do not provide for this clause. We put in our tender," says I, "that we were going to tender like anybody else, and that we would have the privilege of putting on the roof, as anybody else; but that we would not put on the roof until after the masonry work was done. We were not going to interfere with Mr. Charlebois." I said: "If the building belongs to you, you had the right to call for tenders. If it does not belong to you, you had no right to call for tenders."

Then Mr. Lister interjects a question:

What did he say?—I saw that Sir Hector was held by the throat by Mr. Charlebois.

Will hon. gentlemen tell me why Sir Hector Langevin was held by the throat, unless from the inception of this gigantic scheme there was a conspiracy entered into, I won't say between Sir Hector Langevin and the contractor, but I will say between the Department of Public Works and the contractor, that the public treasury of this Dominion should be raided almost without limit in order to supply Mr. Charlebois with funds for himself, and for other purposes which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House well understand. Then the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) interjects a question:

On the second occasion you went to see the contract you found it had in it a clause that was not in the first?—It had a clause that was not in the first.

Was that the reason you did not execute it?—Of course; I could not consent to purchase the right of way.

Did you ask Sir Hector to give you further time to negotiate with Mr. Charlebois?—He told me to ascertain how much it would cost from Charlebois.

How much did he say?—I think I went to Charlebois, and he said it would cost $10,000.

Just think of a raid of $10,000 upon a contract of $42,000; if these men had to pay $10,000 for access to the building, the tender would be just so much worse by $10,000.

I asked Sir Hector to raise my tender by so much, as we had not provided for that. He said he had nothing to do with that.

On the second occasion you went there you saw the contract engrossed, as we call it in English—ready to be signed—and you found this strange condition in it—clause 7. You then objected to sign it with that condition in it. Did you ask Sir Hector to give you further time to try and arrange with Mr. Charlebois?—No. I tell you candidly I did not want to have anything to do with Charlebois. I told Sir Hector: There is

that one clause. If you are the owner of this building you had the right to call for tenders; but if the building belongs to Charlebois, you had no right to call for tenders. Charlebois had scared my partner at first. * * * *

You called next morning ?—Yes, sir.

On the 12th of August you were in Ottawa ?—Yes, sir,

You wrote to Sir Hector then, asking for two or three days?—Yes.

I presume this letter followed the interview with Sir Hector ? During the interview he probably asked you to put it in writing ?—I wrote that letter after Sir Hector told me to see Charlebois and try to come to arrangements with him.

It was then, he said, you had just come in time to cancel the withdrawal ?—Yes.

That he was just about to let the contract to Mr. Charlebois for the roof ?—Yes.

I understand he gave you very few minutes to complete the arrangements with Charlebois ?

Now, Mr. Speaker, listen to the answer of that question:

—Fifteen minutes.

Think of the outrageous conduct of the Minister. Here is a contract involving a large sum of the public funds of this Dominion; here is a contractor who claims to stand upon his rights and who was standing upon his rights; here is another contractor who is exacting what the law does not justify him in claiming and the law did not allow him to exact, and the Minister of Public Works, when he made that statement to Charlebois, had before him the letter of the Minister of Justice declaring that the claims of Charlebois in that respect were wholly inadmissible. And yet he allows this man only fifteen minutes to arrange with Charlebois, a man that he swears had Sir Hector Langevin by the throat. Then he is questioned by Mr. Lister:

He gave you fifteen minutes to complete the arrangement with Charlebois ?—That was in the presence of Mr. Gobeil and Mr. Fuller. It was fifteen minutes to decide. I said: This is not treating us fairly. If you are the owner of the building you had the right to call for tenders. I told him what I repeated a short tome ago, he said in French: I will give you fifteen minutes to decide. * * * *

Mr. Chapleau told you that you were badly used ?—He told me that the Minister of Justice said they had no right to put in such a clause.

The Minister of Justice was right. That is the specification, is it not, for this work ?—Yes.

The contractor shall find, at his own expense, the piling ground which may be required for storing the roof materials from their delivery until such time as he will be notified to begin the work of erection and during the progress of the work. You understood what that meant ?—Oh, yes; we understood what that meant perfectly well. We went to look for piling ground elsewhere, as there was no room there.

Then Mr. Haggart asks a question:

Did the Minister assign any reason for changing the specifications ?—No; he said: you have to sign the contract in the present shape or else your deposit will be forfeited.

There he was taking Mather by the throat. He says: If you did not sign the contract with that clause in it compelling you to make a bargain with Charlebois, then you will forfeit your deposit that you put up when you put in your tender.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON. When, Mr. Speaker, you left the Chair at six o'clock I was proceeding to read an extract from the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee touching the charges levelled against the Department of Public Works and Mr. Charlebois in connection with the construction of the Langevin Block. I will now read a short extract. The witness said:

He (the Minister of Public Works) never assigned the reason at all ?—No. He gave me to understand that, when I found the clause which required me to make arrangements with Charlebois, was there, somehow he looked embarrassed. When we were out in the corridor my partner said to me: "I think we had better give it up. They will make it so hot for us we will not make anything out of it." I considered the position of Sir Hector; I did not tell him at the time, but I thought I would render him a service. As a matter of fact I thought Charlebois held Sir Hector by the throat. That is the reason I was induced to withdraw—to get him out of a difficulty.

Then Mr. Lister asked a question:

You are his friend ?—I am his friend yet.

And you thought Charlebois had him by the throat ?—Oh, yes; I think he had.

You did not think you could get him by the throat ?—No; it is not my habit to get hold of anybody by the throat.

I wish we had a few more contractors like you ?—Well, perhaps, it would be several thousand dollars saved to the Government.

Then a question was asked by Mr. Mulock, the present Postmaster General, as follows:

What do you mean when you say that he had Sir Hector by the throat ?—I mean that there was a certain clause in this contract by which he could compel the Government to do just as he pleased. Mr. Fuller gave me to understand that they had had a good deal of bother with Charlebois, and that that was the reason why they put the clause in.

By Mr. Chapleau:—

You understand by the conversation you had in the department that Mr. Charlebois pretended he had full control of the building—that he could impose any conditions on the sub-contractors ?—He gave me to understand that I could not go on the building, and he said I would lose money on my contract, I said: Mr. Charlebois, if I sign the contract I will go on the building." He said: "There will be a row." I said: "Let there be a row; I will go on the building." That is what I told him at the time, but he overreached me.

You did not go on the building ?—No; except as a visitor.

The further examination in this matter was then postponed until another meeting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may pause here for a moment to consider the terrible obstacles that the department threw in the way of these bona fide and honest tenderers. First, the Minister had two contracts prepared. One contract was without the objectionable clause, and that contract this firm were willing to sign, and a second contract contained the objectionable clause which prevented parties entering on the premises without making some arrangement with Mr. Charlebois. The second contract, as they call it, these tenderers refused to sign. The Minister of Public Works insisted that the contractors should make some arrangements with Charlebois before they signed the contract. He further gave them fifteen minutes in which to make the arrangement with Charlebois. They were on the ground ready to sign the first contract, a contract framed according to the terms and conditions of the specification and tender. They informed the Minister of Public Works of their conclusion, but he would not assent to these proposed contractors going on the premises except upon the payment of $10,000. Rousseau & Mather properly refused to pay this extortionate demand, this wholly illegal demand, as advised by the Minister of Justice of the then Administration, and they properly refused to sign the contract. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that only fifteen minutes were allowed Rousseau & Mather to make an arrangement with Charlebois. They refused Charlebois's terms; and on 12th August, before leaving Ottawa for Montreal, they addressed the following letter to Sir Hector Langevin:

Ottawa, 12th August, 1886.

To Sir Hector Langevin,

Sir,—After an interview with Mr. Charlebois, we have decided to go down home, in order to consult together on this matter: and we beg that you will be good enough to wait two or three days longer for final answer.

You humble servants,
ROUSSEAU & MATHER.

The Minister of Public Works made no answer to this communication. He was silent, dumb as an oyster, said nothing. The men went down to Montreal, and they appear, so far as one can judge from the correspondence, to have been exceedingly anxious to obtain the contract, and honestly believed that they would have a good thing in the contract. On reaching Montreal, on the evening of the 12th, they sent the following letter to Sir Hector Langevin, and it shows their intense interest in the contract and their desire to obtain it:

Montreal, 12th August, 1886.

A Gobeil, Esq.,
Secretary of the Public Works Department,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We beg to inform you that if the Government favour us with the contract for departmental buildings roof, we are prepared to carry out the conditions of our tender and deliver works on November 1st, as called for. As the time presses, we would feel obliged to you for an early answer.

Yours truly,
ROUSSEAU & MATHER,
Per A. Rousseau & A. A. Mather.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that after that interview with Sir Hector Langevin they were still insisting on their rights, they were still insisting on getting the contract. I have read the second letter to Sir Hector Langevin, dated 12th August, pressing their demands. In addition to sending that letter, to which they received no answer, on 14th August, two days afterward, they sent the following telegram to the department:

Montreal, 14th August.

We are prepared to sign contract. Give orders to send us blue prints. Wire us acceptance so we may cable to England to fill order. No time to lose.

(Signed) ROUSSEAU & MATHER.

One would naturally imagine that if the head of the Department of Public Works, the great spending department of the country, had desired that justice should be done to the contractors, and at the same time justice meted out to the taxpayers of the country, that telegram would have been answered, and the contract awarded. But there was no answer sent, and the department remained dumb, silent and did nothing. So on the 16th August these men sent the following telegram to Sir Hector Langevin's department, addressed to the Deputy Minister:

624 Craig Street,
Montreal, 16th August, 1886.

A. Gobeil, Esq.

Sir,—We telegraphed on Saturday about 10 a.m. to Sir Hector that we are ready to sign the contract for the roof of the public building at Ottawa, and asking a reply and the blue prints. We to-day confirm our telegram.

Yours truly,
ROUSSEAU & MATHER,
Per A. R.

Was any answer received to that message? Not the slightest; and recollect that up to this time the contract with Charlebois for the iron roof had not been signed. The Minister of Public Works was not only blind but deaf, he would neither see nor hear; he did nothing, and according to the evidence submitted he was in the hands of Charlebois. I should like to obtain some information of the extraordinary conduct of the Minister of Public Works. I should like to hear some justification for this evidently clear and manifest attempt, which ultimately succeeded, to raid the public treasury of very nearly half a million dollars. No explanation has ever been given; but to my judgment the answer is plain and simple—it was simply carrying out the conspiracy entered into between the contractor and the Department of Public Works at the very initiation of this contract, by

Charlebois, who had, as a witness said, Sir Hector Langevin by the throat. Sir Hector could not move; his hands were tied, his eyes were closed, his ears were stopped, he was deaf, blind and incapable of moving, because the contractor had Sir Hector Langevin by the throat. This man Charlebois—I do not know him, but I judge by the correspondence—appears to have been a genius. He had a way of getting over everything, and he suggested to Sir Hector Langevin a way to get out of this difficulty. I find in a communication sent to Sir Hector the following words used:

Honourable Sir,—As you have had the kindness to tell me some days ago, that you were satisfied with the execution of the works that I have undertaken for the Government, and that you would be satisfied if I could say at the conclusion of the works that the whole of it had been completed, even to the iron work, roofing, &c., which ought to be given after tender had been made by me, I believe that considering that I have been obliged to make arrangements with the corporation for the use of the street, &c., and to incur other expenses for tools, and besides that under my contract I am responsible for all damage to the building until the date of delivery and that you have not inserted a clause permitting others except officers of the department to have the right of admission on the works while under my control, the Government might avoid all misunderstanding and protect me by inserting a clause requiring tenderers before sending in their tenders to make arrangements with the contractor for the use of his land and scaffold and plant, tools, &c., which might be necessary to put the roof in position.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) A. CHARLEBOIS.

There you have a clear and distinct admission that in the original specifications, on which Rosseau & Mather based their tender, there was no clause prohibiting them to go on the premises unless an arrangement was made with Charlebois; that in all the tenders subsequently called for there was this restriction. The Minister of Public Works was prompt enough in dealing with Charlebois and was prompt in agreeing with him that in all minor contracts that clause should be inserted; and it was inserted in the other contracts. There were six tenders, one for the main building and five for other portions of the building. All tenders subsequently issued had this clause inserted. Rousseau & Mather were men of some energy, perseverance and determination, and they held out against the attempt made by the Minister of Public Works so long as holding out might prove available. But the Minister of Public Works and Charlebois were altogether too much for Rousseau & Mather. In the end Rousseau & Mather's tender was passed over, and the contract for the iron roof was awarded to Mr. Charlebois, not for $42,000, but for $60,000, or at a loss to the people of Canada, of the difference between $42,000 and $60,000. Sir, the Minister of Public Works—as the leader of the Opposition knows—in order to do this had to ignore the terms of his own specifications and had to override the advice of the Department of Justice who gave an opinion upon this matter. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will find that advice on the records of the Department of Public Works now. The Department of Justice advised that the claim made by Charlebois was wholly without foundation, and that subsequent tenderers had a perfect right to enter the premises for the purpose of completing the contract. But that was not the only difficulty the then Minister of Public Works had to encounter. He got rid of Rousseau & Mather and he gave the contract to the next tenderer, but he had to satisfy the Executive Council, and he had to prepare a report to Council to get over the difficulty. The Minister of Public Works was equal to the occasion and he prepared a Minute of a report to the Executive Council in which I find the following words:—

On a memo. dated 20th August, 1886, from the Minister of Public Works, representing that in answer to public advertisement three tenders were received for the construction and placing in position of the iron roof for the new departmental building, Wellington Street, Ottawa, at prices ranging from $42,975 to $75,500. the lowest tender being that of Messrs. Rousseau & Mather, of Montreal, which was so much below the estimate made by the chief architect ($58,800), that it was apparent they had made some mistake or omission;—Messrs. Rousseau & Mather were telegraphed to come to Ottawa, and on their doing so explained that in their tender they had not made any provision for making arrangements with the present contractor for the stone work of the building, either as regards hoisting and erection of the roof or for providing a "piling ground" for the delivery of all material ready for placing in position, all of which were required by the specification, and asked to be allowed a few days to consider what arrangement could be made. This was granted, but on the 12th inst. they wrote that they had been unable to make satisfactory arrangements, and asked leave to withdraw their tender and have their security cheque returned to them. Subsequently Messrs. Rousseau & Mather asked leave to reconsider this determination, and after consultation with Mr. Charlebois, the contractor for the stone work, expressed their willingness to sign the contract, but on its being submitted to them, they objected to the clause making them responsible for all arrangements with the present contractor, and as this clause was considered essential, and could not be expunged, they declined to sign the contract and renew their application to be allowed to withdraw their tender.

Now, in that Minute of Council I charge that there are four or five distinct and deliberate falsehoods. The evidence submitted so far in no sense sustains the statements in that Minute of Council. Rousseau & Mather made no mistake. They were willing to accept the contract up to the last moment until they were ruled out. It is true they came up here and that one of the parties withdrew the tender but it is just as true that the very next morning they

called upon the Minister of Public Works and insisted upon their right to get the contract and do the work. The report of the Minister of Public Works made to the Executive Council is wholly misleading and wholly false, and his statements rest upon not the slightest foundation. This false report was submitted to the Privy Council but was not approved of by them until the 24th day of August, 1886; twelve days after these men first began the negotiation. During all that time they expressed their keen and earnest desire that the contract should be awarded to them. It is not true, as reported to Council by the then Minister of Public Works, that in the original specifications there was a clause, that before tenderers could get access to the building, they would have to arrange with Charlebois. I challenge any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House to point out any such clause in the specification. They swore it was not in the specifications, and they declared it over their own signature in letters and telegrams and other statements. I say that the tender of these men was ruled out fraudulently and improperly, and that the contract was illegally awarded to Charlebois for $60,000. Now, did Charlebois construct the iron roof for $60,000 ? Verily, no, Sir. The records show that for this same work Charlebois was paid over $101,000. In other words, this economical Government which one day sat upon this side of the House, paid Mr. Charlebois $101,000 for doing a piece of work that Rousseau & Mather offered to do for $42,000. The hon. gentlemen who once held power in this country may think that this is administering the affairs of Canada in the interest of the great body of the taxpayers, but in my judgment it is consistent only with one thing, and that one thing I stated at the opening of my remarks, namely, that there was a conspiracy from the beginning that Charlebois's pockets should be lined for some purpose, and whether the lining remained there always or not I will not venture to say. This is a sample of how the Government dealt with the contractors for the minor portions of the building.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see how the other contracts panned out under the manipulations of the Public Works Department. There was another tender called for the iron joists of the building. Several tenders were submitted, but I am not concerned in discussing any but one, and that was the tender from Carrier, Lainé & Co. ; and their tender was the lowest and amounted to $16,627.13. Did they get the contract from the Government ? Not at all. They were frozen out. They were squeezed out of the contract by this same process adopted by Mr. Charlebois, aided, assisted and abetted by the Department of Public Works, to extort from these men who put in a low tender a commission of 25 per cent. The result of it all was that the contract was awarded to Charlebois at $15,327. Did Charlebois do the work for that ? Not at all. I find that he got extras amounting to $6,080, and I find further that he actually charged the Government $295 for hauling his material to the building. In all, Charlebois was paid $21,702 for doing a piece of work that Carrier, Lainé & Co. offered to do for $16,000. That may be economy in the sense that the late Government understood the term, and it may be considered by them proper management of the Public Works of the Dominion, but I do not understand it so.

Then there were tenders called for an iron staircase, and by this time it became known to the tenderers that no man could get admission to the building without the permission of Mr. Charlebois.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman give me the reference to the evidence ?

Mr. CAMERON. Which evidence ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A reference to the evidence that shows Charlebois was paid for hauling the joists from the station to the building.

Mr. CAMERON. You will find it in the statement submitted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman the evidence under his hand ?

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Because the evidence is all to the contrary.

Mr. CAMERON. I have every item of it here, and I can give the hon. gentleman the whole amounts in detail if he is anxious to have them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I merely ask for proof of the statement which I challenged.

Mr. CAMERON. I did not want to take up the time of the House too far, but as I understand it, it appeared before the Public Accounts Committee in an account put into the Public Works Department for the extra claims. I have every item of it here, and it amounts to $101,792.97.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) that the joists were not taken from the station to the building. They were hauled from Nepean Point to the building, and hauled for nothing.

Mr. CAMERON. There is an item for hauling of $295.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not from the station to the building.

Mr. CAMERON. It was for hauling from somewhere. I do not know where they could haul it from except from the station

to the building, as I suppose that the joists came by car to Ottawa. When the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) interrupted me I was speaking of the iron staircase. Tenders were called for and no one tendered, for the simple reason that it was known that Charlebois charged 25 per cent commission in order to allow contractors admission to the premises. I find that Charlebois got the contract for $11,040, and that he charged for extras and loss $6,823. Was that right? This information I have in my possession and I have it from the public documents which are on record. Then there were the elevators to be erected, and tenders were called for them. Tenders were called for and the lowest tender was that of John Fenson for $29,877. Now, Mr. John Fenson knew when he put his tender in, that Mr. Charlebois exacted a commission of 25 per cent and he added the sum of $8,000 to the tender to cover that commission. As I understand it, he was paid that $8,000 and he was also paid $5,222 for extras. In other words, we had to pay for extras over $5,000, and by reason of the exactions of Mr. Charlebois another $8,000, making in all $13,222, which the country had to pay extra on account of this transaction. Then, Sir, there was another tender called for the heating apparatus, and the contract was awarded to Garth & Co. who were the lowest tenderers at $15,000. They also knew when they submitted their tender of the exactions that were likely to be made by Charlebois, and they added $3,750 to their tender on account of that, and they were paid that and likewise $9,233 for extras. In all, a piece of work that ought to have cost the country $15,000, actually cost the people of Canada $28,483. Now, will any member of the old Government tell us exactly why all these extraordinary extras should be paid? In some cases the extras amounted to very nearly as much as the contract, in some cases to 50 per cent of the contract, in all cases to exorbitant sums; and no one could understand why they should be there. What was the object of all these claims? Why did hon. gentlemen opposite permit them? Was the object to enable Mr. Charlebois to get from 50 to 75 per cent more than the contract prices, or that the Minister estimated that the building would cost? What was the object? Or were there raids on the Minister that he could not resist? The whole transaction reminds me of a story told by Sir Charles Dilke in "Greater Britain" about the Rajah of Travancore, who wished to build a bungalow. He called his architects and contractors before him, and said to them: "I will give you 10,000 rupees for the construction of the bungalow." One of the contractors agreed to take it, and went away. But in a few days he returned, saying: "I cannot take the contract, your Highness." The Rajah asked: "What is the trouble? Why don't you go on with the work?" The contractor replied: "Well, your Highness, out of the 10,000 rupees I have to pay to your Prime Minister 5,000 rupees; I have to pay to the Prime Minister's secretary 1,000 rupees; I have to pay to the servants in his office 2,000 rupees; I have to pay to the ladies of his harem 1,000 rupees; I have to pay to the commander of the forces 500 rupees, and I have to pay to the builder of the bungalow 500 rupees, and what is left for me?" That was the position of Charlebois: "If I submit to all these demands, what is left to me? Nothing." And so his contract prices were supplemented to the extent of 50 or 75 per cent. Perhaps the members of the late Government will tell us confidentially how many rupees of these enormous sums went to the bosses of the party, how much to the labourers in the vineyards, how much to the reptile fund, how much to the commander of the forces, how much to the ladies of the harem, and how much here and there. They might take us into their confidence, and let us know something of that. It is admitted, and everybody who was in Parliament in the session of 1891 knows, that the frauds and the stealings from the public treasury in connection with the Esquimalt Graving Dock were extraordinary. Every one of us who sat in the Parliament in the session of 1891 knows that it was practically admitted that the stealings in connection with the Quebec Harbour Works were shocking; everybody knows that the frauds and forgeries in connection with the Kingston Graving Dock were startling; but I tell you that the stealings in connection with the Langevin Block—using no harsher word, and I do not wish to use strong language—stand out in bold prominence as compared with the stealings in connection with the three works I have mentioned. Let hon. gentlemen opposite explain, if they can, how it was that these extraordinary large sums were paid to these men. Now, Sir, I supposed that this thing was at an end. I supposed that we had heard the last of Mr. Charlebois. I supposed, after the disclosures that were made in the Public Accounts Committee in the session of 1891, that we would hear no more of any demands being made on the public treasury on his account. After we had paid him, according to the Minister's own statement, made on the floor of Parliament, $867,000 for works originally estimated to cost $489,000, and which were contracted for that sum, one would naturally imagine that that was the end of the whole business. But the end was not yet, Mr. Speaker. It is true, that to some extent the scene has changed since 1891. The old men who were here then, a good many of them, are not here to-day. Some of them have gone to their reward, and some of them have gone elsewhere. But although the scene and the men are somewhat changed, Charlebois appears to have been to the fore; and in January last, upon the eve of a general election, when it was in plain view, when everybody knew that it could not be

delayed more than a few months, Charlebois appeared upon the scene once more. He was right. The Conservative forces were then marshalled by a man who understood that sort of business to perfection; nobody knows it better. Charlebois made his raid. He put in a claim to the Government for $296,000, for something in connection with the Langevin Block. I wonder if this claim was made during the reign of Sir John Abbott, or Sir John Thompson, or Sir Mackenzie Bowell; or was it left until the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper appeared once more upon the scene, and was it then for the first time that this extraordinary claim was presented to the Government? Why, everybody knows that the claim ought to have been at once rejected. Is there not a clause in the contract under which these works were undertaken and completed, that prohibits any demand on the Dominion Government, unless with the sanction of the chief architect? Is there not a clause which says that the chief architect's certificate must precede any demand made on the Government for extras? But, Sir, Charlebois knew that his hour had come, and he knew that his man had come, and Charlebois was not the man to stay his hand when the hour and the man were to the fore. Sir, I see it stated in the public press—and I have no doubt it is true, but it is to obtain the absolute proof of it that I make this motion—that, either shortly before or shortly after the late Government were spewed out by the people of Canada at the general election, they passed an Order in Council referring this claim—not to the Exchequer Court; oh, no, there would be there legal rules and principles and intelligent construction of legal documents; but they referred it to a friendly arbitration. One of the arbitrators, I am told, was the chief organizer and heeler of the Conservative party in the city of Montreal; the other was a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite and a friend of the contractor. It is true, that the name of Mr. Walter Shanly, in whom I have every confidence, was given as that of the third arbitrator; but, pray, what could Mr. Shanly do when the other two arbitrators were political friends of the Administration? Even if there were nothing in the way, the enormous amount of the claim itself ought to have aroused the suspicion of the hon. leader of the Opposition; and his Government ought to have stayed their hands, or at least ought to have referred the claim to the Exchequer Court. They ought to have insisted, in the case of a man like Charlebois, on the strict legal rights of the Government under the contract, and ought to have recognized no claim that was not sanctioned by the chief architect of the department. Sir, the claim was referred to this friendly arbitration. Fortunately for the good name of the country, fortunately for the public treasury, the watch-dog was at hand, watching the farmer's ricks, and the Order in Council was cancelled. The Order in Council was cancelled, and the little scheme, the little conspiracy which was concocted, has failed in result so far. How far it will fail in the future, I do not know, but I have every confidence that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) will stick to the letter of the law and the fairness of the contract, and, at all events, refer the matter to the judge of the Exchequer Court, who, no doubt, will do justice in the premises. Sir, I wish to get these papers. I want to know the reason why the Government waived their right under the contract. I want to know why they referred this matter to a friendly arbitration—I mean, friendly to the contractor and the Government. I want to let the people understand exactly how their money has been squandered for the last eighteen years. I want to let them into the true inwardness of the workings of the Public Works Department during the last eighteen years. I want to let the great body of taxpayers understand that the affairs of this country have been managed, not only with extreme extravagance, but extravagance verging—nay, more than verging—on corruption of the worst possible type and kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the conclusion of this most extraordinary speech, to which we have had to listen, the hon. gentleman himself disposed of many of the wild and reckless statements which he inflicted on the House. Whatever we may think of the extraordinary adjectives and superlatives in which he has indulged, it is somewhat satisfactory to know that he has had to confess that he does not believe implicitly himself, if at all, in his own statements, because, after having stated that the object of the last Order in Council was to perpetrate a raid on the treasury, he confesses that the object of his inquiry is to ascertain why this claim was referred to arbitration. He admits that it is information he seeks, and it must be satisfactory to those who are so sensitive as to feel at all hurt by the wild language in which the hon. gentleman has revelled, to know that he does not himself credit his own statements. No doubt, a great many members of this House, who have some knowledge of the Langevin Block matter, which was investigated by a committee of this House in the session of 1891, of which House the hon. gentleman was then a member, cannot be expected to be in a position now, after this lapse of years, to deal with garbled extracts from the evidence adduced before that commission.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the point of order?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The expression "garbled" is unparliamentary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have a perfect right to use the expression "garbled extracts," and propose to do so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I appeal to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry to say that I did not catch the exact words which the hon. gentleman used.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall repeat them, because I am quite certain that I am within the rules of debate. What I stated was that, considering that this question was dealt with in 1891 by a committee of the House, of which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken was a member, and considering that the question then was not made the subject of any formal resolution or debate after the evidence had been taken by the committee and printed and circulated, no hon. gentleman can be expected now to be prepared to deal with garbled extracts from that evidence or the falsification of public documents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I rise to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my opinion, the hon. gentleman must not charge any hon. member of this House with using garbled documents.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not said that the hon. member for Huron did garble the documents. We may think what we like and still be in order, and I shall think what I like with regard to the manner in which the hon. gentleman has treated this question and treated his absent colleagues of a Parliament that has passed away; but the rules of debate will not permit me to make a direct charge against the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. Or an indirect one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Or any charge of having garbled the evidence; but I say that no one can expect that any hon. gentleman could be in a position to-night, without notice, to deal with garbled references and garbled extracts from the blue-book

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is now referring to garbled extracts.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the hon. gentleman, in the sense in which he has last spoken, does impute that the hon. member did knowingly make use of garbled extracts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not said so, but will defer to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as I am always happy to do. I propose to draw your attention, Sir, to another remarkable feature in connection with this debate. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is an old member of Parliament; but I venture to say that you will look in vain in the records of this House or through "Hansard" to find an attack of such a vicious character made upon either a member present or absent without the slightest hint having been given him in advance or the slightest suggestion that such an attack was to be made. The hon. gentleman put an apparently perfectly harmless motion upon the paper; and, under cover of that motion, which only intimated his desire to obtain information, he asks this House to listen to a laboured argument containing frequent reference—what we are bound by the rule of Parliament to believe are references—to the evidence; and he asks this House to accept an ex parte statement, distinguished mainly for reckless invective, in which he was encouraged by the cheers of the sensitive gentlemen seated around him. The language he used was so extraordinary that I dare not characterize it as it deserves to be characterized without following the bad example of the hon. gentleman. Nor shall I attempt, for the same reason, to characterize as it deserves the conduct of the hon. gentleman in attempting to base upon this apparently harmless motion the gravest possible charges against the character of public and private gentlemen in this country. But I think there can be only one opinion, and that not confined to one side of this House, with regard to the violation of all the rules of taste and the canons of fair-play of which the hon. gentleman has given such a melancholy and deplorable exhibition. It will be my duty, in justice to some of the people whose names have been mentioned by the hon. gentleman in connection with his serious charges, to puncture a great deal of the extraordinary case which he has set up to-day, by the very simple, though tedious, process of reading, not portions or disconnected sentences of the evidence, but the sworn testimony of the officials.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The whole of it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, but a much more extended reference to the evidence than the hon. gentleman has given, which will at once dispose satisfactorily of his heated charges. Listening to the hon. gentleman, one would imagine that tried and trusted officials who have long served their country, and who are now in the Public Works Department, and who were examined with reference to this so-called steal, were not worthy of credence.

And explanations, none of which were referred to to-day, none of which were given to this House, were put on record. And after these explanations had been recorded, the responsible Ministers sitting in this House had the satisfaction of finding not even the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) prepared to make an accusation upon that evidence before their faces and in their presence when he had an opportunity to do so.

But the hon. gentleman has waited until—a fact which he himself referred to—these gentlemen have disappeared from this Chamber, until these responsible Ministers who were in Parliament with him at that time are no longer here. And this is the opportunity, this is the time, according to that hon. gentleman's idea of what is fair and parliamentary—this is the time and on such a motion as this calling for papers and information, to make these serious charges. Now the evidence, which the hon. gentleman must have examined because he held in his hand a very lengthy brief, shows that the officials of the department not only were responsible so far as they could be responsible in connection with the form of a contract and the peculiar terms of it which gave rise to the complications to which the hon. gentleman referred—these men, experienced for over twenty years in the Public Works Department, serving under different Administrations, Reform and Conservative, testified upon oath that the clause in the contract which gave rise to these difficulties which were reported upon by the Minister of Justice, were common to all the contracts with which that department had had to deal, were common to the contracts for all the buildings that had been built by Canada. And, further, Mr. Speaker, disposing at once of the silly charges that were made to-day, these officials testified that the same conditions, the same difficulties, existed in connection with all these various blocks, with every public building in Canada, and that after the Minister of Justice had advised, the form of the contract was, in that year 1891, for the first time changed, in order, if possible, to surmount a contingency of this character. And, before I come to the evidence, which may be a little tedious, let me give you the summing up of the results and the comparative expenditures made, under Conservative rule, if you will, as contrasted with the expenditure upon similar works made under other Administrations and made in previous years under Conservative rule. Mr. Ewart, one of the architects of the Public Works Department, was called and examined, and his testimony, while not very long, is very much in point upon this question :

948. Can you state how the price of the iron roof compared with that of other roofs of a similar character ?—Yes ; we considered it a fair rate—6¾ cents.

949. Is that about the general thing ?—The general thing for that class of work is from 6 to 7 cents.

950. Can you give us an idea of the price of the heating apparatus compared with the price paid in other cases ?—As regards heating apparatus, the general rule is this : We rate them so much the cubic foot for the extent of the building. Quite a number have been put in recently at 1¼ ; I think they nearly always cost 2. In the North-west we have paid more than that.

951. Of course it would be scarcely fair between the Langevin Block and the North-west ?—No.

952. You are an architect, Mr. Ewart, are you not ?—Yes.

953. And generally make estimates of the cost of public buildings ?—Yes ; as a general rule.

954. You are accustomed to making calculations ?—Yes. When any buildings are complete we take out the cubic contents.

955. Can you inform the committee how the cost of the Langevin Block would compare with other public buildings—such, for instance, as the Western Block ?—The Western Block cost 32 cents per cubic foot, and some buildings cost a great deal more than that. The Langevin Block cost 26½ cents, as against 32 cents for the Western Block. Of course, it depends a great deal upon the building. The Hamilton post office, for instance, cost 24 cents per cubic foot. A plain brick building generally runs from 3 to 16 cents ; stone and brick from 16 to 20. Buildings all stone generally run from 20 to 24.

956. The Langevin Block you consider as cheap as any of the public buildings that you have referred to ?—I consider——

And I call the particular attention of the House to this :

The cheapest building that has been erected since I was in the department over twenty years ago.

Could any man reading that evidence, putting it before the House, hope that this House would take seriously the statement made by the hon. gentleman when he attempted to characterize the nature of this transaction. And then as to the suggestion that because estimates had been exceeded, that because estimates had been almost doubled there must be something wrong—why, we have had time and again in this House the evidence, and the best evidence, that in connection with all the great public works of Canada, whether under the late Government, under the late Mr. Mackenzie or in the previous period of Conservative rule after 1867, work has been found to be of such a character that it could not be done for the estimate and the estimate has been doubled or trebled. So in connection with the works outside of this country. For instance, the Manchester Ship Canal, the original estimate, made by skilled engineers, was, I believe, trebled before the canal was completed. And no one has ever heard in connection with that work a single suggestion of wrong-doing. Of course there may be fraud and there may be thieving in these things. In that case, of course, the cost to the country would be increased ; but no person should jump to such a conclusion, from mere comparison of the estimates with the actual cost. A serious charge of that kind can only be proved by evidence of the very strongest character. Then Mr. Fuller, the chief engineer of the department, pricked all these bubbles long ago. But the hon. gentleman who has addressed us for such a length of time did not do the late Government or even Mr. Fuller the justice, as the architect who assumed so far as he could assume a great deal of responsibility in connection not only with this work but in con-

nection with the recommendations that were taken to Council to read what he said. Mr. Fuller was called, and after a great deal of the evidence by the disappointed contractors, Messrs. Rousseau and Mather upon whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) so strongly relies, he gave evidence first of all that the contract that Mr. Charlebois was acting on his report, that it was taken to Council and acted upon. That report was submitted, and, in order to dispose of the hon. gentleman's argument, I think it necessary to put that report before the House. It is as follows :—

Memorandum.—Re Tenders for Iron Roofs, New Department Buildings, Ottawa

Tenders :

Rousseau & Mather.....	$42.975
Hamilton Bridge Works	46,000
A. Charlebois	77,590
Estimate by department.....	$58,809

The tender of Messrs. Rousseau & Mather being so much under what was considered by the department to be the fair value of the work, there appeared to have been some mistake or omission. Therefore, by direction of the hon. the Minister, Messrs. Rousseau & Mather were telegraphed on the 31st ultimo to come to Ottawa, in order that explanations might be obtained as to what arrangements they had made to execute the works if the contract were awarded them.

Messrs. Rousseau & Mather arrived here on the 2nd instant, and stated that they had not made any arrangements with the contractor for the building, either as regards the hoisting and erection of the roofs, or for providing a "piling ground" for the delivery of all material ready for placing in position, all of which were required by the conditions of the specifications. Before deciding to accept the contract they asked to be allowed a short time in order to see what arrangements they could make. This was granted. At this interview Messrs. Rousseau & Mather stated that there was a mistake of several thousands of dollars in their tender; but, of course, they did not expect that to be allowed then.

On the 12th instant they wrote (No. 69833) that they were not able to make satisfactory arrangements, and preferred, under the circumstances to withdraw their tender and accepted cheque.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). That is the report that the hon. gentleman is reading

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The report of Mr. Fuller, the Chief Architect.

The second tender, that of the Hamilton Bridge Company, was informal, as it contained conditions not called for by the specifications, and which would materially alter the amount of the tender. The third tender, that of A. Charlebois, was considered unreasonably in excess of what the department estimated a fair value of the work. To call for new tenders would have caused a great delay, and have given the contractor for the building a claim for damages, as he had notified the department that the walls would be sufficiently advanced by the 1st November next to allow the erection of the iron roof to be commenced. It was considered advisable to ascertain from the second tenderer if any terms could be made by which the work might be progressed without delay. The manager of the Hamilton Bridge Company was, therefore, summoned here by telegraph and arrived here on the 13th instant.

In the meantime, Messrs. Rousseau & Mather wrote (No. 69879) that they had another interview with Mr. Charlebois, and asked to be allowed two or three days before giving a definite answer. This was granted. On the 14th instant they wired (No. 69914) that they were prepared to sign the contract and asked that acceptance be at once telegraphed them so that they might cable England to fill the order for iron. The reply telegraphed was that no authority could be given until the contract was signed, and that it would be ready for signature on or before noon the 17th instant.

The hon. gentleman, I think, spoke of their being pressed. Here were gentlemen on the 14th asking that their tender should be accepted at once, and the answer was : We cannot accept by telegraph, but the contract is ready for acceptance on arrival at Ottawa :

On the 16th instant Messrs. Rousseau & Mather wrote (No. 69928) in confirmation of their telegram of the 14th.

Owing to pressure of business the contract was not ready for signature until the 18th instant, after perusing it, Messrs. Rousseau & Mather objected to the clause making them responsible for the arrangements to be made with the contractor for the building, so that there might be no disputes or delays hereafter in the prosecution of the work of hoisting and erecting in place the various portions of the iron roof, and asked that the clause be expunged. This could not be allowed, as the clause was necessary, and also covered the purpose for which the application of Messrs. Rousseau & Mather for the reconsideration of the withdrawal of their tender was granted, and, when the matter was submitted to the hon. the Minister they positively declined the contract. At the interview of the 14th instant with the manager of the Hamilton Bridge Company, he stated that, in making up their tender, no arrangements had been made with the contractor for the building for hoisting or erecting the iron work of the roof, nor had any provision been made for a "piling ground," that the tender submitted was made low under the supposition that an extension of time for the delivery of the material until April 1st as stipulated by the company would be granted ; that under ordinary circumstances, all the work might be delivered by the 1st of November, as called for by the conditions and specifications, but that they could not undertake it without a considerable addition to their tender owing to the large amount of work they had on hand, though he was not then prepared to state the terms upon which the company could be induced to assume the work

As the prosecution of the work is very urgent, and, as before stated, to call for new tenders would entail delay of probably at least one year in the completion of the building, it was considered advisable to ascertain what terms could be made with Mr. Charlebois so that he should assume all responsibility of every description and guarantee that the work would proceed without delay.

After a full explanation and discussion of the whole matter, Mr. Charlebois stated that the

delay which had been granted Messrs. Rousseau & Mather would oblige him to pay an increased amount to induce reliable parties to undertake to deliver the work on time, still, as it was of great importance to him as well as to the Government that the building should be completed as speedily as possible, he would undertake the whole work, assuming the entire responsibility for the sum of $60,000, and guaranteed to have sufficient portions of the iron principals erected in position to enable him to have the whole covered in so as to form a thorough protection, and thereby enable him to proceed with interior work during the winter, which would materially hasten the completion of the building.

Unless arrangements could have been made between the respective contractors, it is believed that both parties would have caused endless disputes, involving delays, and thereby claims for heavy damages, which would have entailed large legal and other expenses, besides a delay of probably another year in the completion of the building.

Therefore, under all the circumstances, and with the view to as early occupation of the building as possible, I consider it would be in the public interest to accept the offer of Mr. Charlebois to undertake the whole of the work and assume all the responsibility for the sum of $60,000, which amount is only $2,000 in excess of the department estimate.

I would further recommend that the cheques of the other tenders be returned.

No man can accept the view of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) without considering that Mr. Fuller is absolutely unworthy of the position that he occupied then, or occupies now. But no hon. gentleman since 1891, after hearing that gentleman's testimony, ever suggested, ever whispered, that Mr. Fuller had not maintained the highest possible character in his administration, and in the performance of his duty as chief architect. Mr. Fuller goes on to give a recital of the different tenders. I can only speak on a few points, because I sent for this document while the hon. gentleman was speaking, and I am not in a position to sum up, as I know with very little time I could do, a clear and complete answer to every statement the hon. gentleman made. Take, for instance, a reference to one of the last subjects, and one to which I called attention while the hon. gentleman was speaking, to show how inaccurately he has taken notes to make up his argument:

With relation to question 307, with respect to the hauling of iron joists from the station, what explanation do you desire to give ?—I think, in my previous evidence, I said something about the Canada Atlantic station.

That was in reference to piling ground ?—No ; hauling. The joists were to be hauled to the Government ground on Nepean point, and carried from that point by the Government.

Did the contract provide for the delivery of the joists by the contractor ?—Yes.

Why did you take them to Nepean Point ?—When it was decided to take the placing of them out of Carrier's hands, it was necessary, before the men could be paid that the joists should be delivered on Government ground, and, therefore, he hauled them to Nepean Point instead of to the building. That was a longer distance than to the building and the Government paid for their delivery.

Did you pay the contractors anything extra for taking them from Nepean Point to the building ?—No.

Why did you send them to Nepean Point instead of the building here ?—There was no room here.

Was the building ready for them when they were delivered ?—No.

Consequently, you had to send them to some other place in the building ? Certainly.

The hon. gentleman being a member of the bar, does not require me to go on and show that in the arrangement there made under the terms of the contract, the department acted very wisely indeed. Now, Mr. Speaker, this officer was examined on two occasions. I refer to the last occasion when he was examined. When he was in the hands, I think of the chairman, he was asked:

Were the conditions in the original contract with Charlebois for the construction of the main building, the same in the specifications as is usual in your several contracts for public buildings ? They were exactly the same, but since this difficulty has occurred, we have always put it in the contracts that they are to allow people to go in.

Now, I call attention to another portion of his evidence. After having stated that they had awarded the contract to Charlebois upon his report:

And subsequently, about the time you were going to advertise for tenders for the roof, Charlebois wrote the department a letter advising the department that in regard to further contracts, for instance the roofing, to avoid any further misunderstanding you should put in a condition in which the tenderer was required to show that he had made his arrangements with Charlebois ? Yes.

He must show you he had got Charlebois's consent to tender for the roof ?—He had to find his own piling ground.

And to get Charlebois's consent ?—No.

You swore so the last time, I think ?—If I did I made a mistake then.

This is a correction which the hon. gentleman had overlooked. Mr. Chapleau examined one of the contractors, Mr. Mather, to whom the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) declared, as follows:—

Did the Minister speak to you about the specification—you had read the specification for your tender ?—Yes.

You know there was a clause in that specification which said an arrangement had to be made with the main contractor ?—Yes.

And did the Minister tell you it was in your specification, and you were obliged to do it ?—Yes.

That is what he said ?—Yes.

This shows that when the contractors went into this speculation or business they knew they were in the hands of Charlebois to a large extent in connection with that tender, and that was not peculiar to Charlebois's contract, but was the stereotype form which

had been used for many past years in connection with contracts for public buildings. I am going to ask the attention of the House to Mr. Fuller's evidence on some of the points to which Mr. Ewart refers :

With respect to question 432, were the conditions in the original contract with Charlebois the same as the usual specifications ?—I want to add to that some instances. In 1870 the finishing of the Parliamentary Library was by separate contracts under precisely the same conditions. The contract for the masonry, iron roof and putting on the roof were separate. The Western Block extension in 1875, the contract for the foundation was let to one person, the masonry and brickwork to another, the carpenter and joiner work to another, and the iron joists and iron roof to another.

I call attention to the work on the Western Block extension, which was carried out in the good old Reform days in 1875. The contract for the foundation was let to one person, the masonry and brick work to another, the carpenter and joiner work to another, and the iron joists and iron roof to another. What about the attempt to steal in 1875 ? Where is the memory of the hon. member for South Huron in that regard ? How was it that he did not discover all those diabolical schemes and plotting, where they divided up contracts in the same way with interested parties and carried out a system of connivance, collusion and fraud to divide up money which should properly belong to the public treasury. The hon. gentleman never referred to cases that occurred in 1875. Yet if we are to follow the hon. gentleman in his argument, it will appear that this fraud, rascality and villainy has been rampant from 1867 down, and was not stopped by the Reform party, but was carried on between 1874 and 1879 ; and it was not until this corrupt Administration to which the hon. gentleman has referred, took the matter up that Mr. Fuller prepared a clause, by which the condition enabling this rascality to be carried on was eliminated from the form of contract. The witness goes on to say :

The Hamilton post office, in 1882, is another instance. The contracts for the main building, heating and elevators were all separate. We had no trouble of any kind whatever. In 1883, the contract for the Montreal drill hall included separate contracts for the masonry and iron roof, and there was no trouble of any kind. These were all under the same conditions. In 1885, there were the Montreal armouries. The contracts for the masonry, iron girders and the iron roof were separate. The iron roof was put on by Rousseau & Mather under the same conditions precisely.

Here are these poor men driven out of the business on account of this clause read by the hon. member for South Huron. But they had worked on a contract in Montreal under precisely the same clause. Here they put in a tender. And the hon. gentleman accepts the interested statement made by them as against Mr. Fuller's official evidence and all the rest of the testimony, when they set this up as an excuse for not accepting the contract and for the purpose of building up a claim against the Government for damages in connection with the withdrawal of their tender. Mr. Fuller is further examined :

From which we learn, that although the contracts in the past, from 1870 to the present time, until you had this difficulty, have never had a provision in the contract to compel the contractor for the masonry work to permit access, there has been no trouble ?—We always took it for granted that they had the right.

And that was subsequently decided by the Minister of Justice ?—Yes.

Turn now to question 445 ?—The same answer as previously, with respect to the specification.

Mr. Fuller then explained that this particular condition is not new, but that it was the usual one, and so he explained all the evidence on which the hon. gentleman had tried to base a case. Further on his evidence is as follows :—

Then look at questions 782 to 807 ?—Rousseau states that Sir Hector told him : "You have come in the right time, because I was going to give the contract to Charlebois." This must have been on the 12th of August, as the letter of withdrawal was dated the 11th, and Rousseau states he arrived in Ottawa at midnight on that date and waited on the Minister next morning. This remark could hardly have been made at that time, because the next tender was from the Hamilton Bridge Company and they had not then been asked if they were prepared to enter into the contract.

I do not think it necessary to attempt more than I have already attempted in a debate of this kind, sprung upon the House suddenly. I was very suspicious under the circumstances, seeing the state of indignation into which the hon. member for South Huron worked himself, finding an old parliamentarian, as the hon. gentleman undoubtedly is, resorting to such a motion to make such charges, in regard to the motives animating the hon. gentleman. I confess I thought the hon. gentleman had been a little restive at being placed on the defensive and compelled to support an Administration of whose policy he is just as ignorant as I am, who has been kept in darkness as we all have been as to what they are thinking about, what they are going to do and as to what they imagine they may be able to get through this House and yet politically live, and consequently he has endeavoured to draw a herring across the track. He does not desire that the public mind should be drawn to the Government in the regular and constitutional way and that its members should be kept under the fierce light that a Government, if it lives, must exist under ; but he has endeavoured to hark back and dig up some old scandals and charges, and I am certain he has not put them in any more formidable shape than did those who attempted to make political capital out of them in years gone by. But the hon. gentleman thinks there has been fraud and corruption, and he scents them in an Order in

Council, which I think the country was somewhat surprised to first learn from the lips of a Cabinet Minister on the stump. It seems to me that if hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are seriously considering the situation of the country and are making a bona fide effort to develop a policy to be announced at an early day, they should not be occupied with ransacking the records and files of the department and scampering out on the stump, and with making behind the backs of gentlemen affected and behind the backs of their opponents wild statements such as the Minister of Public Works made, because he found, forsooth, under an Order in Council that there was a reference of a dispute between the Crown and a contractor. Did the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Cameron) never hear of the hundreds of references that were made in the time of Mr. Mackenzie, and did the settlements of claims and the payment of more than the contractor could legally recover from a court of law convey to him than indications of dishonesty or jobbery? Did the hon. gentleman not learn before insinuating such serious charges, that the statements he made in regard to that Order in Council and that reference are altogether inaccurate? He has referred to those gentlemen to whom the reference was made in a rather questionable manner. Well, Sir, the House knows Mr. Shanly and his standing in Canada. I do not know the other gentlemen, and I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) knows either of them, but he has probably picked out of some Grit newspaper of low standing charges against their character. It is enough for me that Mr. Shanly would sit with them. In the absence of any evidence to support the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron), it is enough for me, and it will be enough for most hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to know that Mr. Shanly was one of the arbitrators. That distinguished engineer has a character in Canada that would not permit him to take so ill-advised a course as the hon. gentleman from Huron has suggested. But what are the facts? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) did not read the Order in Council, it was hardly fair for him to attack the character of any one in connection with it. The Order in Council authorizes a reference to these gentlemen, but nothing in connection with the reference made the opinion of these gentlemen binding upon the executive. It was an inquiry directed upon the terms of the Order in Council, and when that inquiry is finished—should it be gone on with as contemplated—it would then be for the Executive to consider its value, and after having considered it, to decide whether they would take the responsibility of acting upon it. That time never came, and so I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) has, in ignorance of the facts, rather precipitated his opinion upon this House. The Government had in every sense the right to refer to these gentlemen to ascertain their views, and before they could be open to the suspicion which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) has suggested, some executive action would be required from which it would be impossible for the Government to retrace their steps. In speaking of the Hon. Mr. Desjardins, who is not now a member of either House of Parliament, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron), who has apparently followed the newspaper reports, might have in justice to Mr. Desjardins, given his explanation of the facts, and made it unnecessary for me to have said a word on that score. Mr. Desjardins says that his chief architect admitted in dealing with this matter, that he could not give an unbiassed report. I accept that statement, and in view of that, surely no dangerous course was pursued in referring the question to this board for their opinion. But, whenever we step aside from the cast-iron provisions of these Government contracts, some hon. gentlemen labour under the delusion—and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) is conspicuous in that—that there is an irregularity of a serious character involved. I hold in my hands a report of the Auditor General of Great Britain of date 1893-94, and in that, Mr. Speaker, you will find that in a dispute between a Government engineer and a contractor, the usual course is to refer to an arbitrator. The form of the contract is set out in that report, and while the contractors are in the hands of the engineer, there is a clause which says:

> In case of disagreement in respect to any of the matters mentioned in the last paragraph, the matter in dispute shall be referred to arbitration and determined by E. Murphy, Esq., Government arbitrator.

The fact that the chief engineer has one opinion or another does not tie the hands of the Executive, nor would it be in the public interest to lay down any hard and fast rule of that character. I am satisfied that when the House is put in possession of the further information moved for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron), and when hon. gentlemen take the trouble to study this blue-book, which gave us some time and trouble in 1891, it will be found by any impartial investigation, that whatever be the difficulties in the matter and whatever the additional expense, this building was one of the most satisfactorily accomplished public works ever undertaken in Canada, if we are to believe the officials; and that the difficulties and jarring between these claimants was due to no such idea as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) has conveyed to this House to-day, due to no corruption of any kind whatever, directly or indirectly; but due to this usual and regular form of contract, the weakness of which was first discovered in this matter. The contract was practically at the bottom of all the

difficulties. This report also gives a statement at the end of it, showing that a great many of the extra allowances were the ordinary and usual allowances in connection with such a work. These allowances were determined by the chief architect, and the opinion of that gentleman has not yet been attacked. I wish to make a remark before I sit down with regard to the reference of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) to Mr. Raza. He said that Mr. Raza was a Tory heeler, and I suppose he did not mean that in a complimentary sense to Mr. Raza. I am informed, and my information, I hope, is better than that of the hon. gentleman, that Mr. Raza is a well known architect of high standing in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Mr. Speaker, the debate arises on the motion made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) for all the papers in connection with the construction of the well-known public building on the south side of Wellington Street in this city. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has apologized tonight for his inability to grapple with the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) by stating, somewhat fairly, that he only was able to read a few portions of the evidence while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) was making his speech.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I admit that his argument was scrappy, and that his defence was very poor, and I accept his apology that he had not time to prepare it. But, I think the question of sufficient magnitude to justify this House in giving time to the hon. gentleman to mature and deliver the fullest defence that is possible under the circumstances. Sir, I followed with some care the speech made by my hon. friend from Huron, and I have some knowledge of the facts myself as I followed pretty closely the evidence taken before the committee in 1891. Although my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) did use very strong language in condemning the conspiracy and the corruption which has surrounded that work from beginning to end, I venture to say that he did not use one adjective which the circumstances does not justify. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says that if he had time he could give a complete and clear answer to every one of the charges made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), and I hope the debate will assume such shape that he may have ample time.

It will give me great satisfaction to find that the charges, which I believe to have been proved up to the hilt, of corruption against public men of this country, are without foundation. If the hon. gentleman can establish that fact, and can whiten and clear the characters of those public men who have been under a cloud for the last 10 years in connection with this matter, he will deserve the gratitude of this House; and I propose, before I close, to move that this debate be adjourned in order that the hon. gentleman, after he has had the amplest time to study every scrap of information he can obtain in connection with this subject, may confirm the statement he has made here, of his ability to give a clear and complete answer to every charge of corruption made against public officials in connection with this matter. The hon. gentleman appears to be a good deal agitated, not only to-night, but on almost every occasion on which he has arisen since this House met, about what he conceives to be the absence of a policy on the part of the Government. The hon. gentleman is about the only one I know of who is at all troubled.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Don't you believe that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there is one feeling that I have heard of more than another from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island, in connection with the advent of this Government to power, it is the feeling of complete and profound satisfaction which animates every class of the community, in the larger cities particularly, the fact of the relegation to obscurity of the late Government, and the accession to power of my hon. friend on a policy which has been defined so clearly in the last three years that nobody has any doubt what it means—a policy, Sir, which he has not only the intention to carry out, but which I am proud to tell hon. gentlemen opposite he has a good majority at his back to enable him to carry out; a policy which will give satisfaction, not only to the mercantile and manufacturing community, as my hon. friend from North Leeds (Mr. Frost) so very well said the other night, but which I believe will give equal satisfaction to the great farming, lumbering and fishing communities, who have been looking in vain for relief for so many years past.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Explain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Now, Mr. Speaker, without going into the details of this matter, let us look at a few of the more salient points connected with the letting of the contracts for this work, and ascertain if possible wherein the facts before this House, apart from any extraneous evidence, justify a charge of conspiracy and corruption. There was a contract made for the erection of a great public building in the centre of Ottawa. After plans had been carefully prepared by the chief architect, and submitted

to the Minister of Public Works and approved of by all the officers of his department, the late Government came down to this Parliament and asked it for $300,000 to construct that great public building. They told us, away back in the year 1882—it was just after I had taken my seat in this Parliament that the congestion which existed in the then departmental buildings was such that more room had to be found, and that after the most careful examination and preparation on the part of the chief architect and his assistants, they were enabled to inform the House that if the House entrusted them with $300,000, they would give this country a building complete in every particular—there were to be no extras. On that statement the House voted the money, and the then Minister of Public Works let the contracts, and went on with the construction of the building. At the end of three years he discovered, or he told the House that he had discovered, that the contract which the Government had let for a complete building was a contract for the walls of the building, without a roof at all. We had entered into contract, $200,000 or $300,000 of public money had been spent, and the House was then coolly asked to vote some $60,000 more to these gentlemen to enable them to put a roof upon the building which they had constructed. That sum was voted in 1886. Then, in the year 1888 they found that they had no staircases in the building to get from the basement to the upper storeys, and Parliament was called upon to vote some $11,000 extra to build staircases. Our hands had been tied, we were not free agents, and we voted the money to the extent of $366,000. What happened then? My hon. friend has given in detail, with a lucidity which requires no comment from me, the history of the letting of these several contracts. He has pointed out to the House how it is apparent on the face of the very calling for tenders and every letting of contracts, that there was a deep-seated conspiracy on the part, not, as he carefully guarded himself to say, of the head of the department, but of the department, that every one of those contracts should fall into the hands of one man; and no matter who tendered or how much money others could put up or how much political influence they had, Charlebois was always able to squeeze them out and get the contracts. What did he do? After entering into those three contracts for $366,000, he came down with claims, for extras on the main building amounting to $137,412, for extra work on the iron roof amounting to $3,800, and for extra work on the iron stairs amounting to $6,823, from which was deducted for work provided for in his contract which he did not perform, $22,000. And so this gentleman, who entered into a contract to construct the building originally for less than $300,000, was paid by the late Government, $490,000 odd. Sir, I have never heard yet in this Parliament a public man, who valued his reputation, attempt to defend that payment except my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to-night; and when my hon. friend takes the time he asks this House to give him, I do not think he will venture to say that these are a series of transactions which he can approve of. And now, after the whole thing is over and $490,000 has been paid for the building, Mr. Charlebois comes to the Government and makes a claim for an additional extra of $296,000. Why, Sir, has this claim remained so long unpaid? Sir John Macdonald was leader of the Government when he first put in his claim, and it was not allowed then; Sir John Abbott followed him, and the claim was pressed from time to time, and was not allowed then; Sir John Thompson followed him, the claim was again pressed, but was not allowed; and lately we had the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, under whom the claim was further pressed, and not allowed then. And why?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has not been allowed now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the chief architect told each successive Government that there was nothing in the claim at all. Because the chief architect stated on each successive occasion that he could not certify to the claim, that it was utterly baseless, and because the several contracts under which Mr. Charlebois constructed the building, contained a clause, clear and specific, that if he had any claim for extras that claim was to be determined upon, solely and exclusively, by the chief architect. Sir, the contract had made the chief architect the umpire who was to decide between the contractor and the Government, the contract was clear and explicit that the chief architect's decision should be final and irrevocable, and that decision was given, time and again, with wearisome iteration, and I say that at the last moment, just on the eve of the elections, twelve or thirteen years after the claim had matured and been repudiated, for a Government, not fresh from the people, which had never received a mandate from the people at all, and which had been selected, owing to the peculiar and untoward circumstances of the time, to carry on the legislation, from day to day, until the people's verdict could be recorded—for such a Government to step in and reverse the verdict of four succeeding Governments and recognize, in the way they did, this extraordinary claim, thirteen or fourteen years old, for $296,000, was an act which has no parallel, I venture to say, in the preceding history of Canada. What does the contract say? It says explicitly in its thirty-third clause:

That all matters of difference arising between the parties thereto—that is between the Crown

represented by the Minister of Public Works, on the one hand, and Mr. Charlebois on the other—on any matter arising out of the contract shall be referred to the award or arbitration of the chief architect, and that the award of such chief architect shall be final and conclusive.

Sir, the chief architect had made his award. Time and again he had represented to Mr. Charlebois and the Department of Public Works that there was not the shadow of a basis for this claim of $296,000; yet in the face of that and of the further fact, which ought to be always borne in mind, that the chief architect was peculiarly qualified in this case to give judgment, because the building had been constructed, from the cellar to the iron roof, in his daily presence, and he knew therefore all the details and was not basing opinion on a report of the sub-engineer from some part of the Dominion, one would have supposed that this old and musty claim of twelve or thirteen years ago would have been relegated to the limbo of the past. But no, this Government, of which the hon. leader of the Opposition was the head, on the 6th of July—a fortnight after it was defeated by the people, and when it was established beyond peradventure that it did not and never had enjoyed the confidence of the electorate—passed an Order in Council, taking it out of the power of the chief architect to give any further decision, and vesting it in the hands of three or four gentlemen, two of the names of whom my hon. friend says he never heard before. How can that be justified? Who gave that Government the mandate to relegate to these arbitrators the decision of a matter which had been determined by the recognized legal authority?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not the decision.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What was it referred to them for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Investigation and report, leaving it free for them to act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let me read to the hon. gentleman what the terms of his reference were:

That in the event of Mr. Charlebois refusing to accept that specific sum, authority be given to refer the claim, as above stated, amounting to a total of $296,257 to three arbitrators, the said arbitrators to be Messrs. Alphonse Raza, and J. O. LaForest, C.E., with Walter Shanly, C.E., as third arbitrator or referee.

That seems plain enough.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That part, yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is there any doubt about that? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if that were a legal document binding on the Crown, and they had gone to an arbitration, and the arbitrators had made an award, any Government or Parliament could afterwards in equity repudiate it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I mean to say that the effect of that document was simply to give the Government the benefit of the opinion of those references, and that after they had reported in favour of the claim, the Government could, for any reasons that might seem proper to it, decline to pay, and the claimant could not bring an action and enforce his claim.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The effect of that document was precisely the same as the effect of any other reference the Government may make. The Crown is only bound legally when you get a judgment against it in the Exchequer Court, but it is bound by motives just as high as a legal obligation to abide by the decision of arbitrators to whom it makes a reference. If the Crown refers a matter to arbitration, the Crown is bound, in equity and good conscience, by the result of that arbitration, unless it can show fraud in the reference or award. As I understand, this Order in Council refers to the three arbitrators the determination of that claim of $296,000, and I say that in so doing the late Government went beyond its power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman a copy of the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would it be too much trouble for the hon. gentleman to read the order?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What I have read is the only part which touches the point now before us.

That in the event of Mr. Charlebois refusing to accept a specific sum, authority be given to refer the claim, as above stated, amounting to a total of $296,257 to three arbitrators, the said arbitrators to be Messrs. Alphonse Raza and J. O. LaForest, with Walter Shanly as third arbitrator or referee.

That before any action be taken on the finding of said arbitrators, their award be laid before His Excellency the Governor General in Council. That the cost of the said arbitration be paid by the contractor should the award not exceed the sum of $19,000 above named, but in case of an award exceeding that sum said cost to be paid by the Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly, that is my clause.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I see no importance in that. In every case where there is an award, before action is taken notice has to be given to the parties interested. There is no use, in my hon. friend trying to lead the House to believe that this was not an attempt to take that matter out of he hands of the chief architect, in whose hands the contract had

left it, and refer it to three arbitrators who, he believed, would give an award in favour of the contractor, which the chief architect refused to give.

I shall not detain the House in discussing the matter further. I promised only to touch upon a few of the most salient points in connection with it. I trust the debate will not close to-night. I trust that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will have the ample opportunity he desires of going thoroughly into the matter and answering, if he can, the damaging speech which has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). With that object in view, I may close by moving that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISMISSAL OF PATRICK McBRIDE.

Mr. HACKETT moved for:

Copies of all letters and papers relating to the disposal of Patrick McBride, late overseer of fisheries for Prince County, Prince Edward Island.

He said: The other evening, on the general subject of dismissals, I took the opportunity of referring to this case. I wish again to say that Mr. McBride, who was a very competent official, a gentleman who had had very great experience on fishery matters, was dismissed from his office after the advent of the present Government to power, no sufficient cause being assigned for that dismissal. No charge whatever was preferred against him: he was dismissed simply at the command of the Minister. Mr. McBride was appointed by Order in Council, and it has always been believed that officials appointed by Order in Council should be dismissed by Order in Council. But in this case Mr. McBride was simply notified, not through the regular official channels by the department, but by the agent of the department at Charlottetown, Mr. Lord. Now, Mr. Lord is a thoroughly competent man, and well understanding his duties in connection with the fisheries of Prince Edward Island. He would not have sent this letter to Mr. McBride unless he had been instructed by the Minister or somebody else in authority. This letter stated that Mr. McBride was dismissed simply because there was a change in the Administration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to quote from the letter?

Mr. HACKETT. No; I have not the letter by me. But I was informed by Mr. McBride that he had received such a letter. I did not think it necessary to ask him for it, but I felt it my duty, in justice to Mr. McBride, to bring this matter before the attention of the House. If we are going to have an introduction of the spoils system here, if officials are to be dismissed for no cause but that a change of Administration has taken place, the result must be that the tone of the civil service will be lowered, the service will be degraded, and the men who are faithfully doing the work of the country will be discouraged. I do not blame the Minister in this matter, as I feel that pressure must have been brought to bear upon him. A number of office seekers, no doubt, have been urging him to make changes, and he felt that he should do something to satisfy them, and found that Mr. McBride was his easiest victim. He saw there was no difficulty in dismissing Mr. McBride, and he dismissed him in order to make way for some one who, as he thought, had claims upon the party. The hon. Minister is a good-natured gentleman, who would not wish to do any man a wrong, and he dismissed Mr. McBride without considering that gentleman's claim, and without considering the large interests entrusted to Mr. McBride's care—the interests of the fisheries. I took occasion, the other evening, to read to the House an extract from a newspaper published in Prince Edward Island, stating that one of the finest angling streams in the province, the Dunk River, which not only affords good trout fishing, but which, in the fall of the year, is the great salmon-breeding ground, has been utterly neglected. Mr. McBride lives near this stream, and has had special charge of it. He was the overseer, and had one or two guardians under him, so that for years it has been well protected. Since Mr. McBride was dismissed, as I said the other evening, this stream has been neglected, and is being netted to-day, and thus one of the most valuable fishing streams on the Island is being made valueless. In speaking of Mr. McBride, the other evening, the hon. Minister said that Mr. McBride had not paid sufficient attention to his duties in connection with the lobster fishery. This is an exceedingly valuable fishery, affording employment to a large number of people of Prince Edward Island. It brings into the province about half a million dollars a year, which to a population of 120,000 is a good deal of money. This fishery requires the paternal care of the Government, and I know, that it has all the care the hon. Minister can give it, for he feels as much as any man the necessity of protecting this fishery, and he desires as much as any man to advance the interests of those engaged in this industry. It is a singular thing that about the time the fisheries should be closed, when the close season should be strictly observed, the hon. gentleman should take the opportunity of dismissing Mr. McBride. The hon. gentleman stated the other evening that Mr. McBride had not shown himself an active and attentive officer. I know very well, from my association with Mr. McBride, that he has paid great attention, not only to the lobster fishery, which is of great importance,

but also to the oyster fishery. The oyster fishery of Richmond Bay, which is one of the finest in Canada, is right in the vicinity of Mr. McBride's place, and he has been paying great attention to that fishery. I am informed on good authority that that fishery is not at present receiving the attention and the protection which it should receive at the hands of the department. But, to show what care has been taken of the lobster fishery in Prince Edward Island during the last few years, I will give the House some statistics which will show the hon. Minister that Mr. McBride has not been neglecting his duty. The quantity of lobsters canned in the province of Prince Edward Island in the season of 1887 was 2,009,107 pounds. That was the lowest quantity the pack of the Island has reached. In 1894, seven years after, notwithstanding that it was supposed the fishery was nearly exhausted, the pack increased, owing to the protection given, and owing to the more intelligent regulations and the greater attention given to the fisheries, to 3,173,084 pounds, or an increase of 1,163,977 pounds in the seven years. These figures show that, not only had that fishery been preserved, but it was producing a larger amount than it did seven years previously, at which time it was believed that the fishery was about exhausted, that, in fact, the lobsters were well nigh exterminated. Now, let me show what was done in Prince county, where nearly one-half the whole amount is canned. This county was specially under Mr. McBride's care. In Prince county, in 1887, the total pack was 1,206,567 pounds; in 1894 the pack was 1,498,528, or an increase of 291,961 pounds, showing that Prince county, which was more specially under Mr. McBride's care, had not deteriorated, but had improved, although it was supposed in 1887 that the fishery was about exhausted. I trust, therefore, that the hon. Minister will consider these facts, and that he will recognize now that Mr. McBride was dismissed without cause and without any charge being preferred against him; that he was attending strictly to his duty, and that he will see that Mr. McBride is again restored to his position, in order that he may afford that protection to the fisheries of Prince Edward Island which they were receiving in the past.

Motion agreed to.

BRANCH RAILWAYS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, resolutions and other papers in possession of the Government relating to the proposed branch railway from Southport to Murray Harbour, and other proposed railway branches in the province of Prince Edward Island.

He said: With the indulgence of the House, I would like to offer a few remarks on the subject of this motion. And this is the first time I have ventured to address the House, I shall have to crave your indulgence for any lack of knowledge I may display in the a b c's of debate. This question has been brought before the House on previous occasions, and is no doubt familiar to some hon. members: but as there are some new members in this Parliament like myself who may not have been present on former occasions when this question was discussed, it may be well for me briefly to state the grounds on which the province of Prince Edward Island bases her claim. Prince Edward Island was admitted into the confederation in 1873. When confederation went into effect in 1867, the Island was invited to join, but the people at the time did not consider the terms offered were sufficiently advantageous. One of the difficulties in the way was the isolation of the province, on account of which we did not think we would be able to participate in the benefits of the public works which might be constructed in other parts of the Dominion. They considered they were entitled to better treatment than was offered, and waited for a few years before deciding to enter confederation. The terms offered in 1873 were accepted by Prince Edward Island, but I must say that some of those terms have not been fulfilled by the Dominion up to this present day. One of them relates to better communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland; but the subject of my motion relates rather to railway extension in that Island. The railway mileage in the province of Prince Edward Island is 211 miles. Although it is a small province there has been no proper system of railway extension. No less than $3,250,000 have been devoted to building a railway on the Island. This sum had been spent by the province itself—out of its own resources—and though Prince Edward Island has been over twenty years a province of the Dominion of Canada little has been done by the Dominion in building any railway or railway branches, which forms a subject of complaint in the province. For many years, especially since 1883, when a departure was made from the terms on which the Island entered confederation, large expenditures for railway purposes have been made in other provinces of the Dominion. The Island claims that it has not been benefited by those large expenditures made in other portions of Canada. When we entered confederation the terms on which the Dominion were to construct railways was embodied in the British North America Act, which reads as follows:—

Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province:

Lines of steam ships between the province and British or foreign country:

Such works as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be

for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

My idea of the object of the clause in the constitution is to preserve a proper balance of power between the different provinces. It was well known that the larger provinces had a preponderating influence in the confederation, and that the clause to which I have referred was placed there as a guarantee that a fair share of the expenditure should be divided between the provinces as a whole. No railways were to be constructed in one province that would be of no importance to the other provinces or connect other provinces. That arrangement met the requirements of the Dominion for a number of years, in fact until 1883, when it was determined to still further open up the country and undertake larger expenditures. The Government undertook to make expenditures larger than those which we considered to be justified by the constitution. They undertook the construction of railways that were in no sense of Dominion importance. The Island, I repeat has not benefited by those large expenditures; we have not to any appreciable extent benefited by the expenditure since 1883. I may further claim that previous to 1883 the Island has not benefited by the large expenditure on public works, especially on railways in the Dominion. This I shall prove to the House by extracts from the utterances of public men, which I shall quote. I first refer to a speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper in 1886, when a delegation from the Island proceeded to London, and claimed that the treatment the Island was receiving in regard to Dominion expenditures was not satisfactorily. Sir Charles Tupper in reply said:

I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of the province of Prince Edward Island extending over all my life, and from my experience as Minister of Railways in Canada, that if the Prince Edward Island Railway was connected with the Intercolonial Railway, that the Prince Edward Island Railway would be a paying road.

I will now read an extract from a memorial submitted to this House in 1886:

The undersigned having been deputed by the Government of Prince Edward Island to confer with the Federal Ministry relative to the financial arrangement existing between that province and the Dominion, and referring to their interview of to-day, with the Prime Minister of Canada on the subject, desire to bring under the consideration of the Privy Council, the justice and propriety of augmenting the subsidy payable by Canada to Prince Edward Island. These are the principal grounds upon which this application is based:

1. The expenditure by the Dominion upon great public works, in the advantage of which Prince Edward Island, owing to its situation, cannot participate, has been greatly in excess of what at the time the Island joined the confederation, it was estimated such outlay would reach.

2. The policy adopted by the Canadian Parliament, subsidizing lines of railway of a local as well as of a general character, has been extended to every province of the confederation except Prince Edward Island. The construction of 11 miles of railway at Cape Traverse in the Island, cannot be regarded as embraced in this policy, such work having been done in pursuance of that part of the terms of union which provides for the maintenance of continuous steam service between the Island and the mainland.

3. The island has been debited with the entire cost of the construction of its railway under contract when the union took place in 1873. The undersigned therefore submit that the amount of the expenditure for constructing the Prince Edward Island Railway should be transferred to the credit of that province in its account with the Dominion.

This was one of the complaints which the people of the Island made in 1886, and it was embodied in this memorial, part of which I have read; and the claims which were made then hold good to-day. Although Prince Edward Island is the Rhode Island of Canada, still we expect fair treatment from the general body forming the confederation. I now desire to submit some figures showing the nature of our claim. The reason I desire to make this statement is that the contemplated expenditure by the Dominion in 1873 on railways was not to exceed $34,552,148. I shall proceed to show, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditure on railways has very largely increased over what was contemplated in 1873. I have taken some time to compile from the blue-books the actual expenditure since 1873, and to compare it with the contemplated expenditure in that year. Up to and including 1895, there was expended on Dominion railways, the following sums as set forth in the Statistical Year-book for 1895:—

Before confederation	$13,831,461
1868	483,354
1869	282,615
1870	1,729,381
1871	2,946,930
1872	5,620,570
1873	5,763,269
1874	3,925,124
1875	5,018,428
1876	4,497,435
1877	3,203,502
1878	2,643,742
1879	2,507,954
1880	6,109,077
1881	5,577,237
1882	5,175,047
1883	11,707,619
1884	14,913,075
1885	11,224,245
1886	4,443,220
1887	1,546,887
1888	1,765,582
1889	2,709,857
1890	2,392,768
1891	1,184,317
1892	417,425
1893	712,917
1894	585,749
1895	376,815
Total	$122,750,702

In all the expenditure on railway construction and rolling stock by the Dominion of

Canada amounts to $122,750,702. There was expended of this sum, before Prince Edward Island entered the union, $30,707,580 which we must, of course, deduct from the gross sum and which leaves a balance expended since the year 1873 on Dominion railways for rolling stock and construction, amounting to $92,043,120. Besides that, there has been also expended in subsidies a very large sum. The system of subsidizing railways was introduced in the year 1883, and since then the following subsidies were paid out each year :—

For the Fiscal Year—	
1883-84	$ 208,000
1884-85	403,245
1885-86	2,171,249
1886-87	1,406,533
1887-88	1,027,042
1888-89	846,722
1889-90	1,491,595
1890-91	1,079,106
1891-92	1,061,616
1892-93	624,794
1893-94	1,043,285
1894-95	1,123,949
Total	$12,487,136

Since the year 1883 we have thus paid in subsidies to railways directly $12,487,136. I wish to call your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House to the fact, that in addition to this twelve and a half millions, there is the additional subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway amounting to $25,000,000, the additional subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway extension to Quebec, $1,500,000, and the subsidy to the Canada Central Railway amounting to $1,525,250. There is also the annual subsidy of $186,600 payable for twenty years to the Atlantic and Northwestern Railway Company under chapter 58, Statutes of 1885. There is the annual payment of $119,700 to the province of Quebec, being the interest on $2,394,000 under the Act of 1884, for the line between Ottawa and Quebec. Already $1,119,700 has been paid on account of this. We have a further item which I think may properly be charged to these subsidies. There was in the first place, 25,000,000 acres of land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway which has been subsequently reduced to 18,206,986 acres. I compute this land is worth $1 an acre, which I think was the price set upon it at that time. This will add $18,206,986 to the amount granted to railways which I have already cited. There are in addition several railways, having in the aggregate 4,473¼ miles, which have been subsidized by grant of lands to the extent of 32,257,200 acres, which I presume also to be worth $1 an acre, and which adds $32,257,200 to the sums already given. Now, Sir, when I add up all these items, I find that since 1873 there has been an expenditure by the Dominion Government for railways—railway construction, railway stocks, subsidies to railways, and land granted to railways—of the large sum of $186,533,044. The statement will then stand as follows :—

Expended by the Dominion Government in construction of rolling stock up to the year 1873	$ 92,043,120
By subsidies from 1883 to 1895	12,487,136
In addition the C. P. R. received	25,000,000
The C.P.R. extension to Quebec	1,500,000
The Canada Central Railway	1,525,250
Subsidy of $186,600 yearly for 20 years to the Atlantic and N. W. Ry. Co. under Act of 1885 (already paid)	1,119,600
Government of Quebec, interest on	2,394,000
32,257,200 acres land	32,257,200
18,206,986 acres land	18,206,986
Total expended	$ 186,533,292
By the Dominion on Railways since 1873—deduct estimated expenditure	$ 34,552,058
	$ 151,981,134
40th part of Prince Edward Island's share is	3,799,528
Prince Edward Island received	1,096,693
Due Prince Edward Island on railway account	$ 2,702,835

Mr. Speaker, in order to show the House that I am taking every pains to make a correct statement, I propose to give credit to the Dominion for $20,000 a year which was added to the subsidy to Prince Edward Island, I think in the year 1886. That sum capitalized would amount to about $500,000. That would make $1,096,693.96 as the share received by the province of Prince Edward Island for the construction of railways since 1873, leaving a balance due to Prince Edward Island of $2,702,829. In this statement I do not take into consideration at all the large sums which have been expended on canals and on other public works throughout the Dominion from which Prince Edward Island derives no benefit. I take into consideration merely the railways in the railway system of Canada. Now, I will quote a statement made at the conference at Charlottetown previous to confederation, as to the treatment which Prince Edward Island might be led to expect when she joined the Dominion :

> We viewed the British North American provinces as a portion of one great family, who owed and were bound to pay common allegiance to our noble Queen. This was not a question of bringing foreign elements together ; he regarded it rather in the light of a family arrangement, in which the island, as the youngest and smallest member, naturally looked after its own interest.

Now, I ask this House if that is the kind of treatment Prince Edward Island has received since she entered the union. I think the figures I have read will go to prove that it is not. To show further that I am making a fair statement, and one which has been corroborated to the utmost by the utterances of the public men of this Dominion, I will read from the Order in Council, making the addition of $20,000 to the sub-

sidy for Prince Edward Island in the year 1886 :

1st. From the insular position of the province they (the Governor in Council) are of opinion that the construction of the Pacific Railway and of the Intercolonial Railway has not effected to the same extent that it has the other provinces, and the island has not had the benefit of the advantages which accrue to the other provinces from these lines, and on this ground it is entitled to some consideration.

2nd. The sub-committee think also that consideration should be shown on account of expenditure for the construction of the above-named railway having been greater than was anticipated at the time these works were taken into consideration and the terms upon which Prince Edward Island entered the union, having been in a great measure based upon the estimates thus formed for the completion of these roads.

This is exactly the ground which I take, and the ground which was admitted to be good ground at that time, as will appear from a speech delivered in 1887 by Sir Charles Tupper, which you will find reported in the "Hansard" of that year, volume 2, page 814, as follows :—

The attention of the Government was called to the fact that in the arrangements for admission of Prince Edward Island into the union, they were not in a position to derive the same amount of advantage from the expenditure on the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railway as the other portions of the Dominion, which were on the mainland and which were in immediate railway communication with those roads.

The question then was raised that, as the expenditure on both those railways was so greatly in excess of what was estimated at the time the island was brought into the union, they ought to receive some corresponding consideration on that account.

I wish the House to pay particular attention to that statement :

Then there was the further question that Parliament had adopted the policy of subsidizing lines of railways in the other provinces—that in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there had been considerable expenditures in connection with the construction of railways and Prince Edward Island had not received any corresponding advantage. No subsidies had been granted for the construction of railways in Prince Edward Island, and on those two grounds it was claimed that there should be additional consideration given to the Island.

Now, this also corroborates the ground which I have taken. It has been said that in Prince Edward Island we have quite a large number of miles of railway compared with its population. In answer to that, I wish to say that before Prince Edward Island ever entered confederation, she had almost every mile of railway she now has. In that Island there are 211 miles of railway, for which it has not to thank the Dominion, because the Island has paid for its own railways. In our account when entering confederation with the Dominion Government the sum of $3,255,000 is debited against the province as the sum expended on railway construction. I submit that taking the statistics which I have prepared with great care and laid before the House and the deductions therefrom, the Island has a good valid claim for railway expenditure. I may also say that this question received the attenion of this House in the year 1894. A statement was made in this House by the then Minister of Railways, which showed that the Government of that day were anxious to do something for Prince Edward Island. That question was brought before the House by the then member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald), and the then Minister of Railways, (Mr. Haggart), in reply to a similar motion to the one I am now making, said as follows :—

I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) in his complaint that large sums have been expended constructing the Intercolonial, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the canals, and other public works in different parts of Canada, and that while these may be regarded as works for the benefit of Canada at large, still this little Island has not received even indirectly very much benefit. On that account he claimed that there should be a larger expenditure in Prince Edward Island in return for the larger contributory share which she pays for the public works of the Dominion. There may be a good deal in that argument.

I may state for the information of the House in what direction the petitions are. They are in favour of a line of railway :

From O'Leary station, westward	8
" Summerside, northward	3
" Emerald, northward	7
" North Wiltshire station, southward	10
" Royalty Junction, northerly	9
" Harmony, eastward	8
" Southport, south-eastward	60
Total	105

To show you that this will not be a very great drain on the resources of the Dominion—this proposed construction of 105 miles of railway—the hon. Minister of Railways had an estimate prepared of the cost of building those 105 miles of road. The cost would be as follows :—

COST OF OPERATING.

Forty-seven miles of the six small branches, say a train to double the road each day, equals 29,432 train miles at 47c	$13,828 34
Snow-plough train, say 1,000 train miles per year at 47c	470 00
Sixty miles of South Port line, one train each day, each way, 37,460 train miles at 95c	35,587 00
Snow-plough train, say 2,500 train miles at 90c	2,250 00
Estimated cost of operating per year.	$52,135 34

EARNINGS.

Six short branches at $250 per mile of railway, 47 miles	$11,750 00
South Port line at $750 per mile of railway, 60 miles	45,000 00
Estimated earnings	$56,750 00

This would not bring the building of these roads within any appreciable distance of the amount which Prince Edward Island claims from the Dominion. As a proof that the burden of building these 105 miles would not be any great strain on the resources of the Dominion, I may mention that the revenue expected to be derived from the operating of the 105 miles would be as follows :—The estimated cost of operating for the first year, was as follows :—

Working expenses.....	$52,135 34
Earnings	56,750 00
Estimated probable amount....	$ 4,614 56

I may say also that one and a quarter million dollars would not be a very serious expenditure for this Dominion to undertake. At 3½ per cent the interest would only amount to $38,900 per year. That is the extent of the drain which the little province of Prince Edward Island asks at present in order to obtain at least a share of the claim to which she is entitled. That would be at the rate of a little less than a cent per head of the population of this Dominion. It is not a large sum, and is one by which a small part of that which is justly due to Prince Edward Island. Besides, we must consider her isolated position, which deprives her of any benefit from the railway system and the canal system of the Dominion. Her case is made stronger also by the fact that the winter communications which we were promised at confederation have not yet been provided to the extent contemplated and expected by the people of Prince Edward Island at the time of the union. This House is well aware that this is a question that perhaps requires a good deal of time. I think that, while the settlement of that question is pending, these railways should be proceeded with without further delay. It may be said that Prince Edward Island already has a number of railways in operation. But it is not to be forgotten that Prince Edward Island, as the statistics show, is more densely populated than any other province of the Dominion ; and while it is true that she has many harbours, these harbours are all small and nearly all suitable only for small vessels. It is necessary, therefore, for the advancement of Prince Edward Island that these railways should be built, and necessary also in order to give Prince Edward Island a fair share of public expenditure in proportion to the other provinces. Prince Edward Island pays as much per head for interest on the public debt as any other part of the Dominion, and it appears a little unjust that she should not participate in these expenditures. Therefore, I trust that, if not in the present session, then in the very near future, Prince Edward Island may receive fair treatment at the hands of the authorities of the Dominion. I have here a copy of the report of the proceedings of this House for the 21st April last. I find that the then Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole tomorrow to consider the following proposed resolution :—

> That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to build and operate, as part of the Prince Edward Island Railway, the following lines of railway, that is to say :—

And here follows a list of these railways. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is desirable that all, irrespective of party, should favour this means of developing Prince Edward Island, and that the Government should take hold of this question and proceed with the construction of these roads. This is the first time that I have attempted to address the House, and I feel that I have overlooked many branches of the subject. But I remember one argument having been used against giving Prince Edward Island these railways, and I think, before I close, it would be well for me to refer to it and refute it as well as I can. It is said that there is a pretty large loss at present on the railways already being operated in Prince Edward Island. That deficit is rather more apparent than real. On all the Dominion Government railways, without exception, there is a large loss. There may not be a large deficit as between running expenses of the road and the receipts, but there is a large loss in the shape of interest on the money spent in the construction of the road. On page 638 of the Statistical Year-Book I find the following :—

> Mr. Mulhall, in a paper entitled "Our Colonial Empire," published in the "Contemporary Review" for May, 1895, and dealing with recent years only, says : "The average cost of construction per mile in Canada was £11,900. The net earnings were £211 per mile. The net profit in 1893 on every £100 invested in railways was £1 15s. 6d. in Canada. The annual loss on Canadian railways, that is the difference between the net profits and the interest on capital, appears to be £4,000,000."

That is a statement which bears very directly upon the question before us. It is now being said that the Intercolonial is a paying road. But if we calculate the interest on the money which was spent on building the Intercolonial, I think we shall find that it is not a paying road at all. The interest on the $55,000,000 which the construction of the Intercolonial cost would be $2,200,000 a year. Now, you have this to say with regard to the little railway in Prince Edward Island, that you lose no interest on the money it cost for construction, for the province of Prince Edward Island paid for that construction itself. Supposing the Prince Edward Island Railways made a loss every year of $140,000, it would then be in as good a position as the Intercolonial Railway. But as a matter of fact it does not make such a loss as that, or half of that loss. Little Prince Edward Island has literally made a present of a road which

has cost that province three and a quarter million dollars, for the Dominion Government has not paid interest on the cost of construction the same as it has done on the Intercolonial Railway, and on other railways belonging to the Dominion; and therefore the deficit on the Island railway is more apparent than real. I trust, Mr. Speaker, I have shown the House the justice of the claim of Prince Edward Island for a share, at least, of the amount that is due her for public works, the most important of which is the construction of these branches to which I have alluded. I am not going to refer to what has been said in Prince Edward Island in regard to that matter. I wish to discuss this question without any display of party views. I am pleased, however that the late Government has taken a good hold of this question, and that the Government of the day appear to have done the same. The statement has been made by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries that if the Liberal party got into power they would proceed with the construction of these roads.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No. Too many of them were promised.

Mr. MARTIN. At least some of those roads; and if the hon. gentleman denies that statement, with your permission, I will read ——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will withdraw my denial if you will stop.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Minister thinks I am not quoting him correctly, I will read from a paper in Prince Edward Island, which is his organ, the statements in and which I think he will accept as correct, not only in regard to this proposed railway, but in regard to another undertaking of even more importance, a bridge across the Hillsborough River to connect this railway with Charlottetown, and which he says will cost at least half a million dollars. Since the Minister of Railways has challenged my statement, I am compelled to read an extract of a speech made by him last June at a political meeting held at Murray River during the election contest, as reported in his paper:

> Mr. Davies then came forward, and his speech throughout, and it lasted two hours, was punctuated with applause and cheers. After taking up the great issues of the day he directed attention to the branch railways in a forcible manner, pointing out why the people of Belfast and Murray Harbour were entitled to a branch line, and strenuously advocating the building of a bridge over the Hillsborough to connect this branch line with the city of Charlottetown. He resumed his seat amid thunders of applause.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How much did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that bridge would cost?

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. MARTIN. According to "Hansard" of 17th June, 1895, page 2778, the then Minister of Railways was laying before the House his estimate of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and Mr. Davies is reported to have asked the Minister of Railways: "Does that include the bridge?" Mr. Haggart answers, and then Mr. Davies says that that bridge will cost at least half a million of money. Now, Sir, I trust that the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a very prominent member, will take up this question at no distant day and do justice to Prince Edward Island. I have a great many other extracts in regard to what the hon. gentleman has said concerning this railway in little Prince Edward Island during the election contest. I do not wish to introduce party politics delivered during the election contest, but I think if these were read they would at least show that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is committed up to the hilt to the building of this railway.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no fault to find with the remarks of the hon. gentleman on the whole. The arguments he has used are somewhat familiar to me, as I have had occasion, more than once, to present them to the House, and they have been presented by gentlemen from Prince Edward Island at different times. I think the hon. gentleman was a little unfortunate in the opportunity he selected to bring his views before the people of Canada. The evening too is not propitious, the hon. gentleman had not the good fortune to have a very large House. I hope at some future time when he takes the matter up and threshes it out more thoroughly, he will catch the ear of the House at a time when there will be a greater attendance to listen to his arguments, with the main portion of which I concur. I merely rise to tell the hon. gentleman that which he in point of fact assumed during his speech, that there is no intention on the part of the Government to introduce any railway legislation this session, and no exception will be made in regard to Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman quoted a resolution which was introduced, but not moved, last session by the then Minister of Railways, having for its object the voting of public money for the construction of some seven branch lines in Prince Edward Island. I understood the hon. gentleman rather to give the House the impression that I had in some way or other advocated in Prince Edward Island the construction of those seven branch lines. If the hon. gentleman intended to do that, he did me a great wrong, because he knows that as regards at least five of the branches I disassociated myself entirely from them.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not wish to be understood as saying that in the Island the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had actually

advocated the construction of the seven branch railways. All I wish to say is this, that the Minister came into the riding where it was proposed to construct the Belfast and Murray Harbour extension, 60 miles out of the 105 miles proposed to be built. In that district the Minister held four meetings, and at every one of those meetings he was pledged up to the hilt, as he told them he had been for years, to build those sixty miles of road.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman; but he is making a speech and not an explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has put himself more nearly correct than he was before; but he is out yet. The hon. gentleman understands that I disassociated myself entirely from five political lines proposed by the Government of this country. They never had any existence except on paper, and they had the effect of discrediting the only railway extension which really was contended for, and therefore did not receive any support or encouragement at my hands. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that I always expressed myself in favour of the railway extension to Belfast and Murray Harbour—but I hope the length will not be as great as he suggests. I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman should have thrown cold water on that which is essential to construct that road, and that is the bridge.

Mr. MARTIN. I never did that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry he did that, and the people will resent it very much. When I go back to East Queen's and complain that the hon. gentleman in his first speech rather induced the House to show the cold shoulder to a project very near to the hearts of most of the people there, I am afraid the hon. gentleman will not be received back with many cheers. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would have supported the construction of the bridge, and I had hoped for the cordial co-operation of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. You will have it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So I hope the hon. gentleman will not throw cold water on the project any more.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let us bring this matter fairly before the House and not introduce party politics into it. I hope at some not very distant day to induce my colleagues to consider the claims of Prince Edward Island for railway extension, and to have the cordial co-operation of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not the right to close the debate.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to make an explanation.

Mr. HACKETT. Before the motion is carried, I desire to offer a few observations. The subject before the House on this occasion is one of very great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island, namely, the question of railway extension. I have the honour to represent a riding where it was contemplated to build a short branch.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he has any lengthy remarks to address to the House, he might move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HACKETT. I shall be very glad to do so. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Reports or correspondence and the reasons for the dismissal of Roderick McLeod and Robert McKay, bridge tenders on the Intercolonial Railway bridge, Pictou, Nova Scotia, and the appointment of Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas in their place and stead.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Inland Revenue, or any officer of his department, and the Supervisor of Cullers at Quebec, or any officer under him, or any merchant or other person relating to the subject of the measuring and culling of timber at the port of Montreal and its vicinity. Also all correspondence between the said department or any of its officers and any other persons bearing upon or suggesting any change in the law now governing the measurement and culling of timber and deals, &c., from the year 1890 to the present time.—(Mr. Quinn.)

Return showing the subject of reports to His Excellency in Council and all Minutes of Council approved after the resignation of Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1873, before the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie took office; also showing the subject of all reports to His Excellency in Council and Minutes of Council approved after the defeat of the Hon. A. Mackenzie, in 1878, and before Sir John A. Macdonald took office; also showing the subject of all reports to His Excellency in Council and Minutes of Council approved after the 23rd day of June, 1896, and before the Hon. Wilfred Laurier took office; also showing the subject of any Minutes of Council approved after the 23rd June, 1896, subsequently rescinded.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Copies of all letters, papers, reports, petitions and orders relating to the change of the name Boston Post Office, county of Norfolk, to Shawmut.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all letters, petitions, reports and orders relating to the change in the postmastership of Waterford, Ont., in October, 1894, by the appointment of Mr. Alexander Roch in the place of Mr. B. H. Rammage, as postmaster, and giving more especially the date of the resignation of Mr. Rammage, and a copy of the same.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all letters and papers relating to the dismissal of James Currie and Sylvain Wedge, trackmen on the Prince Edward Island Railway. —(Mr. Hackett.)

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). With the consent of the House, I wish to submit the following motion :—

That all returns presented to the House, under the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, relating to Governor General's warrants since 1888, be printed immediately, and that rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

I understand that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has already obtained an order of the House for the printing of the papers relating to the Governor General's warrants which have been laid on the Table, and I think it is desirable, for the purpose of comparison that a similar statement should be had for a few years past.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the result of that would be to suspend the printing of papers which have special reference to a special case, and it does not appear to me at all necessary to the discussion of the question before the House to have the papers the hon. gentleman requests.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not think this motion can cause any delay in the printing of the other papers, and need not delay at all the discussion of the special warrants, whenever the hon. gentleman chooses to discuss that question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that the hon. leader of the House undertakes that there shall be no delay caused by this addition to the motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). An order of the House has already issued for the other papers, and I presume they are being printed. I do not see how this motion can possibly delay them. It may be that the information I desire may be a little delayed, but the order already issued is now in course of execution.

Mr. HACKETT.

FAST STEAMSHIP LINE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the hon. the leader of the House to a very important question which is agitating the public mind at this moment, as the hon. gentleman is aware, and that is the fast line service. It appears to me that in a question of such importance and on which there has been some difference of opinion expressed in the press as to the actual facts, it is very desirable that all the papers connected with it should be laid upon the Table. It would take some time to give notice of a formal resolution, and I, therefore, ask if my hon. friend will undertake that all the papers on that question shall, so far as it is gone, be submitted to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am very glad my hon. friend has drawn my attention to that. My hon. friend is aware that negotiations are going on with the Imperial authorities. I shall be in a position, in a day or two, to tell my hon. friend whether we can lay on the Table those papers. I am anxious myself that they should be brought down.

SUPPLY—DISMISSALS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) : That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the question that was raised by my hon. colleague from the county of Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is one which naturally interests a great number of people throughout the Dominion. In every contest there is a great division of feeling among the political parties as to what should or should not be the course of conduct of those gentlemen who hold office in the service of their country. Very often, a man who is deeply attached to his party and who feels that he holds office as a reward for party services, does not know how to conduct himself in the great contests that periodically recur and determine which party will dominate the country. To my mind, the great motive that should guide us in considering this question is the desire to promote the public interest ; and I learned with considerable regret from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) that the line laid down for his guidance was that he would dismiss any official whom he found taking an active part upon the platform or abusing himself, his leader, his party or the principles of that party. The proposition that officials should be dismissed who are not satisfactory to the public, who either have neglected their duties in order to serve their party, or who did not give good service to the country, is one which cannot be con-

troverted. If it were proposed to punish officials who were found guilty of offences against the public, I would feel that a good precedent was being established by the Government, for we must all admit that punishment is deserved by those officials who have been guilty of neglecting their duty or of a want of courtesy in their conduct towards the great mass of the people. But, so nearly as I can recollect the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine, the proposition laid down by him was that an official should be punished if he actively engaged in opposition to the party which might be successful in that particular contest—because I have no doubt at all that the hon. Minister of Marine would be perfectly prepared to condone, or to pardon even, great activity on the part of an official in support of the party to which the hon. Minister himself belongs. But if they were opponents of that party and that party came into power, then, as I understand it, the hon. Minister of Marine thinks that the Government of Canada as represented by him would be justified in summarily and without trial punishing that official for his participation in the contest. Now I am satisfied that that is not a position that the hon. Minister should have taken; I am satisfied that it is not a position in which he will be supported by a majority of his colleagues; and I am sure it is not one in which he will be supported by the sound sense of the people of Canada.—I do not think I would be very much astray if I said that not even a majority of the party to which the hon. Minister of Marine belongs would support him in the contention he made on the floor of this House. My experience of politics leads me to believe that the better element of the people are disposed to look with the utmost tolerance upon the activity of officials in politics, seeing that they are actuated by one of the noblest sentiments, that of attachment to the party to which they belong. I believe it is not the better element of any party but the worst element of any party that would demand the decapitation of officials because they had taken part in an election contest. To my mind it seems clear that, so long as officials are not disfranchised, so long as they are permitted to vote, so long should they be permitted also to take an active and intelligent part in the contests waged to decide what party shall govern the country for the time being. It is a narrow and wrong interpretation of the position to say that an official should be prevented from expressing his opinion, seeking to influence his fellow-electors and endeavouring to secure the success of the party to which he belongs. Now, with reference to the county of Pictou—because it was with reference to particular cases in that county that my hon. colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) raised the question in this House—I may say that it is not the better element even of the Liberal party in the county that has incited the Minister of Marine to decapitate so suddenly the gentlemen who acted as sub-agents of the department in the county. It will be with the utmost surprise that the people of the county and the people of the town of Pictou will learn that the Minister has facts at his command which justify him in saying that the gentlemen referred to, Messrs. Noonan and Davies, are active or offensive partisans. No statement would cause greater surprise in the county of Pictou than that. But by implication the hon. Minister makes such a charge against them, because in the general proposition he laid down, he said that if he met opponents on the platform and found them abusing himself or his leader or the party to which he belonged or its principles, he would find himself justified, and in a measure driven to proceed at once to take off the official head of these gentlemen. It seemed to be implied in this statement that was a case in point. These gentlemen were appointed something like twenty years ago and carried on their duties for a time under the Ministry led by the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and yet they are dismissed without notice or ceremony or any consideration, although they occupied the positions of sub-agents of marine for the last twenty years or more without giving offence to any one, without failing in respect of their duties, and without, so far as I know, having had any charge laid against them in respect of their official conduct. In such a case he has acted without much courtesy, without notice, summarily dismissing these gentlemen, and he would thus seem to imply that in this case he has met individuals who have taken an active part in the contest, who have appeared on the platform, or who have been abusive of himself, his leader, his party or the principles of his party. Now I am sure I am within the truth when I say that more inoffensive or carefully-guarded actions than those of Messrs. Noonan and Davies could not be found on the part of any who took an interest in the success of their party. But the most extraordinary commentary upon the Minister's utterance is the appointment he has made to fill the place of the officials discharged. The gentleman appointed has the distinction of being one of the most active, one of the most vigorous, one of the most lively, energetic and active politicians we have in the county of Pictou. I am sure I am not far astray when I say that out of two or three Liberals of the county of Pictou who have commended themselves to their party by their great activity, zeal, and, I may say, success, in carrying on party warfare in that county, Mr. Oliver would stand very near the first. This is the gentleman selected to succeed Messrs. Noonan and Davies, who are dismissed for no other purpose, apparently, than to make a place for Mr. Oliver. If it be the purpose of the Government of Canada to use the power entrust-

ed to them to reward political support, then in this case the Minister of Marine has acted very well and wisely; he has rewarded a man who, so far as party service is concerned, certainly deserves it. But much larger interests are involved than those of party. While we recognize the fact that in this country we must govern ourselves through the instrumentality of party, yet the sense of the House, I am sure, would be that no party reward should be granted in a manner to impair the efficiency of the public service or to cause the official to lose sight of the fact that the great purpose of officialdom is to serve the people of the country. To my mind, Sir, it is most important that we should avoid going one step in the direction the hon. Minister has taken. I am sure that if we begin such a course, we shall find in a very short time that officials will be prevented from taking any interest whatever in public affairs, or compelled to cultivate the foresight that will enable them always to be upon the winning side. Now, it is to my mind one of the most creditable features in our nature that we have a spirit of loyalty. I think if there is anything particularly to be admired, it is a man who, although an official, is not afraid by reason of his official position, to be known and accepted in the community in which he lives as a Liberal or a Conservative. I believe it is not a good thing that the Government of Canada should so shape its course as to discourage the development of true manhood in the officials of the country; and if it is to be understood that without reasonable cause assigned, and fair trial given, officials are to be dismissed from the public service, not for any wrong they have done, but simply because they have shown themselves clearly and unmistakably adherents of one party or the other, then we are entering upon a course which cannot fail to lead us into dangerous waters. In the neighbouring republic it was for a long time understood that the maxim, "to the victors belong the spoils," should be accepted and held as a proposition not to be disputed; and the consequence was for many years that immediately after an election took place, immediately after one government had passed out of power and another had come in, there was a general clearing out of all the officials, and every man was dismissed as a matter of course, and in his place was put a man who had been attached to the other side of politics, not selected because he had a greater knowledge of the duties of the position, or was more fit for it, but chiefly because he belonged to the winning party. Now, Sir, that is a proposition that I am sure you could not get a majority of the people of Canada at any time to endorse; because, while it is necessary that parties should be formed and should wage political warfare upon one another, the great interests of the public require that officials should not be appointed only as a reward for political services, but mainly in view of their competency to discharge efficiently the duties of their position. There is one objectionable feature in any proposal to take such a course as that which was recommended by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that is that it will inevitably lead, if entered upon by any one party in this country and followed out with anything like consistency or regularity—it will inevitably lead to reprisals; and if it does, these reprisals will proceed step by step, modified or retarded, as the case may be, by the worse or better sentiment of the several communities; and it will reach inevitably, if nothing occurs to arrest its progress, the exact position formerly held by the United States, and we will have accepted in Canada the maxim that to the victors belong the spoils. That, I maintain, would be a most unfortunate thing. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries represents a neighbouring province to the one from which I come, and I should regret to think that one of the reasons for which he was to be remembered by the people of Canada was that he had introduced such a policy into the administration of the civil service. Now, I do not think the Minister did himself justice in being so outspoken in his determination of dealing with officials in the manner he avowed; nor in assuming full responsibility for the dismissal that occurred in the county of Pictou. I am satisfied that in this matter he did not act on his own motion; that the natural kindliness of his disposition would have prompted him to a different course of action. I think I may fairly ascribe to him such a disposition, and I may say that he has shown a spirit of fair-play and even of generosity so long as he is treated in the same manner by opponents. I am the more induced to believe that his action in relation to this dismissal was prompted by others, because, in the same county of Pictou, in the eastern part of the county where I live, no dismissals have taken place; and therefore I am sure I am doing no more than justice to the Minister when I assume that he did not act of his own motion, but that he has acted under pressure from local politicians in that county, and I am sure I can lay my finger upon the identical gentleman who has in this case induced the Minister to make this improper dismissal, for I think I am safe in saying that it is an improper dismissal. I was sorry to hear him the other day, lay down the policy that he did, when speaking of the dismissal of certain officials. I am satisfied that he was speaking under pressure from local politicians, and those not representing the better elements, the better part of the Liberal party in the western part of our county. But there is in the Minister's proposition, as laid down the other day, rather a dangerous element, namely, that in dismissing

public officials for the reasons assigned, he would constitute himself both judge and jury ; that he would give them no chance to be heard, but of his own motion, relying on his own knowledge, accuse them, try them and convict them. Now, Sir, I am sure that such a principle is not in accord with justice. It appears to be an unfair thing that a gentleman holding a position in the public service, and who has taken only a reasonable interest and pursued a usual course in an election, should be liable to be dismissed without any opportunity of defending himself. In the case of the dismissals that have already taken place, I am sure that the gentlemen so dismissed, even if they were accused of any misconduct or of any neglect of duty had no opportunity to defend themselves or to justify their course. Now, Sir, if this practice is likely to become more general, then it is important that the people of Canada should express themselves as opposed to it. Of course I acknowledge that for the time being the present Government officially represent the people of Canada ; but at the same time the Opposition may be said to represent the second thought of the people of Canada ; they are here to represent the Conservative sentiments of the people, and it is their duty, and they are bound to prevent, if they can, the Government of Canada from entering upon a course which cannot fail to be injurious to the public service. It is impossible, of course, for us to do more than remonstrate, we cannot prevent the Government from pursuing this policy if they chose : but I think we are bound to raise our voices in warning, and to show that the sentiment of the country is not in favour of such a course. I was very glad to see to-day that an important organ of public opinion in this country, the Montreal "Witness," which is an independent paper with strong party leanings, so strong that at times you might not be far astray if you described it as a paper supporting the Liberal Administration and the Liberal party—I say I was very much pleased to-day to note that that paper had nothing but condemnation for the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that in its opinion the course marked out by him, if followed generally, would lead to a condition of brigandage in this country which could not fail to be most injurious. Now, the question we have to consider is this : If it be to the public interest that officials should be dismissed for the reason assigned by the Minister, then, of course, let them be dismissed ; but if it be not for the public interest, but to the detriment of the public interest, then by all means let every official be retained in his place, and not interfered with merely because he has taken a usual part in political warfare. Why, Sir, it is the best officials, generally, who lapse in this direction ; the more generous spirit, the better men, are those who have a desire to take an active part in politics. After they have been appointed to the service of the country, if they desire still to take part in politics, and even actively to support their party, why should they not be allowed to do so ? After you give a man a vote, surely you are not going to disfranchise him, you cannot reasonably limit his action politically to a mere expression of opinion, and to the mere act of voting. For my own part I should be very glad to know that in no case would an official be dismissed or interfered with against whom no charge of fraud or inefficiency has been brought. In fact, no doubt it is familiar to every one who takes an interest in public affairs that there are a large number of applicants for public positions. Does not every public man and public representative receive many applications for office ? How is he to grant these requests ? He is able to grant them by the slow process of filling up vacancies in offices with his friends, or by the more rapid process of wholesale dismissal and replacing of officers. I am sure I am perfectly safe in saying that all those who are exceedingly anxious to serve the country are not the best fitted to fill the positions. They are not the best men in the Liberal party who are the most anxious for office ; they are not men of that class, but as a rule those men who seek office are not such men as the office would seek, and as a rule to encourage a general dismissal of officials would have the effect of introducing into the public service a class of men inferior to that now holding those positions. It is true that under the British system the appointment of public officials is one way by which a party fully and properly may reward its adherents and friends. With that course no fault has been found, but if we are going to accept as a proposition that the appointment of officials by a political party is not wrong, I do not know how you are going to take a different position in the event of a change of Government. And how we are going to pretend to justify the dismissal of men in the public service because they continue to hold strong feelings in regard to the party which gave them their official position. There is great danger, however, that there will be reprisals. The adoption by one party of such a course may compel another party to follow the same course. No doubt the fact of a change of party is pressed on the attention of the Ministers as an argument to lead them to make dismissals and appoint their own friends. This circumstance has undoubtedly great weight, more particularly in small localities and communities, because there men cherish small interests and wait for the turn of events ; but such matter is one of such small consideration that it should not engage the attention of Ministers of the Crown, and they should not be called upon to listen to such propositions as that certain officials should be dismissed and the friends of the party in

power be appointed. It would be unfortunate for the Government of Canada to find itself resorting to the position occupied by the lord high executioner of punishing officials appointed by the opposite party. It would be an improper and a low position for the Government to occupy. The course followed by the late Government should be adopted as the line of action to be pursued by the present Administration, namely, that officials once appointed should be considered permanent, and should remain in office until charges are brought against them and trial had, and the parties be proved guilty of neglect of duty or of action injurious not to the party to which perhaps at that time they may be opposed, but towards the public whose servants they are, as indeed are Ministers of the Crown, and whose interests are to be promoted by those officials as well as by the Ministers. No other course would be safe or creditable either to the members of the present Government or to any other Administration. I should be sorry if, looking back at the history of Canada, and to the fact that we have in a large measure accepted and adopted the position of the mother country, which has given us our institutions, and set us the highest examples of how to use them, we should now find the very opposite maxim applied—to the victors belong the spoils—and indeed that this element should come into consideration at all. I was very sorry in the course of the debate—although I had not the pleasure of hearing the First Minister—to hear the expressions made use of by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for I believe he regrets them at this moment, because, no doubt, that hon. gentleman did not act in this matter from any inward impulse, but perhaps from weakness, if the hon. gentleman will excuse the expression. It is impossible to say that the hon. gentleman's views were endorsed when the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not derive much support from his hon. friends on the same side of the House, and especially when the Controller of Inland Revenue, speaking rather firmly and forcibly gave the House to understand that so far as he was concerned, the officials of his department would not be treated in this fashion, but would be treated fairly. It is of course perfectly within the power of this Government to dismiss all the officials of the country, from one end of it to the other, if they feel so disposed, but it cannot be supposed for a moment that this policy is one which would prove satisfactory for Canada to adopt, and in looking back at successive Governments of this Dominion it would be found that it has not been the general practice to dismiss officials secure in the positions to which they have been appointed. It was important that a change for the worse should not now be commenced. There had not been a great many changes of Government in the past, but no doubt there will be more in the future. It can scarcely be expected that one party will remain in power so long as the Liberal-Conservative Government has done, which has been practically from the days of confederation. We must expect more rapid political changes in the future, and that changes of party will take place more frequently than in the past; and in that view it would be a great and aggravated misfortune if some officials should be punished for supporting the political party to which they belong, or even if they chose to take a fairly active part in the contest. I am sure there is not an hon. member who will be prepared to take the position that he should use the authority given him to punish officials who may have opposed him in his contest. If such was the general principle, if it was laid down by the Government as a principle that officials should not interfere at elections, then I suppose an officer who accepted office under those conditions and used the position in which he stood, if he departed from the position and violated one of the conditions on which his tenure of office depended, he should be dismissed. But that has not been the practice. It is very natural, in the course of this debate that hon. members, especially from Ontario, should recall the fact that officials connected with the Ontario Administration have engaged in election contests, and have not been punished for taking part in politics.

I have heard, Sir, statements made here which I listened to with a very great deal of pain. It has been stated by hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House—and there has been no attempt to deny it—that officials of the Ontario Government, officials appointed by the Government of which the present Minister of Justice of Canada was the Premier, have taken an active part in politics. Nay, Sir, more than that, and much worse than that, it has been represented here that these officials have taken advantage of the positions which they hold as officers of the courts and as license commissioners, not only to take an active interest in party politics, but that they have set up a system of tyranny by which they have compelled certain persons to abandon their own political views and to give support to the party which those officials represent. That, Sir, is an extraordinary statement, and it shows a most dangerous state of affairs existing in that province. We are also told, Sir,—and there has been no attempt to deny the statement—that this state of affairs has gone on for years, and that it has not been condemned by any member to-day speaking on the Government side of the House. It is a system which was inaugurated and continued under the control and guidance of that very man who is to-day Minister of Justice, no less, in the Government of this Dominion. And, if these hon. gentlemen supporting the Government were really sincere in their contention that

Government officials should not take an active part in politics, and that they should be punished for so doing, how is it possible that they can sit quietly by while those charges are made against their own friends in office, without a word of condemnation from them ? Why do not they condemn the action of their friends, the Ontario officials, and why do they not say that they would be glad to see those officials dismissed from office, because of their improper conduct ? Sir, it appears to me quite plain that the whole object of hon. gentlemen opposite is to dismiss from office those who are opposed to them, not because they have acted improperly, not because they have acted in a manner injurious to the public service, but because it gives them an excuse to vacate these offices and to bestow them as a reward upon their own partisans. I shall deplore very much if the Government of the day sanctions any such course. As I have already said, I feel that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has spoken much more strongly than he intended to, and has made statements on the floor of this House which his sober second thought will warrant him in refusing to be bound by. I would remind the Government that, while they have the power to decide in this manner, yet it is a power which will enable them to do not much good to the country, but a great deal of harm. The Government at present in office ought to have the same interest in view that we upon this side of the House have, namely, the prosperity and the welfare of Canada and the purity and dignity of our official service. I feel assured that when they come to reconsider the matter, that view will obtain amongst the Ministers. Now, when this question is raised, and now when they come into power after eighteen years, and have the first opportunity of stating their position on this question, I trust that they will lay down a sound position in the matter, one which they and their party can look back to in years to come with pride, and that they will decide that no man shall be punished because he has gone either for the Liberal or the Conservative party, but that his merits or demerits shall be judged by the manner in which he has served the people of Canada, who are his masters. That would be the proper position for the Government of the day to take. It might be held that we upon this side of the House have a personal interest in pleading the case of the officials, but in that opinion I do not agree. If anything could be done by the present Administration to hasten that downfall to which they are tending, as all successive governments do tend, it would be that they should make a general dismissal of all the officials of Canada in order to refill these offices by their own supporters. There are many officials who now feel, that the present Government having got into power, their interest requires them to be very quiet and to take no part in politics, and if such officials were dismissed, every man of them would be aggrieved and would be working night and day against the party in power, working for revenge, and working for an opportunity to punish those who had injured him. On the other hand, these hon. gentlemen in power would have the greatest misfortune that could possibly befall them : that of having enormous and practically unlimited patronage thrown on their hands at once. Although hon. gentlemen opposite have not had the control of much patronage during their career, I think the experience of those who have had the patronage proves my statement to be the rule, and I can assure them that it would be a most unfortunate thing for their own interests. It is a matter of common experience—it is certainly a matter of common opinion, at least—that when patronage falls to the lot of a party, while it may make one contented supporter, in the gentleman who fills the office, it leaves twenty half-hearted supporters or half enemies, in the gentlemen who have been disappointed in the distribution of the spoils.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is not in the interests of our party that we are speaking here. I feel, for instance, that in my own county of Pictou the Government could do me no greater service, so far as the question of my success is concerned, than by dismissing gentlemen who have been appointed to the various offices in the country by the Liberal-Conservative party, and by filling up these offices by their own friends and supporters. However, Sir, I do not wish to enjoy that advantage to such an extent. In protesting against the introduction of the spoils system in this country, I am merely stating individually what the Liberal-Conservative party have laid down as their policy in the years past. We do not wish, nor did we ever wish, to see the spoils system introduced into this Dominion. I do not wish to see any man dismissed from office who has faithfully and fairly well filled the duties of that office, and here from my place in Parliament I protest against any act of the Government in the contrary direction. I shall not detain the House further than to express the hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, during his career in office, will leave to us in the lower provinces a better record than that we have had a Minister of this Government who led the van of the spoilers.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have avoided speaking until as late a period in the debate as possible, under the hope that the First Minister would feel it necessary to have something to say as to the policy of his Government with reference to this question, which is not by any means an unimportant question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) appears to keep well within the old lines. He has said nothing. He evidently intends to say little, and I think it does not comport with the dignity nor the place of a First Minister leading a Government,

on an occasion of this kind, face to face with a principle of so much importance, face to face with a principle which has so many practical results hanging upon it—I say it does not quite comport with his duty to this House and to the country, to keep utter silence on this matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) must recollect that we are now about to consider the Estimates, and that he wishes these Estimates placed in a position where his Government may administer them. It is of the essence of parliamentary control over public moneys that, before the House grants Estimates, the House should have satisfactory explanations, not only as to the mere items of the Estimates, but as to the policy which the Government proposes to carry out with reference to important questions, of which, I contend, this is one. Therefore, Sir, I have been waiting for some time to hear the hon. First Minister take us into his confidence, and give to the House and to the country his views upon this very important matter. It is important because of the interest which exists in the country with reference to it. After a Government and a political party have have been in power for eighteen years, and a new Government enters upon the scene, there is naturally a great deal of curiosity and interest as to what lines of policy the new Government will pursue. Thoughout the country there is none at the present time of what you might call the minor issues in which the curiosity and interest of a great body of people is more thoroughly aroused than it is with reference to this question, not because there are a number of public officials who may be decapitated, and a number of aspirants who may be put in their places; but because the action that the Government may take with reference to this matter is founded upon a principle which lies very deeply at the root of all governments, in this or in any other country. I may say that this is emphasized to a certain extent by indications which the hon. gentleman himself may have read in the House, and which all hon. gentlemen have certainly read in their constituencies.

Amongst gentlemen who support my hon. friend and his Government, and who have supported them in the different constituencies, there is at this time and has been since the 23rd of June a very lively interest taken in this question. In many of the constituencies working committees have already parcelled out the offices which are now occupied, but which they hope to see vacant before many days. They have arranged the whole roster. I know that such is the fact in several counties in New Brunswick, which I have visited, and in which I have an intimate knowledge of what is taking place. By open statement or covert insinuation, every office holder at the present time is made uneasy with the idea that people are seeking to have him ousted, in order that, if successful, they may get his place. That is not a healthy state of things. I have lately gone through a contest in the county of Queen's and Sunbury.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends seem to have heard something of that election. Well, I was in it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And you were out of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not ashamed that I was in it.

Mr. LISTER. You are not in it.

Mr. FOSTER. After my hon. friends have had their little outburst, I will go on. I know this, that that contest has brought no glory and no honour and no extension of respect to the Liberal party. I am speaking from what I know when I say that if that contest is to signalize and indicate the course of pure politics that these gentlemen have for eighteen years been laying down as their policy in the country, and as their crowning glory when they come to administer public affairs—if they hope to find evidences of it in that contest, they will seek in vain.

Mr. LISTER. Tell us about York.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe there was an office holder in those two counties who was not approached by adherents and canvassers for the candidate of the Government and actually threatened that if he did not vote for the candidate he would lose his office, or told that if he did vote for the candidate, he would not lose his office. That is an indication of what is going on the country through; and, to allay that feeling, for the satisfaction of the country and the quiet of the country, and for the betterment of the public service of the country it is high time that the hon. gentleman should take the House and the country into his confidence and state the principle upon which he proposes to act. From the statements that have come from the back benches, one cannot say what the policy is to be. One gentleman rises and declares for a summary dismissal of every man who took the least part in politics. Another gets up, and just as strongly urges that the Government should go slowly in this matter, and that no person shall be dismissed from his office for having taking an honourable and manly part in the contest just held. Looking at these two positions, I cannot tell what course the Government will take. I remember the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) getting up, and in a tone of glee saying: "There is not a Tory to be found to-day in the civil service of Ottawa."

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. "Hear, hear," says my hon. friend; and what underlies a statement and the approval of a statement like that? The meanest principle that could be intro-

duced into the public service. Does my hon. friend not feel that the principles and the policy of his party are sufficient to keep him afloat in this country, or does he want to hold the whip of scorpions of a possible dismissal over the whole civil service at Ottawa and in the country? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) is a sinner of just as deep a dye as the hon. member for Wright, if he is correctly reported; for I understand that in his own province, shortly after the election, that hon. gentleman gleefully boasted that you could not find a Tory in Prince Edward Island now if you were to search the province over with a fine-toothed comb. I did not know that you had to seek for a Tory with that particular instrument; but what my hon. friend meant to say was this——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Are you challenging the fact or the statement? Which are you objecting to?

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend meant to say, I suppose, was this, that those who had been Tories before, now that there was a change in the Government, were not Tories, to the eye at least; and why? Because their principles had undergone a change? No; but because there was a whip held over them of possible ejection from office, and consequently no office holder dared any longer to say that he was a Tory.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the only way to turn a Tory—with the whip.

Mr. FOSTER. I must appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, for silence.

Mr. SPEAKER. An occasional interruption, I suppose, an experienced speaker like the hon. member who has the floor would not object to; but I think it has gone too far.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to a pertinent question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not deal with impertinent ones.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman had better take himself out. I was going on to analyse the principle which underlies statements of that kind. What my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries meant to convey was that now that there was a change of Government, and the offices were at the disposal of the Liberal party, those who before were Tories and supporters of the Liberal-Conservative Government, did not now choose to make themselves at all plain as such. Well, I say that is an unworthy principle to invoke. I say that the principles and policies of a party ought to be sufficiently strong, sufficiently full of merit, and sufficiently approved by the people, to keep it in office and at the front, and that it ought not to rely upon terrorizing such as this. When we come to the front benches, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is diameters apart from the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière, although they are both members of the same Government. Let us analyse the action and the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. His action in one case, if the statement of my hon. friend at my back was true, was to dismiss a fishery officer, because, forsooth, there had been a change of Administration—to dismiss that officer without investigation, and without asking for his side of the case. Another action of his was to dismiss another man from the position of master of a lifeboat service, simply on indications which were given to him by an opponent of my hon. friend the Solicitor General in the late Government. In another case he actually dismissed a gentleman at Pictou, and dismissed him without investigation, without hearing his case, although the gentleman had received his appointment by an Order of the Governor in Council. The hon. gentleman dismissed him on his own responsibility, without appealing to Council, or without putting the matter before the Governor General. My hon. friend did that, I believe, and in doing it, he did a thing which he had no right to do. The mere dismissing from office of an officer, even in an arbitrary way, is in itself not so much; but if that is to mark the principle on which my hon. friend is to found his practice, then it amounts to a great deal, for it amounts to this, that the appointments by Order in Council, signed by the Governor General himself, and which can only be revoked on giving a sufficient reason, first to Council and then to the Governor General, may be revoked by any Minister of his own will, and the official dismissed without that Minister asking his colleagues or the Governor General in Council for the authority to dismiss. That indicates the principle which is going to be acted on by my hon. friend, if we are to believe his words. He outlined this as the principle upon which he is going to act until he is overruled by his colleagues. Are they going to overrule him in this, or are we going to hear from the First Minister that the policy of the Government will be that each Minister may dismiss officials on his own personal knowledge, without giving a hearing to the party accused or even sending him the accusation, without asking him for his side of the case, without investigation, without an Order in Council, and without giving any reason to the Governor General for the dismissal? Is that the principle my hon. friends are going to act upon? If we are to believe the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) it is not the principle he intends acting on, for he took exactly the opposite view. When the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) declared yesterday that in the Inland Revenue Department there are 200 officials who have nothing to do, and who are there simply

as political heelers at the beck of their party and Ministers; when that statement was made, the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) rose and said that such a statement demanded action on his part. What action did he say he would take? He required some higher authority than was sufficient for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who, because of what somebody told him or of some knowledge which he thought he had himself about Messrs. Noonan and Davies, incontinently dismissed them without Order in Council. The hon. gentleman who represents Lambton (Mr. Lister) made his statement on the floor of this House, on his responsibility as a member, and that is an authority which is certainly as high as the information which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had. But the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue did not take the ground that the word of a member of this House even was sufficient to warrant him in cutting off the heads of these 200 men. He said: If a statement of that kind, if any charges of that kind, are put before me, I will have an investigation, I will give these men the opportunity of clearing themselves from the charges made; and if they do so, they will not be disturbed, but if they do not clear themselves from the charges of offensive partisanship in the elections, then I shall take action. There are the two statements from the two Ministers, members of the one Government, and they know quite well that in a Government there must be solidarity. What is my hon. friend the First Minister going to do about it? Is he going to endorse the one Minister or the other or allow his whole team to go just each as he pleases? There is no other way, and my hon. friend knows it, than for the Government to adopt a policy on this matter, the lines of which each member of the Government must follow out in the administration of his department. You cannot have one Minister administering in one fashion and another administering in an altogether different fashion, in questions of principle and policy, and I invite my hon. friend to clear up the difficulty which exists between two members of his own Cabinet and to state what he proposes, as First Minister, shall be the policy to be carried out.

Now, I want to touch one other matter. We have been talking about those who are the servants of this Government; but there was another matter imported into this discussion—brought into it with the dissent of hon. gentlemen opposite—and that was that the local governments, such of them as are of the same political stripe as hon. gentlemen opposite, encouraged their officers to leave their duties and go out into the political field and become the strongest and most active political partisans in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite and against the Government of the day. When we drew attention to that, we were met with the cry: Oh, those are local governments with which we have nothing to do. What, Mr. Speaker, nothing to do with local governments. Why, my hon. friend sits here to-day because he has swallowed the principles which he enunciated from time to time, and which his party leaders before him enunciated, on the floor of this House. He has swallowed the great principle that the Hon. Edward Blake stood for over and over again, namely, that there should be no combination between the Dominion Government and any provincial government. I have the statement made by my hon. friend in the province of Quebec, not more than three years ago, where he reiterated his own predilection for that view. But my hon. friend is here to-day because he has abjured that principle, and because he made a league with the provincial Liberal governments, by virtue of which these governments placed their whole weight upon his canvass, and from the premiers down, with all their officials, went into the late contest in favour of my hon. friend. In 1893 my hon. friend knows that his party had a convention in this city at which all his leading men came together. They laid down their platform and looked over their men; and from that day forth it was known amongst the leaders of the party that when a new government was formed by my hon. friend,—it it ever should be formed—certain provincial premiers were to be called into it. Did those premiers know of it at that time? They were dull, if they did not see the signs. Were they conferred with after that? Were they told, in so many words, that the government of my hon. friend would include them if he were successful in the fight of the 23rd of June? Were they? My hon. friend knows and these gentlemen know, but we know this. We know that these premiers went from their offices, with the whole force of provincial patronage at their back, and in the contest which ended on the 23rd June, those provincial premiers canvassed and exercised all the political patronage and power in their provinces in favour of my hon. friend. My hon. friend is here to-day because these provincal premiers and their governments leagued their fortunes with him and joined their forces with his during the fight for political and party power. And yet my hon. friend says, you have no right to allude to the provincial governments. Why, the Minister of Justice was Premier of Ontario until after the fight of the 23rd of June. He was promised a senatorship if the party was victorious, and he held on to his premiership until he saw whether the party was victorious. And while he was still premier, his officials, from the highest to the lowest, were fighting for the victory that came on the 23rd of June, and when it came, the premier of Ontario stepped into this Ministry. He it was who allowed, he it was who directed, he it was who condoned the efforts

of his officials, men paid by Conservatives as well as Liberals, men paid by the country and not by any party—he it was who directed them, he it was who put them into candidature and who, when they were defeated gave them back the offices they had held ; he it is to-day who is the Minister of Justice in the new Government. So, I say, we have sufficient reason for bringing up the question as to how the party patronage is used in these provincial governments which are of the same stripe and have the same interest as my hon. friend and his party who hold the reins in this House. Now something has been said, as to holding provincial offices and still having seats in this House. I do not wish to do any injustice to any man, but I would like to ask my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) whom I see in his seat—I will not press the question : I have no right to a reply unless he wishes to answer—as to whether or not he was, before the election, in receipt of a salary as an employee of the Ontario Government ?

Mr. BRITTON. I have no objection to answer the question. I was in receipt of a salary. I gave up that salary to become a member of this House. I sacrificed $3,500 a year for the sake of obliging my friends in Kingston who wished to nominate me as a candidate. I am not aware of any member of the Opposition having done so much.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend leaves me to infer just what I wished to seek information about—that he has resigned that office and does not hold it to-day. That, therefore, ends my argument in reference to that.

Mr. LISTER. If he had been a Tory he would have stuck to the office.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; but I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) what would have happened if the hon. gentleman had been unsuccessful. He would have been put back into the office he resigned.

Mr. BRITTON. I am afraid there is a misunderstanding as to my answer. If my hon. friend asked me whether I resigned office before the election, and if he understood me to answer that question by saying that I did, that is a mistake. I did not resign the office, because the statute itself made my acceptance of the position of a member of this House—if I may use that expression—a disqualification for the other, and I no longer hold that office ; and I knew at the time I accepted a nomination as a candidate for this House that I was jeopardizing the office I then held.

Mr. FOSTER. That is perfectly plain and perfectly frank. My hon. friend did not resign. His election to, and acceptance of, a seat in this House vacated the office. But the House will remark this—that if he had not been elected he would have retained the office. And we have again the not very edifying spectacle of an official of the Ontario government with a salary of $3,500 a year running as a candidate in the interests of gentlemen opposite without the disability of losing that office if he were unsuccessful, but being perfectly free to go back to it if the people did not elect him. Now I want to ask the attention of my hon. friend and the House while I canvass for a moment the propositions which, as I regard it, underlie this matter. Evidently there are different views among members of the House on this question, and these views have been, so far as this debate has gone, in the main very temperately and very moderately set forth. I do not think that among the members of this House there is any very great diversity of opinion as to the principles and practice that should prevail. In the first place no one denies that a civil servant or government employee should have the right to vote. For my own part I do not think it is a proper thing—proper for the official himself or best for the health of the body politic—that we should disfranchise per se every man who takes office or employment under the Government. Here you have your postmasters with salaries ranging from $10 upwards. These postmasters are among the most intelligent of our people. They are, as a rule, a reading people. They are, as a whole, a superior class of people. The mere $10, or $20, or $30 which these gentlemen get from the Government is not worth the trouble they take in carrying out the duties of their office, and it is unfair and unreasonable that they should be deprived of their franchise, that they should be held by the Government of the day to be unfit to cast a ballot. It would be a great loss to the public life of the country if these gentlemen were debarred from the right to vote. On that point, I take it, there is practical unanimity. Well, there is an advance on that position which is held by some—that not only should the office holder have a perfect right to his vote, but he should also have a perfect right to his opinion. It seems to me that we ought not to take away the right of a man to his opinion as to the affairs of his country, simply because he is for the time being a servant of the country. He is in the employ of the Government, which is in the hands of a party. But the Government for the time being in power represents the Crown, represents the country, and pays a salary or wage that Parliament votes as a sufficient remuneration for the employee. He is not the employee or servant of a party; he is the servant of the Government ; he is the servant of the Government as representing the whole country and not a part of the country. Now why should we take from the country the benefit of the opinion of the most intelligent classes of men in their different grades that we have in the country, simply because a part of their time is taken up in attending to the public business ? My

own belief is, and I give it as my strong personal belief, that we have no right to take a man's ballot from him, that we have no right to take from him his opinions on the affairs of the country. Now, we go a step further to the position indicated by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière.) He said he would investigate a charge such as was made, and if he found a gentleman was guilty of offensive partisanship then he would feel that punishment ought to be inflicted with the loss of his place. I think the whole matter is found there and in one other fact and that is—the duty which a man has to perform. It does seem to me that if a public servant performs the duties assigned to him by the Government of the day, if he is not guilty of offensive or unbecoming conduct in his canvass or in the expression of his opinion, he has a perfect right not only to his ballot but also to his expression of his opinion, whether it be by voice or by pen. The only limit that ought to be placed upon him in the interest of the service and in the interest of the country is that his duties shall not be in the least interfered with, and in the second place he shall not lose sight of the fact that, as an employee of the Government as represented by the party in power for the time being, he is to keep that courteous line of conduct which is becoming in every employee toward the person who employs him, towards the party which employs him, towards the party which employs him as the representative of the Government of the country. Now, Sir, it does seem to me that we ought not to go beyond that, we ought not to suppress an expression of opinion by men belonging to the most intelligent classes of the people, those who are its office-holders; we ought not to keep them from depositing their votes, we ought not to keep them from a fair, and courteous, and becoming expression of their opinion; and if civil servants perform their duties faithfully and live up to those rules, I think they have a perfect right, not only to vote, but to express their opinions and to let them be felt upon the country for the good of the country, as they, as intelligent, reasoning beings, according to their light, think to be in the interest of their country. Now, that is the view I take. What I want to impress upon my hon. friend is this: The last thing I would like to see would be the introduction of the spoils system, such as that which did exist in the United States, but which has been largely rooted out from their system, and is every year being still further rooted out by the operation of civil service laws applied from time to time by the President, through the powers given him by Congress. I would not like to see office-holders who do their duty well, who are respectful, when parties change and another government comes in to power, feel the least uneasiness as to their status, or their position. Least of all would I like to see a change by arbitrary dismissal, by the mere whim of the Minister, upon information which must at best be second-hand, coming to him from a partisan source—I would not like to see action taken simply upon such charges. But if there is a charge against any official for neglect of duty, for offensive partisan conduct, or unbecoming and ungentlemanly action, that charge should be laid before him as an accusation, he should be allowed to answer, and an investigation should be carried out, and it should be dependent upon that investigation whether punishment is meted out to him or not. I do not think that we, as a Parliament, should ask for anything less. I do not think we should limit our civil servants to any greater extent than that. I believe that if this line of policy were carried out, it would prevent the unrest and disquiet which is now abroad in the country, and will continue unless a very clear and satisfactory line of policy is taken at this time. I would like to see the civil service of the country put in the most independent position; and I would like to have an expression from my hon. friend the leader of the Government as to the policy of the Government with reference to this most important matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, you are aware that I did not rush into this debate, because I did not want in any way to countenance the tactics, which are becoming very evident, of hon. gentlemen opposite to protract this session and to prevent public business from going on. The hon. gentleman has so far travelled from the subject as to mention that which is altogether foreign to the discussion which has taken place; he has referred to the election which has recently taken place in Queen's and Sunbury, and has stated that the election had reflected no glory and no honour upon the Liberal party. He was there and I was not, therefore I cannot answer him; but he would have shown better taste if he had waited to make his charge until the gentleman who was elected there had been here to answer him. Then the hon. gentleman took up the virtuous role of a critic. He took to task my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton), evidently expecting a different answer from the one he received. He supposed that my hon. friend was still a servant of the Ontario government, but finding that he was debarred from serving the Ontario government, he took refuge in the statement that if he had been defeated he would to-day be an officer of the Ontario government. I do not know what would have taken place. I do not know whether the Ontario government would have reappointed my hon. friend to the office which he vacated when he ran for the constituency of Kingston: but I know one thing, and my hon. friend knows it as well as I do, that there was an

officer of this Government, an officer appointed by my hon. friend himself, and I will give him his name, Mr. Vanasse, harbour master for the port of Montreal. Mr. Vanasse resigned his seat to contest the electoral district of Yamaska in the province of Quebec, and was defeated. Then what took place? Sir, this is not a hypothetical case, the record is before you; the man who had vacated his office in the civil service in order to become a candidate, was reappointed to the same office, after his defeat, by the hon. gentleman himself and his colleagues in the late Government. Now, Sir, my hon. friend wanted to know what was my opinion. I tell him again that I did not rush into this debate. My opinions upon this question are well known, because I have had occasion to express them more than once upon the floor of this House. I expressed them in the session of 1888, and I repeated them in the session of 1891, when a servant of this Government, the highest in the service, the late High Commissioner himself, left his post in London and came back to Canada to take an active part in an election, to the scandal of the whole population and to the harm of the Liberal party; and after having done what service he could to his party, he returned to England, and charged his expenses to the country besides. Now, Sir, with regard to the question of the hon. gentleman, I have no objection at all to repeat what I have had occasion to state upon more than one occasion—I say here, as I have said before, that I am strongly opposed to the American system that to the victor belongs the spoils. I am opposed to any dismissals taking place from the service except for cause; but I have no hesitation in saying at this time that if an officer in the service chooses to be a politician, he shall be given every opportunity by this Government of being a politician. What is the cause of the abominable practice which has been stigmatized in the States, that to the victor belong the spoils? Why was it that after every Presidential election attended by a change of parties in power, the whole civil service was cleared off, the whole body of servants of the government were forced to resign or be dismissed? The reason is obvious, the reason is that every officer under the American system was an active politician, and being an active politician it was quite natural that when the opposite party came to power the man who had been an active politician could not be a trusted servant of the Government whom he had opposed. Now, when we find an officer in the civil service, however good a servant he may have been, however faithfully he may have discharged his duties, but who has been an active politician, who has taken part in the election, offensively and actively, and before the eyes of the whole community, that official has become a scandal in the eyes of the community, and I have no hesitation in saying that he cannot be trusted to render faithful service to this Government. Where there is a Government officer, he may hold his opinions, I do not care what they are; they may be Liberal or Conservative, I do not care; he may go and vote, and I will not inquire how he voted—but when he is seen on a public platform, when he takes part in party processions and is actively and offensively prominent as regards party candidates, that man has taken his life in his hands, and no one can have a word to say if he is dismissed from the service. But he should not be dismissed summarily. There is a difference in cases, I admit. Take the case stated a few days ago by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend was addressing a public meeting, and at that meeting he saw a man who is an official of the service, an active partisan. My hon. friend says to himself: That official is before me. Does the Minister need any more evidence than the evidence of his own eyes? Under such circumstances, I say that my hon. friend is perfectly justified in acting as he did. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) on the other side of the House asked me, a moment ago, how I could reconcile the doctrine enunciated by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the doctrine stated by the Controller of Inland Revenue. I see no difference between those two doctrines. They were expressed differently, but they amounted to the same thing, namely, that no official should be dismissed except for cause, but any man who was an active partisan gave cause for removal; and that is the position in which we stand to-day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The one Minister considered it necessary to make inquiry, and to have a full investigation; and the other Minister was prepared to act on his own motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. No Minister would pretend to dismiss any official unless he had an opportunity to defend himself; but when the case is within the personal knowledge of the Minister himself, under such circumstances there is no case for inquiry. When the Minister is not cognizant of the facts himself, whenever the case is brought to him by extraneous evidence, those statements must be substantiated, and every man must be given an opportunity to defend himself. I do not want, for my part, and I am sure the Government does not desire—and I can speak for the Government on this matter—to act arbitrarily on this or any other subject; every one must be given a fair opportunity to be heard before he is dealt with; but when the facts are substantiated against him, and are of the character I have indicated, he must be given every opportunity to become a politician in the full sense of the term.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not intend, after the very full statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), to take any part in this discussion; but I am afraid, after the remarks which have just fallen from

the leader of the Government, I shall be obliged to make, at all events, a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman charged that I was guilty of an act of great impropriety in leaving my duties as High Commissioner for Canada in London and coming out for the election of 1891 and taking part in the general elections. But the hon. gentleman omitted to say that the circumstances which arose at that time were of a very exceptional character.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I shall be able, Mr. Speaker, to satisfy those hon. gentleman that I was quite right in making the statement I did to the House. On the occasion of the elections for 1887, when Sir John A. Macdonald, who was leader of the Government, desired that I should leave my position as High Commissioner for Canada in London, and come out to take part in the elections, I did so; but, before doing so, as the hon. gentleman knows, I resigned the position of High Commissioner and accepted the office of Finance Minister in Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration, and, therefore, I took a natural and legitimate part in those elections. I do not hesitate to say that, under ordinary circumstances, I do not think the gentleman, whoever he may be, who holds the position of representative of Canada in London, should take part in partisan politics. I may say to the hon. leader of the House that when I held that position, and during the period I held that position, I was pressed in the strongest manner to deliver an address when visiting Canada at a time that an election was going on in the city of St. John, N.B. I refused, and I did so on the ground that the position of High Commissioner of Canada in London was one of a non-partisan character, that it was to some extent like the position held by an ambassador who represents a foreign country at a court. The duties being to a large extent of a similar character, I felt I was precluded from taking any part in what could be regarded as partisan politics, not depriving me from delivering addresses in relation to Canada, or in maintaining, so far as I was able, the policy of the Administration of the country in regard to fiscal questions and matters of that kind, in which it was important to Canada that a correct view as to the action of the Government of the day should be entertained. I hold, therefore, and I say, that the position of High Commissioner for Canada was one that debarred the person who held it from taking an active part in political questions. But my hon. friend the leader of the Government will remember that the occasion of 1891 was of a very extraordinary and exceptional character. He will remember that when Sir John A. Macdonald appealed to me to come out and take part in the general elections, it was on the ground that he believed British institutions were at stake.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will require more than noise and clamour on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to controvert the position I take. I say that Sir John A. Macdonald appealed to me on that occasion to come out and take part in those elections on the ground that, in his judgment, the most important crisis in the history of Canada had arisen, that a policy had been propounded openly, and above-board by the Opposition of that day which he regarded as fatal to the continuance of British institutions in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What was that policy? I will give hon. gentlemen opposite proof, and they will not be able to controvert or question its authority. Hon. gentlemen know that on that occasion the Liberal party of this country propounded a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States of America.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman having previously made the proposition himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman makes a statement which does little credit to his intelligence, if he believes it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My ears may have deceived me, but I remember, in this House, in 1888, hearing the hon. gentleman asked, when I sat in the seat he now occupies, whether he had made an unrestricted offer of reciprocity to Mr. Bayard, when he went to Washington, and the hon. gentleman was obliged to state that he had made an unrestricted offer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman does little credit to his intelligence, if he confounds a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States with an unrestricted offer of reciprocity with the United States. If the hon. gentleman is unable to discriminate between those two questions, I feel he is doing great injustice to the intelligence he possesses.

Sir, the Liberal party having been defeated again and again, and the electorate of Canada having declared that in their judgment under the circumstances in which Canada was situated—five millions of people living alongside sixty millions in the great republic to the south, who had a policy of high protection—the policy of protection which the Liberal-Conservative party maintained was the proper policy. The policy of our party was met by hon. gentlemen opposite with a policy of free trade, and these hon. gentlemen declared indeed that they were the apostles of free trade. But, after suffering defeat after defeat at the hands of the people, they suddenly changed front, and the present leader of the Government himself declared that unrestricted recipro-

city was the only policy that was consistent with the true interests of Canada. And, Sir, what did unrestricted reciprocity mean? It meant that this party which had declared that a revenue tariff was the highest form of protection they would endorse, suddenly asked the people of Canada to accept the highest protective tariff in the world—the tariff of the United States of America. Unrestricted reciprocity meant that the Parliament of Canada should accept a tariff made at Washington, that the Parliament of Canada, for the purpose of obtaining continental free trade with the United States, should not only adopt a tariff which was made at Washington, but that Canada should place herself in the position before the world of not only adopting the high protective tariff of the United States, but that she should turn her back upon the mother country altogether.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sir, can any person question what the result of such a policy as that would be. Can any person suppose for a single moment that under such circumstances England should continue to give that support and countenance and protection to Canada that she always has given? Can any person doubt that if such a policy were adopted it would be possible to maintain British institutions in this country? These were the circumstances under which the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald appealed to me to come from England, declaring as he did, that British institutions in Canada were at stake.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Can any person doubt for a single moment the soundness of that opinion?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, if they do, I can quote in support of that opinion the words of the greatest authority that ever existed in the ranks of the Liberal party in this country. Sir, we fought that battle and the result was that the Liberals were again defeated. Their policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States failed, as their previous free trade policy had failed, to bring them into power. These were the circumstances under which I came to take part in that contest at the invitation of the leader of the Government of Canada. I do not hesitate to say, Sir, that I did it feeling that I took my official life in my hands. I felt that if the Liberal party triumphed, then I could not continue to serve in the position of High Commissioner for a single hour.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I guess not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I felt that ordinarily the position of High Commissioner for Canada was of an unpartisan character. No person can doubt for a moment that when I entered into the contest against the Liberal party, holding the position of High Commissioner, I took my official life in my hand, and was in a position to retire instantly if the Liberals obtained power. These hon. gentlemen opposite express incredulity at my statement that in the great struggle the question was not an ordinary one between the two great parties in this country, but that it was an occasion when the institutions of which Canada feels so proud were at stake. I shall not give the evidence of the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, nor of myself, nor of any other gentleman connected with the Conservative party, to prove this, but I shall remind the House of the striking circumstance that took place on that occasion. The man whom I do not hesitate to say is the greatest who ever adorned the ranks of the Liberal party since confederation, the man who was the leader of that party for many years in this House, the man who has been looked up to by every Liberal in this country as a leader of whom they had reason to be proud; the Hon. Edward Blake, on that occasion, on the eve of the battle, refused to go to his constituency, and refused to take part in the struggle, and what was his reason? The very next day after the election he published over his own signature a letter in the London "Times," in which he declared that the reason he deserted hon. gentlemen opposite was because he was not willing to fight under false colours. What was the meaning of that? Why, Sir, it was because they endeavoured to convince the people of this country that British institutions were not in danger in that struggle. But Mr. Blake went further and he said: that in his judgment the policy of the Liberal party then was calculated not only to lead to commercial union and commercial consolidation with the United States of America, but that it must end ultimately in the annexation of Canada to the United States.

I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that I did no discredit to the high office I held, and I did no violence to any principle that should govern a person holding that office, when on such an occasion I felt that I could not refuse the call of the great leader of the Conservative party to fight side by side with him the battle of British institutions. I felt that the result of the struggle was to be either the triumph of Liberal-Conservative principles again, and that Canada and Canadians were in future to maintain that close union with the mother country which it has always been our pride and our glory to maintain; or, on the other hand, that the triumph of the Liberal party meant that the British institutions of which we are so justly proud, should be swept away and that we should be come allied with the United States.

Such was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I have no hesitation in saying that on that occasion I did discharge what I believed to be not only a duty to myself, but a duty to my country, of the highest and most important character. I may say, however, to hon. gentlemen opposite, what they may be entirely unaware of, that holding as I did a quasi ambassadorial position in London, I could have found some considerable justification for my course in the practices that appertain to the position of ambassadors, if I had even taken part in an election. It may be news to hon. gentlemen opposite, but I am able to state for their information that a peer of the realm, who accepts the position of an ambassador to France or to Russia or to any other foreign country, incurs an obligation to leave his embassy and come and vote in the House of Lords whenever the Government of the day require his support, thus taking part, in the strongest possible manner, in the political contests of the day. I only refer to that incidentally, not as any justification for my course on that occasion, for I have already placed my justification on higher grounds. But I think the hon. gentleman rather failed in good taste when he referred to my expenses having been paid by the country on the occasion of that visit to Canada. I think the hon. gentleman's memory will enable him to recollect that my visit to this country on that occasion was not confined to taking part in a general election. He will remember that I was sent by His Excellency the Governor General on an important visit to Washington, immediately after the general election, and that I was detained in this country in connection with important public duties of the very highest character, apart altogether from the question of the general election. Now, Sir, I do not intend to detain the House much longer, because this subject has been pretty well discussed. But I may say that I am glad that the hon. leader of the Government has made a frank statement of his position on this question of official tenure in connection with political action. It was very desirable indeed that before this debate closed the hon. gentleman should state, in a free and frank manner, the policy he holds in regard to that question. The hon. gentleman's declaration, while being a very important one, falls far short of the extreme doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils; because I am happy to say that the practice of Canada in the past in regard to the civil service has been much more akin to that of England than to that of the United States. I believe it will be conceded that the finest civil service in the world is that of England; and I believe that the steady and continuous efforts that have been made in Canada to approximate our system as nearly as we well could to the English system, have tended to elevate the civil service of Canada in a very great degree. After many long years of official life and opportunities of judging, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the civil service of Canada to-day is one of which any country might be proud. From the highest officials, the deputy ministers, down to the lowest grade, I believe the civil service of Canada will compare very favourably with that of any other country, perhaps except England itself: and I regret any step that is in the least degree calculated to lower the tone of that service. Now, although the hon. leader of the Government has not gone anything like the length of some of his supporters on this question, I am very much afraid that the position he has taken here to-day, that no civil servant, however high and influential his position may be, can in future take any part in political contests beyond simply depositing his ballot, without exposing himself to the risk of being driven out of the service—for I understand that to be the position the hon. gentleman takes—is calculated to lower and deteriorate the civil service. We want to get the best men the country can produce to enter the civil service of Canada: and if gentlemen feel that in order to become civil servants they are obliged to avoid the free and independent expression of their opinions on questions of great public and national concern—in fact, to submit to being muzzled—I think the result will be that many gentlemen will hesitate to enter the service. I would have been glad if the hon. gentleman had gone further than he did, and had taken the very proper ground taken by one of his supporters. I had not the pleasure of being present when this debate commenced the other day; I was absent in Toronto; but I ran my eye over the discussion which then took place; and of the views expressed, those which commended themselves most to my judgment were those of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I believe that on the lines indicated by that hon. gentleman would be found a perfectly safe policy—one that would protect both a Government and an Opposition from offensive partisanship on the part of public officials, and would at the same time leave to them the opportunity for a free and courteous and clear expression of their political opinions, without let or hindrance. If that policy were adopted, and gentlemen of either one party or the other felt that as long as they confined their political action to a respectful statement of the opinions they held, their official tenure was secure, I believe it would tend to the maintenance of the civil service in the high position it now occupies, and would at the same time sufficiently guard either an Opposition or a Government from any undue or offensive partisanship on the part of any civil servant. If my memory serves me, that was the attitude taken by the late lamented Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and, if I am not mistaken—it was a long time ago—the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) endorsed to a large extent that view of the question. He was only pre-

pared to limit the political action of civil servants to the respectful expression of their opinions, requiring them to avoid anything that could be regarded as in the slightest degree offensive to gentlemen engaged in a political struggle. If I am not mistaken, he went a little further, and drew the line at conduct which was courteous and respectful in support of the Government of the day, holding that the Government had the right to expect perhaps more support from the civil service than had the Opposition. The line, however, which the hon. First Minister has taken, I am afraid, will have the effect of lowering the tone of the civil service. And it will have another and worse effect. One of the greatest advantages of a permanent civil service, such as they have in England, and such as we have been, at a respectful distance, endeavouring to copy, is that its permanency assures its efficiency. Every one knows that a man who believes that he holds office "aut vitam aut culpam," who knows that so long as he conducts himself properly and discharges efficiently the duties of his office and gives no just cause of complaint to the Administration of the day, his position is a safe one, will make a better servant of the public than if he feels that his tenure of office is going to terminate with the life of the Administration which appointed him. That lack of permanency has been the greatest defect of the system, not perhaps latterly, but formerly pursued in the United States, under which civil servants depended for their tenure of office entirely on the Administration of the day being sustained at the polls. I do not intend to prolong these remarks further than to say that I am afraid the result of the declaration of the hon. the First Minister will be that our civil servants will not feel that they have the same security in the tenure of their office as they have enjoyed in the past.

Mr. LISTER. Let them keep out of politics.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it desirable that anybody should keep out of politics, whatever position he may occupy, provided he conducts himself in a reasonable and proper manner There is nothing that will tend so much to the elevation of public life as the desire and the ambition of the best educated men in the community to take a part in the politics of their country. I know of no greater misfortune that can happen to any country than for men of high character, intelligence and position to dissever themselves from the political life of their country. I do not, therefore, share the views of the hon. gentleman who interrupted me. I do not feel that it is at all desirable that gentlemen of education, character and standing should be obliged to suppress any expression of their opinion on political matters because they happen to hold office in the civil service of their country. I trust that the result of this discussion will not be to promote in the slightest degree the policy of dismissing officials. It is a policy from which the Government have nothing to gain, but a great deal to lose. I do not look at this question from a party point of view. From that point of view I should not object, in the slightest degree, to the hon. gentleman making the most sweeping changes and dismissing large numbers of civil servants in order to replace them with their own friends. A more disastrous course, from a partisan point of view, the Government could not adopt. Of course if any person holding office in the civil service has taken a violent and offensive course against the party which has been elected, he must be prepared to take the consequences. I do not hesitate to draw the line at that, but beyond that I think it is most desirable, in the interests of the Government and country, that no party should go.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). With a good deal of what the hon. gentleman has said, I am disposed to agree. I would like, however, as he has spent a considerable portion of his later years in England, to ask of him if he can recall to mind any instance of an English official, of more or less prominence, taking part in the elections to the extent of being a member of a committee of a candidate on either side. So far as my information and recollection goes, no such case is alleged to have taken place for a period of many years back ; but if the hon. gentleman has later information on that subject, if he knows of cases in which any civil servant had committed the acts which are charged to have been committed by the men whom my hon. colleague dismissed, let the hon. leader of the Opposition give the House the benefit of those facts, and I will willingly make way for him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman a very striking instance of the extent to which, under the British system, persons holding official positions in England are allowed to go. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware that officers of the highest rank in the Army and Navy of England are allowed, not only to take part in politics, but to become members of the House and oppose strenuously the Government of the day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have never heard that officers of the Army and Navy were held to be members of the civil service. That is a new light, and I think a light entirely confined to the hon. gentleman opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They hold official positions under the government.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are specially exempted by statute, if my memory serves me, and it has

long been understood by both parties in England that officers of the Army and Navy stand in that regard on a totally different footing from the officers in the civil service. The hon. gentleman can produce no instance of officers in the civil service in England—and it is with these that we are concerned—committing the acts charged against those whom my hon. colleague dismissed. We do not pretend to dismiss my hon. and gallant friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who is colonel of a militia regiment, from the position he so worthily fills, because he has taken an active part against the Government. I may say that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Militia, has not the slightest intention of parting with his valuable services because he was our opponent in the elections. And I see other gallant officers and majors in the House—I do not know that there are any captains in the ranks—but colonels and majors there are by the score, who opposed us bitterly, and I believe they are safe in their positions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman not hear a gentleman on that side of the House complain of the action taken by a military force in the recent election, under the orders of a gentleman connected with the force?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not remember the circumstances, but if the hon. gentleman refers to a case where the troops, under the command of a particular officer, were marched down to a particular poll, there might be some reason for resenting this proceeding as an attack on the liberty of the subject. But I always like, whenever the opportunity offers, to give the House the benefit of statements made by the hon. gentleman himself. Now, I find on the 31st May, 1887,—I do not think he had then resigned his office of High Commissioner, but we will speak of that hereafter—about the time that he returned to Canada, at any rate, this question was put by the Hon. Alfred Jones to the hon. leader of the Opposition:

> Was there any reason for Mr. Wade's dismissal?

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) replied:

> I am sorry to say that he (Mr. Wade of Digby) so far forgot the position he occupied as to go out and take a prominent part in holding public meetings and in denouncing the Government of the day.
>
> I think there is no gentleman in this House on either side who will say that any public officer holding any office under the Government or Parliament should adopt such a course, or that if he does adopt it, that he should be retained in the public service, if we are to carry on public affairs in a way in which I am sure hon. gentlemen on both sides would like to see them carried on. There is no doubt that public officers, especially under the ballot, have a perfect right to go to the polls and record their votes for or against any person, as they may please, or as they may consider it their duty, but I do not believe any gentleman in the House will sustain any public officer in going out and taking an offensive course in reference to the Government of the day, whoever may be in power. There is undoubted evidence that Mr. Wade took that course, and that he went to the furthest extreme to which any person could go, and under the circumstances the Speaker was asked to supersede him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is not much difference, there may be a difference as to the definition of "offensiveness." I should be disposed to consider, and I think I said so at the time in accordance with the principle which the hon. gentleman lays down here, that a public servant went outside of his duty and was "offensive," using the word in a legal sense which might properly enough apply to him, if he became a member of the committee of a candidate, or if he were canvassing actively against a candidate. I think that would be stepping outside the limit which has been laid down by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. It is a question which deserves great consideration whether it would not be in the public interest that civil servants should be put—and it would be no disgrace to them—on the same footing as the judges of this country. We do not consider a judge of this country is injured or insulted or if he is not allowed to exercise the franchise or to take part in political affairs. I think that the same arguments that apply to the judges apply also to the members of the civil service of the country. I give that merely as an expression of an individual opinion which I have mentioned on more than one occasion in this House before. But we come to three cases in which the hon. gentleman, being High Commissioner, thought it within the bounds of his duty as head of the civil service—as I think he called himself—to come and interfere actively in politics. I do not remember that in 1887-88 the hon. gentleman resigned his position as High Commissioner. If I am not mistaken, we were called upon to pass a special statute to enable him to be at one and the same time a Minister and High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman retained his place in this House for a considerable space of time without venturing to vote, for fear of bringing himself under certain pains and penalties. I am not going to pry into the secrets of 1887-88—the statute of limitations may apply to that also—and yet I think I have heard long ago that the hon. gentleman came out here under the express stipulation that if he helped in the election of 1887 he would be allowed afterwards to enjoy the fruits of his labour and would become the recognized leader of the Conservative party. I will not call upon the hon. gentleman either to affirm or deny

that. I believe it was found impossible to deliver the goods and the hon. gentleman had to return to his High Commissionership.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to state—although it is hardly requisite that I should reply to so very vague a statement—that there is not the slightest foundation in the world for it, and never was.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That only shows what extraordinary rumours get about even among very well informed people, because, I do not break any bond of secrecy when I say that the impression I speak of was given to me from the utterances of men who had been colleagues of the hon. gentleman. Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement unreservedly. The next time the hon. gentleman came—and I would call attention to the fact—he did not resign his High Commissionership, did not even put in a warming pan. He acted, so to speak, as my hon. friend beside him would say, as his own warming pan. But, Sir, in 1891, a grave duty, he tells us, called upon him to interfere in the elections here. British institutions in Canada were at stake. Well, Sir, it does show the extraordinary extent to which self-deception can go when we find the party which, in 1878, in opposition to the protests and arguments of my lamented friend, Mr. Mackenzie, and myself, turned their backs on the well established policy of the British Empire, which was a revenue tariff, and as near an approach to free trade as could be, and deliberately adopted the American policy of protection and foisted it upon this country, posing as champions of British institutions. When some of their organists were twitted with the inevitable results and consequences, and were told that it was likely to be bad for British connection, who does not remember that we were told that if the National Policy was bad for British connection, so much the worse for British connection. Sir, there are loyalists and loyalists, as I have explained to the hon. gentleman and his namesake behind him on more than one occasion. But of all the loyalists I have ever come across the 35 per cent loyalists are those for whom I have the least esteem. There was a third occasion on which the hon. gentleman came over here. Was it to preserve British institutions in Canada or to protect the British constitution, or to enforce a regard and respect for British precedents that the hon. gentleman appeared here in 1896, on or about the 2nd of January? And will he rise in his place and say that all that then occurred was a surprise of the greatest kind to him, and that the last idea that entered his mind as he crossed the sea in the stormy month of December was that, peradventure, he might be called upon to supplant Sir Mackenzie Bowell? Sir, the hon. gentleman says he came over in 1891 because the free trade party had adopted protection. If so, they had only imitated himself and his friends. And he declares that we were disposed to adopt the highest possible form of protection, that practiced by the United States. Now I have one thing to say to the hon. gentleman with respect to that, and I think it would do him and some of his friends good to ponder on it. They do not appear to be able to apprehend that in the case of the United States, you have, as I have repeatedly pointed out, one of the most remarkable examples of the effect of free trade on a large scale. From ocean to ocean, from the tropics to the arctic zone, the United States have a most remarkable system of free trade amongst the several states that compose it. Now while it may be true, and is true, that nominally, the protective tariff of the United States is somewhat higher than ours, yet really and truly ours is a great deal higher in its practical effects upon the people than that of the United States. The hon. gentleman was not always so extremely averse to freer commercial relations with the United States. I gave a statement of the hon. gentleman a little while ago showing how he regarded dismissal from the civil service. I find here, and I think about the same date, a letter to "My dear Mr. Bayard" in which the hon. gentleman declares:

> I had pleasure in receiving your letter of May 31st, evincing as it does the importance which you attach to an amicable adjustment of the fisheries question and the maintenance of the cordial commercial relations between the United States and Canada, under which such vast and mutually beneficial results have grown up.
>
> I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries.

"In the entire commercial relations of the two countries." Now, Sir, that may not have been unrestricted reciprocity; that may have been—what was it he called it? That may have been an unrestricted offer of reciprocity; it was an unrestricted offer of reciprocity that the hon. gentleman made. The distinction, to my mind, is a distinction between tweedledum and tweedledee. But I have considerable reason for believing that the hon. gentleman came into a wiser frame of mind, if we could have got at his inner thought, after he had paid a visit to Washington, which I remember drew from him a declaration that we had come within an ace of a commercial war with the United States, which, as he truly said, was but a step from absolute and positive war. Sir, in 1888 I brought forward a resolution in favour of a liberal reciprocity treaty with the United States, as full and large as we could make it, as full and large as we could obtain, embracing manufactured

articles as well as natural products. I may mention that his own leader had admitted time and again that it was utterly impossible to obtain an exchange of natural products without offering likewise an exchange of manufactured goods; and it was very remarkable, and I call the attention of this House to that fact, that whereas, in 1888, the leader of the Opposition was Minister of Finance, and was the man whose duty it was, officially and otherwise, more especially to reply to the propositions I then made; although that debate lasted, if I remember right, for fully six weeks, during those six weeks the then Minister of Finance would not put in an appearance in the House; he had an advantage over most of us, he could put himself on the sick list and report himself well when it pleased him. Be that as it may—and I regard it as a proof of great good sense and sagacity on the part of the hon. gentleman—be that as it may, cart ropes, apparently, could not drag him forward to argue against a proposition of the very fullest reciprocity arrangements with the United States, and I well believe that the reason was that his own better judgment approved, to a large extent, of the propositions which I then submitted to this House. The hon. gentleman asked what was the policy of the Conservatives in 1878. Let him look at the resolution of 1876, let him look at his own declarations in his own province of Nova Scotia, where he told the people of Nova Scotia, in order to induce him to adopt the National Policy: Let us have the National Policy and within two years I will give you reciprocity. Sir, it is perfectly well known to the hon. gentleman, as it is perfectly well known to us all, that over and over again, if they had not been meshed, if they had not been entangled, if they had not been, not so much free agents, as the paid agents of certain other parties—it is well known they would have been very glad indeed, in the proper interests of this country, to support a very large measure of reciprocity.

Now, Sir, we will not quarrel over some words that the hon. gentleman may have used, but I noticed that he interspersed a very warm eulogium on the Hon. Mr. Blake for the statement he had made. I remarked to my hon. friend behind me, and will repeat it now, that as soon as ever a Reform leader dies, or as soon as ever a Reform leader leaves the country, he is straightway promoted by these hon. gentlemen to a very high position in the political calendar. I am not sure, Sir, that if either of those fates should befall myself, I might have a chance of canonisation too. But one thing I may point out to him, if he reads that letter, or if any of his friends chose to read that letter, I would request them to read it all, and I think they will find, when they go through the pages, some very pungent remarks as to the position in which Canada was in 1891, and as to the extent to which the policy and practice of these hon. gentlemen had discredited Canada, had debased her public life, and demoralized her people. Sir, there is a practice in the courts, I believe, of swearing witnesses when they come to give evidence, that they shall speak the truth and the whole truth. I think the hon. gentleman, when he quotes Mr. Blake's letter, if he wishes to put his case fairly before the people, would do well, indeed, to give that letter in its entirety.

Now, Sir, I venture to say to the hon. gentleman that he knows, and no man knows better, how idle, how silly, how childish and how culpable, are these reflections from one side to the other on the loyalty of the people of Canada, whether they call themselves Conservatives or Liberals.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must allow me to interrupt him a moment, just to say that no statement I ever uttered in my life will bear the construction of a charge of disloyalty to any portion of the people of Canada. I have, on the contrary, borne testimony on the floor of this House, as I do now, and as I have invariably done in England and everywhere, to the unswerving loyalty of the overwhelming masses of the people of Canada of all parties and of all classes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, regretting much that his language should have been so exceedingly open to misconstruction on many occasions, and trusting that in future he will be very particular when he brings charges, and when his friends, and when his press, and when his adherents, bring charges against the loyalty of the Liberal party of Canada, to be careful to discriminate as he has now discriminated. I am not going to retaliate upon him, although I might well do so, by saying that the policy his party have pursued, I am willing to hope in utter ignorance of its effects, has done more, and is likely to do more, to cause the loss to Her Majesty of not hundreds of thousands, but millions of her Canadian subjects, than any other policy that was ever introduced into Canada. Sir, it is a melancholy fact to-day that in all human probability very nearly a third, or a fourth of the youth of Canada have been driven out of Canada largely by the mismanagement of hon. gentlemen on the other side, youths who are now citizens of the United States. There, Sir, if the hon. gentleman wants to know—although I am perfectly willing to suppose that he and his friends did not intend it—there is one of the results of their policy which has tended very largely to weaken Canada, and which has tended very largely to increase the resources and population of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May we hope to get them back again?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will not venture to say whether we may hope to get back those whom the hon. gentleman has driven away, but I do say that we hope, and it is one of the chief aims and objects of this Government to put a stop to the tremendous drain of the best blood of Canada which was going on under the hon. gentleman's Administration for so many years. That, Sir, is one of the objects which Her Majesty's present advisers have set before them, as one which they desire most exceedingly to carry out; and I think, if we are permitted a sufficiently long time to develop our policy, that is one of the results which will assuredly follow from it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How long must we wait?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentlemen will possess their souls in patience, say until the 2nd of February—I will not say the 2nd of January, because that might bring up painful memories. I think that then they will find that our policy is sufficiently distinct and clear cut even to satisfy the greed of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

Sir, we have strayed perhaps a little from the subject which we originally had in hand, but that diversion was not entirely due to my fault, because when the hon. gentleman was good enough to give us this exposition of the reason of his three-fold flight from England, in 1887, in 1891 and in 1896, why, Sir, we were obliged to go back into ancient history, and I apologize to the House for it.

But on the other question I agree with my hon. friend that it is a matter of very great importance, indeed, to the people of the country, and of very great importance to good government in this country, that civil servants should understand exactly where they stand and what they may expect. So far as regards the statements made by hon. gentlemen near me, no man of common sense will pretend that if a Minister of the Crown is aware from personal knowledge that a certain civil servant has been transgressing the laws laid down, he is bound to issue a commission or institute a court of inquiry to satisfy himself as to what his own eyes and ears can bear witness to. Outside of this House such a proposition would not be entertained for one moment, nor would it be possible to consider it. But to come to the position of a civil servant; it is perfectly well known, because hon. gentlemen opposite are aware that the proposition now laid down has been stated over and over by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that where a civil servant chooses, besides exercising his undoubted right to cast his vote as he pleases, to interfere actively in elections, he must of necessity take the consequences of his own act. We have nothing whatever to do with what has been done by the various local legislatures. All I can say to hon. gentlemen opposite is this: they may turn out the legislatures in other provinces, and then they may do what they please with repect to any civil servant who has transgressed the rules laid down, and if I know anything of the Conservative party, they will not hesitate to carry into most rigorous effect the canons to which I have just given utterance. But it so happens there were other provinces over and above Ontario and New Brunswick in which the officers of a local government took part in elections. There was the local government of Quebec. How much aid and sustenance did the late Government receive from that local government in the elections? We did not hear any complaints. We know moreover what part the Government took on former occasions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Judging by the result, they must have been very differently on the last occasion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is very likely. They did what they could, and no man could be expected to do more. No doubt the hon. gentleman is aware of that fact. In that way, as in other ways, the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Tupper) found the province of Quebec to be a great disappointment; but that result was not to be laid at the door of the government of Quebec. I remember some very curious cases quite closely analogous to those mentioned in the hon. gentleman's statement. I remember the case of Mr. Cowan, who was appointed postmaster of Galt. He resigned his office to become a candidate in the hon. gentleman's interest. He was defeated, and he was reinstated in his office forthwith. An hon. gentleman alluded to the case of Mr. Vanasse. But over and above the case of Mr. Vanasse—because he was not a very prominent official—there was the case of a distinguished senator in the province now represented by the hon. member for Queen's (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), who resigned his seat in the Senate and became a candidate. He was defeated, and was almost immediately reappointed. It was not the fault of the hon. gentleman opposite that other distinguished senators who resigned their seats for the purpose of taking part in the last general elections were not reappointed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to these matters before, but I think they should not refer to them in the concrete, they should rather have confined themselves to abstract propositions, which the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) can handle so well. I would not advise my friends to adopt the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; but one thing is certain, that after 1878 they awarded positions to those who had been faithful to

them, and most undoubtedly, unless my memory is wholly at fault, wherever they had an opportunity, they were not slow in punishing their opponents. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of the case of Mr. Buckingham, and the declaration of an hon. gentleman, "Off with his head." It was used not by Shakespeare, but by an hon. gentleman who quoted Shakespeare, Sir John A. Macdonald. When he left office several appointments had been made, and although I do not mean to say that it was entirely done for this purpose, one of the first acts of the succeeding Conservative Government was to pass an Act by which several hundreds of those appointed by the outgoing Government were at once excluded from office, and within a year and a day another Act was passed and several hundreds of others of those who had faithfully supported hon. gentlemen opposite were replaced in office. These are historical facts which the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, and I am perfectly certain that were the situations reversed and were hon. gentlemen opposite on this side of the House called upon to decide on the fate of civil servants who had interfered in elections, and for which action alone we propose, on proof being furnished, to discipline them, those hon. gentlemen would mete out to them quite as strict justice as we are likely to mete out. I do not desire that any man should be condemned without a hearing. On that point we are all in accord. Unless the case is one absolutely and perfectly evident to a Minister's own senses, as in the cases referred by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is our duty to see that men have an opportunity to repel the charge or confess the charge as the case may be. But given that, and granting that at an election certain men who are public servants have interfered actively, I say it is in the interest of the rest of the civil servants for the purpose, as the hon. gentleman well said, of preserving the special system which has entered into our politics and become a part of them,—it is imperatively necessary for the good of the remainder of the service that an example should be made of those men. One word more, and I have done. It was my duty to take part in the first Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, and I have this to say, and I say it with considerable regret, we had most overwhelming proof that all through the civil service we were carrying on our daily work in the midst of a nest of traitors. I had daily and hourly proofs for months and months that not a paper went to our Privy Council which was not communicated by some member or other of the civil service to hon. gentlemen opposite. We had superabundant evidence of that, and it speaks much for the extreme leniency on the part of Mr. Mackenzie, that he took so very few steps to purge the service of these members. I speak of what I know. I do not for a moment pretend to say that a majority of the civil service were guilty of such practices; but in 1873-74 and even after that, the honourable confidence which should exist between members of the civil service and heads of departments had been time and again violated. With those examples before us, yea, with members of the civil service eating the bread of both parties, and deliberately interfering in elections for the purpose of aiding one political party, if they so act they must be considered as taking their political lives in their hands, and they must accept the consequences of their own acts, and the good sense of the people of the country and their natural sense of equal justice will not merely justify, but demand at the hands of the Government that they should make an example of them.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House for many minutes this evening, as in comparison with many of my hon. friends who sit to your left, I have comparatively little to complain of in so far as official dismissals are concerned, few heads having as yet dropped into the basket at Winnipeg. This may be accounted for in one of two ways; either from the fact that Mr. Martin who was the Reform candidate at the last election was not successful, and consequently is not able to bring the same pressure to bear upon the Government as those members of the party who secured seats in the House, and who being present here in the body are able to interview Ministers and impress their views strongly upon them, or, it may be, because Mr. Martin is more mercifully disposed than some of his fellows, and is not so anxious to obtain revenge against those members of the civil service who worked against him, if there be any such. There is, however, one case which I intended to bring before my hon. friend the First Minister if he were present in the House, but as he is not here, I will bring it to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). Had the Government seen fit to give the western portion of Canada a representative in the Cabinet, it would not have been necessary for me to have brought this case before a Minister who has really nothing whatever to do with it, as the case does not belong to the department of any Minister who sits at present in this House. Unfortunately, for some reason unknown to me but doubtless well known to the head of the Government, there is at present no Minister of the Interior, and no representative of Manitoba, North-west and British Columbia in the Cabinet; and I have therefore to fall back upon some member of the

Government who sits in this House, especially so, as the gentleman who is acting Minister of the Interior while the portfolio is vacant holds his seat in another Chamber. The case to which I refer is that of Mr. Baldwinson, the Icelandic immigration agent at Winnipeg. For the last thirteen years this gentleman has held the position of Icelandic immigration agent in the western country. He has been the means of inducing thither far the greater number of the Icelanders who have settled in Manitoba; and they are now numbered not by the hundred but by the thousand in that country. There has been no fault found with him by the department. His work has always been up to the mark. I can speak from personal knowledge of this, because while I lived in Winnipeg as a private individual, I took an interest in immigration, and paid a great deal of attention as to how matters were conducted at the immigration sheds, and to how the work affecting that department was carried on in the city to which I belong. I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that the Government has no more active, no more energetic, and no more successful man in their service, than Mr. Baldwinson. He has induced, as I have said, thousands of his countrymen to emigrate from Iceland to Manitoba, and I can say without fear of successful contradiction, that there is no class of people who come to that western country who make better settlers; barring of course our own people, by which I mean those from the older provinces of Canada and those who come from the motherland across the sea. The Icelanders are accustomed to a cold climate and consequently our long winters have no terrors for them. They are frugal, industrious and sober, and year after year they are getting better off. We only hope that as time goes on more of them may be induced to cross the ocean and to settle there. It therefore certainly cannot be said that there was no work for Mr. Baldwinson to do, for there are thousands of people yet left in Iceland whose lot could be very much improved by immigrating, and if Mr. Baldwinson is not employed to induce them to do so, somebody must be employed in his place. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker —because I know that you take an interest in immigration—this is not a case where a new broom sweeps clean. In fact, in matters relating to immigration there is nothing like experience to make a man successful, and no man even if he were as able as Mr. Baldwinson, and knew as much of the Icelandic people, and had gained their confidence to as great an extent, could do so well as Mr. Baldwinson, without having the experience that gentleman possesses. He has done well in the past and, as I am sure, he would do well in the future had his services been retained. Although Mr. Baldwinson has been thirteen years in the department, and has brought up a family of ten in this country—not a small family for a man to support—yet, without any complaint from the department, and without any pretense that his work has not been up to the mark, he has been notified that his services will not be required after a fortnight has expired. Now, Sir, I do not believe that there is an hon. gentleman in this House who would consider that that is fair treatment. The only possible objection that can be raised against Mr. Baldwinson is on the ground of interference in politics. I wish to say that so far as I know he has never interfered in Dominion politics. I do not speak very positively, because he may, with my knowledge and without my having heard of it, have taken part in some outside constituency. However, although he lives in Winnipeg he has certainly never taken a hand in the Dominion elections since I was there, and he never did anything to help me in either of the two elections that I fought. I have no doubt that if I had asked Mr. Baldwinson and pressed him, he might have done so, but I did not ask him, and as far as Winnipeg is concerned the place where he lives, he did nothing, and I believe he did nothing in Dominion politics in any other part of the province. It is perfectly true that in provincial politics he has taken an active part. He has been a candidate for the local House, but I do not see how my hon. friends who sit on the Treasury benches could find that that affords any reason for his dismissal, for whatever their practice may have been, the principle which they have always professed is, that Dominion and local politics are totally distinct and that one has nothing whatever to do with the other. If that is what they really believe there is no earthly reason why an employee of the Dominion Government should not take a hand in provincial politics. Besides, judging them by their practice, I know this: That in my own province of Manitoba the employees of the local government were the busiest electioneering agents, not only during the last campaign, but also during the campaigns of 1891 and 1887. I know that in my last campaign in Winnipeg as well as in that of 1891, the employees of the Dominion Government were sent, or sallied forth from the departmental buildings, to act as the most active political agents on the Reform side. For my own part, I do not find fault with that. I do not complain of it for a moment, and I have no hesitation in saying now, that were a change of government to take place in Manitoba, and were the party to which I belong to come into power, I would use any influence I had with that party to prevent any of these gentlemen who worked against me from being disturbed in his position on account of his so doing. But the principle of the provincial governments in so far as the interference of their officials in Dominion matters goes, does not stop here; for if I am correctly informed,

the same thing occurred in my native province of Ontario as occurred in my adopted province of Manitoba. In this province in which we now sit, the employees of the provincial government were amongst the most active workers against the Conservative candidates. Indeed, I believe this was carried so far, that Mr. Conmee who was member for West Algoma in the provincial legislature, and who presented himself as a Reform candidate before the electors of Nipissing in the last Dominion election, never resigned his seat in the provincial House, and claims that he is still a member of that House, although he ran as a Reform candidate for the Dominion Parliament and was defeated. Further than that, Sir, I am aware of this fact, that an hon. friend of mine who sits in this House representing the electoral district of Selkirk (Mr. Macdonell), was an employee of the local government when he became a candidate; and, if my information is not incorrect, while he sits here to-day as a member of the Commons of Canada, he is still an employee of the local government. I speak subject to correction. My sight is not good enough to enable me to see whether he is at this moment in the House or not; but if he is, I should be glad if he would correct me, if I am wrong.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I am not at present an employee of the local government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I am very glad to hear that my hon. friend is not an employee of the local government; but I know this, that the firm of which I happen to be a member, had something to do with the preparation of a petition against the hon. gentleman's return, and, after the petition was prepared and filed, there was great difficulty in serving it. The hon. gentleman was not to be found; he had vanished like a will-o'-the-wisp; and when an application was made for extended time, the evidence that was put in in opposition to our application, was that he was in the country looking after the drains, his official work. However, that is neither here nor there; and although I said a few moments ago that I was glad that my hon. friend was no longer an employee of the provincial government, I wish to withdraw that, because it does not correctly express my opinion. If that state of things is going to be allowed, I would be very sorry if he were not an employee of the local government, because he would not then be in receipt of a double salary. We want all the money we can get in that country; and when it is given to good fellows like my hon. friend, we are not sorry that it is in circulation. However, is this not a case which, even after the speech we have heard from the First Minister this afternoon, ought to be inquired into? My hon. friend the First Minister, in speaking on this question, expressed himself a little differently from what I expected him to do: that is to say, he spoke of active interference in politics being enough to justify a man's dismissal. Now, the word "active" is a little indefinite, and I was in hopes that he would have explained it more fully than he did, because a man may take a very active part in politics without being in the least degree offensive. I quite acknowledge that an employee in the civil service may so conduct himself in the course of an election as to warrant the party he opposes, if successful in that election, in dismissing him the moment Parliament meets. On the hustings, or in the course of private canvass, he may personally abuse the leaders of the party to which he is opposed. He may go to meetings and interrupt in such a rude and offensive manner, bringing with him, possibly, a gang of roughs to back up his interruptions, as to fully justify the successful party in dispensing with his services without delay. I, for my part, do not believe for one moment that we are justified in withdrawing the right of the suffrage from the members of the civil service, unless we at the same time exempt them from taxation; because I believe that it is just as tyrannical, just as wrong, to tax an individual without giving him the right to a vote, as it is to tax a country without giving it the right to representation. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to-day tried to draw a parallel between the members of the civil service and the judges of our country, saying that no judge felt that it was any derogation to his dignity that he was cut off from taking part in elections, that is to say, that he had not the suffrage, as an ordinary individual has. But the position of the two, Mr. Speaker, is altogether different. The judges occupy a position of the greatest eminence in the country. They are men in whom the people of the country place the utmost and most absolute faith; and I am happy to say, thank heaven, that in this country, as in England, politics have never interfered with the judgment of a judge of our superior courts, no matter to what party he may have belonged before he went on the bench. And so well is that understood by the public that even in the case of election trials I do not believe it ever occurs to the mind of either the petitioner or the defendant, or to the minds of the lawyers employed on either side, to consider if the judges before whom the petition is tried, belong either to the Conservative party or to the Reform party—or rather did belong before going on the bench. I speak positively on this point, so far as my own province of Manitoba and my old province of Ontario are concerned, and I have no doubt that the same rule applies to the other provinces of Canada. The civil servants are in altogether a different position. There is no chance of any application to upset an election, or anything of that kind,

coming before them. They are citizens like ourselves, and they have the same right as we have, so long as they pay their taxes, to go to the polls and record their votes for such candidates as they favour; and I was glad to hear the First Minister to-day state that, so far as that went, he was quite ready to grant them that privilege. But, Sir, I go further: I say that they have the right to use their tongues and such influence as they have, as free men, to support the cause of the party to which they belong, so long as they do not do so offensively: but if they do that, they at once take their official lives in their hands, and they cannot complain, if they are decapitated. Now, Sir, I am perfectly aware that the system which is in vogue, and has been in vogue as long as I can remember, has a good deal to do with the present unfortunate state in which the members of the civil service find themselves. My opinion has always been—I do not mention it now for the first time, when we are in the cold shades of Opposition, for, although I have never before had an opportunity to express my opinion on this subject in the House, I have often given utterance to it when speaking before public audiences—my opinion is that the sooner the present system is done away with and one adopted which will remove the patronage from the hands of the Government and members, the better it will be for Canada as a whole. The other evening my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), in speaking in this House, pointed out how much of the time of the members supporting the Government was taken up with applications for office, increases of salary, and other matters arising out of the exercise of this patronage. For my part, I can say that, during the three years that I was in this House before, when I was at home fully three-fourths of my time was occupied with applications for positions or something of that kind; and I have no doubt that my hon. friends on the other side, now that they are basking in the sunshine of power, will find that their constituents will be quite as pressing as mine were, and that they will no longer enjoy the ease and comfort which those who sit on the Opposition benches do. The members are but human, and when they are pressed in this way they at once try to shift the weight from their own shoulders to those of the Ministers. In that way, the Ministers, who have much more important things to think of than who is to be appointed door-keeper here or given a post office there, have their time taken up by applications of this kind, and I fear that before his term of office is over, we will find our hon. friend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) looking anything but the youthful personage he does to-day.

Of course, I perfectly understand that when a party has come into power, particularly after having been out for some time, as has been the case with our hon. friends opposite, it would be perfectly impossible for them to introduce a change, such as I suggest, immediately. As a matter of course, we are all human, and Reformers are quite as human as those who vote on the Conservative ticket, and after having been out so long, there will be numbers of men who think that they deserve, as they certainly very strongly desire, to have positions under the Government. These men will bring the strongest possible pressure to bear on the Government, and for a time it will undoubtedly be impossible for them, without risking their political lives—which I would not expect them to do—to attempt making any alterations in the present system; but I trust that as time goes on, they will take it into their consideration, and if they do, I assure them that they will have very strong support from this side of the House.

I am quite aware that my hon. friends do not desire or require any advice from me on this subject or any other, but on this occasion I am quite willing to play the part of the candid friend and give them advice without fee or reward or hope of reward. But without making a change of that sort, without making a radical change, but keeping the law as it is, it is in their power to so administer that law as to do away with the feeling of uneasiness which necessarily runs through the civil service at present, and I believe that a practical, a frank and fair avowal of what they will really do and what they consider active interference in politics, would have a most salutary effect on the minds of that service and enable many men, who are not only willing but anxious to do their work, to give their attention to it without having their minds disturbed by fears that their heads may drop into the basket before another sun rises. As I have said already, I acknowledge at once that there are certain actions on the part of members of the civil service which would justify their dismissal; and I quite agree in what was said by the hon. leader of the Government as to the fact of a Minister seeing a member of the civil service taking an offensive and improper part in an election being quite sufficient evidence to justify him in acting, without waiting for further evidence. As for myself, I know of no evidence that would convince me sooner than that of my own eyes. But in the case, which I ventured to mention a moment ago, and to which I called the attention of my hon. friend who sits opposite—the case of Mr. Baldwinson—I venture to point out that this is not a case where any member of the Government could know, by the use of his own eyes, that Mr. Baldwinson interfered in politics at all, and it is certainly a case where the fullest and fairest investigation ought to be applied, where the accused ought to know what is the charge made against him, and be given a chance to justify himself, if he can. If the reason of his dismissal is not on account of his political

attitude, if it is because the Government have come to the conclusion that they desire no more immigration from Iceland to the western portion of our country, I think it is only right that the people of the west should know that at once, because that is a matter which affects our interests most materially. And although personally I have no doubt that the real reason for his removal is on account of his political views, I should like to have some explanation or some declaration from the Government or some member of the Government on that point.

I may say, in speaking of the civil service, that in the position which I take as to their right to exercise the franchise and take a certain moderate part in the elections, I do not at all agree in the views expressed by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), the other evening, when he stated that it was perfectly right for a member of the civil service to vote and work hard for the Government of the day, though it would be highly improper for him to do the same thing in favour of the Opposition. I believe there is a principle in this matter, and that principle must apply equally to both sides. If it is right and proper for a member of the civil service to work for the Government of the day, if he belongs to that party, it is equally right and proper for him to work for the Opposition, if his political opinions lean to their side. It is perfectly true that the risk he runs may not be equally great, because a Government, I take it, will not remove a man for working strongly in their favour ; but if a turn of the tide takes place, if the parties change sides as they have done in the recent election, and those who were in power find themselves in Opposition, and those who sat on your left, Sir, find themselves suddenly removed to your right, the man who has interfered objectionally against the Opposition cannot complain if his head is taken off. But I think that, apart from anything like offensive opposition, our civil servants ought to be left as free as possible, more particularly as, if a different system be applied, more particularly indeed if such a system as my hon. friend from Cape Breton mentions becomes the rule, it will be found that the civil servants will have to go to the polls, trembling with the idea that, vote how they will, their positions will be in the balance and depend altogether on the success of one party or the other. It will turn them into veritable Vicars of Bray, ready to turn their coats as quickly as any party can change. That I do not consider will be in the interests of the country, particularly as at present, as was pointed out by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, our civil service stands, I think, as high as any civil service in the world, that of the mother country alone excepted ; and it is acknowledged that the English civil service is the best that has yet been seen on the face of the globe. I do not for a moment deny that there are black sheep in the civil service. I do not deny that as they number many hundreds and run up into the thousands, counting the outside service, and it would be unreasonable to imagine that you could get so many men together without having some that are not everything that they ought to be. But I believe that, taking them all round, they will compare favourably with the members of any other profession or calling in the land ; and it would be most regrettable, in the interests of the country, that any step should be taken which would lower their standard of honour and lessen the pride they feel in their offices, for if you once do that, you will obtain a different class of men, you will get men who go there simply for what they can make, with the idea of remaining for a time and then leaving. In fact, it would amount to very much the same thing as introducing the spoil system which prevails to the south of the line.

I trust that what I have said will have some weight with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). I know that he is a man inclined to give fair-play to all, and although a strong partisan, I have got great faith in his love of justice, and I feel sure that if he will throw aside for the time or allow to pass off the heat of the recent contest, which was certainly enough to stir most men out of their ordinary level, we can trust in his hands the fate of the civil service of this country. I would simply ask him to remember that in the west we have a number of men employed in the immigration service and in the Indian service, men who, for the most part have, so far as I know, no political leanings. Many of them, undoubtedly, are strong political partisans—I mean were strongly attached to their party before they took office ; how far they have worked since they took office, I do not know ; they have not worked in my constituency, and I cannot speak beyond that. But I ask the hon. gentleman to remember that these men cannot be removed to any very great extent without utterly upsetting the service. I am sure if he once looks into the question and considers how widespread would be the effects of removing them simply on account of political action when that action was not offensive, he will see to it that nothing shall be done which will trouble the mind of any man in the civil service who has attended to his duty and has only gone to the poll and voted as a citizen, and, possibly, worked quietly—and strongly, if you will—in favour of the candidate who supported the principles in which he believes.

When I rose I did not intend to say anything except in relation to the question of removals from the civil service. But the hon. gentleman who preceded me, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) turned his attention for some time to the question of reci-

procity. And it struck me very keenly that his references in that connection were not fair to the party to which I belong. The Conservative party, Sir, have never declared themselves against a fair reciprocity treaty. The reciprocity treaty which was in force between the United States and Canada from 1854 was carried by a Conservative Government. That treaty, we all know, was of inestimable benefit to this country, partly, in fact principally, because the circumstances were peculiar. While the treaty was in force the American war raged, which took men by hundreds of thousands from the fields of agriculture to the field of battle, and suddenly caused a demand for our grain, our cattle, our pork—in fact, for everything the farmer in Canada could produce. That treaty was terminated, not by the Conservative party, not by the Canadian Parliament, but by the United States, because, rightly or wrongly, they gained the impression that the people of this country unduly sympathized with the people of the south during the great civil war, and they thought that by taking away the privileges conferred by this treaty they would bring us to our knees and would make us ask them humbly to admit us as one or two states of the American union. But, Sir, when they did so, they altogether mistook the stuff of which Canadians are made. Instead of humbling us, it was a spur to us; it acted like the spur to a jaded horse. And so we found the Canadian people proceeding not to join the United States, but to unite the provinces which before had formed British North America, and so creating the Dominion of Canada. From that time forward several attempts were made by the Conservative party while in power to obtain a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States, but we found they would grant nothing except such a treaty as would give them all the profit and make our people simply hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans and for the employees who work in their factories. The consequence was that, in 1878, when the National Policy was introduced, the cry on the part of the Conservatives and their friends throughout Canada was not a cry against reciprocity, but: Reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariffs. In the meantime, I may mention that before the Conservatives came into power in 1878, and during those halcyon days, as they would be considered by my hon. friends on the other side, when the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was Prime Minister of Canada, an attempt was made to obtain a reciprocity treaty, and the Hon. George Brown, the most prominent Liberal of that time in Canada, I take it, was sent as one of the commissioners to Washington to negotiate a treaty. To a certain extent he met with success, but there was one barrier which he could not pass, one boundary which he would not cross, and that was that they would not agree to any treaty in the shape of reciprocity unless it contained a clause discriminating against the mother country. That Mr. Brown, being a good, loyal British subject, as, I am thankful to say, the Reformers in general are, just as Conservatives are, refused to sanction, and the consequence was that the treaty fell through. After that, it was well known that the Government was willing to meet any fair attempt to make a treaty of reciprocity, but that is a very different thing from what was offered. And an unrestricted offer of reciprocity is a very different thing from an offer of unrestricted reciprocity. So far as the leader of the Opposition's remarks about unrestricted reciprocity are concerned, which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce rather laughed at to-day, we know this—that whatever may have been the intention, whatever may have been said by the supporters of that policy on the Canadian side of the line, it was not in the power of Canada to form such a treaty herself. The treaty had to be made between Canada and the United States, and it mattered little what was proposed by Canadians unless their offer would be accepted when presented to the other party to the bargain. Now, Sir, the American speakers and the American writers, both in the papers and magazines of that country, not having the fear of the Canadian elector before their eyes, stated clearly what they understood by unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, call it which you will. They made no secret of it that the only thing they would listen to, the only terms they would grant, were based upon the idea of one tariff for Canada and the United States. What did that mean? They are a people of 65,000,000, we are a people of 5,000,000. When the question comes of framing a tariff between these two, would it not be framed by the 65,000,000 instead of the 5,000,000—would not that tariff be formed in Washington instead of Ottawa? And by it should we not have reduced ourselves exactly to the position the thirteen states were in at the time they rebelled against Great Britain—that of having taxation without representation. Besides that, it would have involved discrimination against the mother country. On that point many hon. gentlemen opposite tried to hedge while the fight was on; but my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce having the courage of his convictions, as I must say he always has, stated, not once or twice, but several times, that he did not conceal for a moment that if that treaty went through we would have to discriminate against the world, Great Britain included. That, Sir, was a position which the Conservative party never has taken, and I am thankful to say, never will take. We will never desert the mother country, one to which we are bound not only by bonds of interest but by ties of

sentiment, the country which has done so much for us, the country to which we look for our precedents, and the country to which we look for support in case we get into trouble with our neighbours.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, referring to the Hon. Edward Blake's speech to which the leader of the Opposition had drawn attention, said that when quoting that speech we ought to read the whole of it in order to see the terms in which he spoke of the position into which the conduct of the Tory party had reduced the country. But I submit, Sir, that Mr. Blake, when expressing his views as against the Tory party, and when giving those which conflict with those held by the Liberal party, occupied a totally different position. In the one case he is a friendly, in the other he is an adverse witness. It is no wonder that in that letter he told the people that the Tory party had been guilty of corruption, that they were ruining the country, and were fast bringing it down to a state of almost beggary. We had heard that from the hon. gentleman in this House and on public platforms for years before. But, Sir, it was something new to hear that hon. gentleman come out and declare openly over his own signature that the conduct of the party with which he had been allied so long, was such that he found it necessary to withdraw from active political life, because he believed that it would necessarily and naturally lead to annexation to the United States. In fact he felt this so strongly that he found it necessary to go on and explain that if the people of this country decided on joining their fortunes with the republic to the south of us, it would be better for them to enter into negotiations while their hands were free and unfettered by any treaty of this kind, and when they could make fair terms with that country, instead of waiting until we were tied hand and foot, and had to enter the union upon such terms as the Americans chose to offer. I think that my hon. friend is unfair in trying to show that Mr. Blake's statement as against the Conservative party ought to have as much weight as those portions of his letter in which he deals with unrestricted reciprocity. I am not going to detain the House longer, but before sitting down I would like to impress on you, Sir, and on the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches, the necessity that exists for giving some clear and definite statement as to what their position is to be with regard to public officials, how far these can go without fear of risking their necks, and when they may expect to be called to order, or to lose their positions, if they take a stand in favour of one or other of the political parties.

Mr. MACDONELL. I desire to make a few remarks in regard to the position of Mr. Baldwinson who was employed by the late Government as Icelandic Immigration Agent at Winnipeg. Primarily, and secondarily too, he was an active Conservative organizer among the Icelandic population of the province of Manitoba. In his work of organization he did not act simply in opposition to the local government of Manitoba, but he acted as an agent organizing against the Liberal party of the Dominion of Canada. .I am not aware that Mr. Baldwinson interfered actively in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, but I am reliably informed that he did interfere in another outside constituency of the province of Manitoba. He ran as a Conservative candidate in two local elections; and I may say he had succeeded, as Conservative organizer, in changing a large proportion of the Icelandic vote of the province of Manitoba from the Liberal to the Conservative party. Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to myself, I have been referred to by an hon. gentleman as an active partisan, and at the same time as a Liberal in the civil service of the province of Manitoba. I may say, Sir, that I have been a member of the civil service of the province of Manitoba, an employee of the Liberal government of that province, and while being such employee, I have taken an active part in the elections in that province, and I have also taken when opportunity offered, an active part in elections for the Dominion Parliament. Now, Sir, in doing that I understood perfectly well what the consequences to myself would be should there be a change of government, and I was prepared without any complaint, whatever, to accept such consequences. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of this Dominion, represented by the hon. Premier, will deal with this question firmly and fearlessly. I hope there will be no hesitation in dismissing from the civil service every individual member of that service who has taken an active part in elections. I hope that no commission will be appointed to inquire into the matter, as I think the friends and supporters of this Government are quite competent to give evidence touching offenders in this respect. I hope, Sir, that the hon. gentleman at the head of this Government will act firmly and fearlessly, and without regard to any opinions that may have been expressed from the opposite side of the House.

Mr. McNEILL. I have no intention of taking up the time of the House at any considerable length, nor was it my purpose to say a word in connection with this matter. But some of the remarks which have been made during the course of the debate have lead me to think that perhaps it would not be right for one to sit silent without expressing his views in reference to this matter. I have heard with extreme regret, I must confess, and with very great surprise, some of the remarks that have fallen from hon. gentlemen on the other side of

the House, for whom I have the greatest possible respect. I have heard my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries make some remarks which, if he really meant what he said, were a source of surprise, I am sure, not only to myself but to many other members of this House, when my hon. friend spoke of the time having come round when he would be able to wreak his revenge——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, my hon. friend did make use of that expression; I am glad to see he shakes his head, and that he did not really mean, as I gather from his demeanour now, what his words did seem to import. If my hon. friend did not mean what his words would seem to imply, I am only too glad to accept the suggestion he makes that such was not his meaning. I am afraid, however, that the spirit which those words would express, seems to pervade the breasts of a good many of those who sit behind him. I have been very sorry indeed to observe the rapturous applause with which every strong statement has been received by hon. gentlemen opposite, every statement from the Government benches which seemed to indicate that the intention was to lay a heavy hand upon civil servants who had supported the view which they thought was the right view, who had supported that party which they thought was best in the interests of this country. I agree with those who think that civil servants should be allowed to vote, and I agree with those who think that a civil servant being allowed to vote, he should also be allowed modestly and quietly to express his opinion in regard to the questions of the day. I agree also with the view that the civil servant who is an offensive partisan should not expect any mercy at the hands of those to whom he has been offensively opposed; but I do not believe that merely because a civil servant exercises the right of every free man to express his views on the public questions of the day, he should therefore be regarded as an offensive partisan. I do not think that even if a civil servant canvasses quietly against either of the political parties, he should thereby forfeit his position. I remember very well one of the first communications I ever had with Sir John Macdonald was in respect to this very matter. A gentleman in the constituency in which I resided at that time, had taken a leading part against the Conservative party: I would not be prepared to say that he had not been somewhat offensive in the part he had taken. There was a demand by some of our friends, who were a little impetuous, to secure his execution and dismissal. I wrote to Sir John Macdonald, and stated that I hoped he would not lend himself to anything of the kind, that I thought this gentleman had a right to his opinions, and I trusted he would not be dismissed from office because he supported the cause which he thought to be the right one in the best interests of the country. Sir John wrote back that I might be satisfied that his Government would not take any such course; and the gentleman was not interfered with. I remember, also, on the first occasion I contested my constituency, that I found a gentleman there who, occupying a position in the civil service, had opposed me in the election. I spoke to him on the subject, and, after a little fencing with the question, he said this to me, and I have never forgotten it: "Mr. McNeill, how can I forget what John Gillies has done for me?" Mr. Gillies was my opponent; and some hon. members will remember that gentleman as an hon. member in this House. Mr. Gillies had recommended this civil servant for the position he then held. When there was a chance and probability that his friend would lose the seat he held, this member of the civil service, in his gratitude, was prepared to do his best for the man who had been his benefactor. I did not think, when he said that to me, that the fact that he entertained such a feeling of gratitude in his breast was any reason why he would be a less valuable public servant. I did not think it any reason why I should endeavour to strike him down. On the contrary, I felt I could respect the man more than I did before, and I have done so; I ever after held that man in higher respect than I did before. I think it would be a lamentable misfortune if those members of the civil service who quietly and inoffensively have supported the cause which they believed to be the right cause, and supported the men they regarded as their benefactors, should now be knifed and guillotined. There are a great many men in this country, independent men, men who are not very strong partisans on one side or the other, men who are prepared to give hon. gentlemen opposite a fair trial, who are prepared to watch their course carefully and support them, if they do their duty honestly and faithfully in the interests of this country, who will be the first to condemn the course which has been shadowed forth in this House to-day, a course of wholesale decapitation of every civil servant who can be construed as having been an offensive partisan. Now, what is meant by an offensive partisan? If hon. gentlemen mean to say that offensive partisan means simply a man who is quietly exercising his franchise, not only by voting, but by expressing his opinions as to what is the best course to take in the interests of this country—if such men are to be sacrificed and to be beheaded, I venture to say that hon. gentlemen will find, without any doubt whatever, that they have done a great deal to lose the support of every independent man in this Dominion. I am quite sure that the people in this country are the last people in the world to approve

a course of that kind. I sincerely hope that hon. gentlemen do not intend to go so far as that, but on the contrary, they will take care that no man shall be interfered with, unless he has been in the strictest sense of the word an offensive partisan. If a civil servant uses his office for the purpose of improperly influencing voters, then I think, as a matter of course, he should be punished and discharged from his office; but if he simply discharges what is regarded to be the duty of every thinking man in the country, it would be most improper that he should be treated in the manner to which reference has been made here to-day. Furthermore, I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this point, which I think one of very great importance, that it would be a very great injustice to dismiss men from the civil service for a a course of conduct which the rules of the service do not say they should not pursue. Before such a drastic measure as that is adopted, there should be some rule framed, and the civil servant should be warned by a rule which he would violate at his peril. There is, however, no rule of any department of the service which prevents a civil servant exercising the same rights in this regard that any other citizen may exercise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Even being an offensive partisan.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking about common rules of fair-play. I say that there are exceptions to every general rule, and the exception is the case where the man has been offensive.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understood that the hon. gentleman was putting it upon the absence of rules.

Mr. McNEILL. I say in the absence of rules, but I say there are exceptions to every rule, and it is perfectly fair to say that that may be the exception. But then, what the hon. gentlemen want to do is to make it a universal rule, that a civil servant who without being offensive, simply and quietly supports the side he believes to be the right side shall be dismissed from office. I say that to do that, without there being any rule, would be a very great hardship and a very great injustice, and I sincerely hope that the Ministers of the Crown will consider carefully before they give effect to any such desire on the part of their supporters. I am quite sure that the two hon. gentlemen who sit immediately opposite me (Mr. Laurier and Mr. Davies), if they are left to the dictates of their own hearts and their own inclinations, would be of the last in this country—I may be wrong but I believe so—to be guilty of a harsh, or an unkind, or an ungenerous action. I must say, that I think such an action as that which has been shadowed forth here, would be harsh, unkind, ungenerous and unjust.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I want to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Marine, and I have no doubt he will do me the courtesy of answering it, as I think the debate arose largely out of the subject of the dismissal of Messrs. Noonan and Davies. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in replying to me took the position that in their case there was certain information within his own knowledge and therefore no reason for an inquiry. All I desire now to ask him is, whether he will inform the House what the facts were which led him to the opinion which he expressed, namely, that these men were known to have been active, violent, political partisans. When I questioned that, he stated: Many of these facts are known to myself. Now, as these men who have been dismissed have had no investigation, I trust the hon. gentleman will give me the particular facts upon which he formed the conclusion that their conduct was active and violent as political partisans.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have nothing to add to what I have already said on the subject, more especially as my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has a motion on the Order paper for all the papers in connection with that matter. Having put that motion there, I have no doubt he intends to discuss it more fully at a future date. The matter has gone beyond the reach of argument so far as I am concerned——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to argue. I merely wish to know if the hon. gentleman will give me the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—the matter has gone beyond the reach of argument for the reason that the hon. gentleman himself stated that which was within my own knowledge, that these people were his own committee men.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said I did not know that, but I believed it.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) alluded to the opinion of independent politicians in regard to this question of the civil servants. I was elected to this House as an Independent Liberal, and I may claim in some manner to express the views of persons who are not strict partisans. It seems to me that both sides of this House are agreed up to a certain point. They are agreed that every man who has a vote should have the right to cast that vote for whatever political party he thinks best. The Liberals are agreed to that and the Conservatives are agreed to it also. But the Conservatives go further, and say: that these men not only have the right to vote, but that they have a right to work for the cause they believe in. That is where the difference comes in. Let me point out to these hon. gentlemen opposite who have argued in that way, that

when they speak of the action of the officials of the Manitoba government, and of other provincial governments, they speak in terms of the strongest reprobation of just exactly such conduct on the part of the officials of these governments, as some Dominion officials have been guilty of, and whose action they condone. It seems to me that what would be right in the case of an official of the Dominion Government should certainly be right in the case of an official of the local government, and particularly so, when the action of an official of the local government is not in any way or in any sense under the control of this Government or of this Parliament. Let me go further and point out, that when these gentlemen opposite argue that officials of the civil service have a perfect right to canvass and work in the interests of a political party, they are arguing against themselves. For the moment they are in opposition, and the Liberal party is in office, and in the natural course of events from time to time the civil service as it exists to-day will become more and more Liberal in tendency. Therefore these gentlemen opposite are simply arguing, that when the next general election rolls around five years hence, the civil servants of the country shall be used as a weapon against them in that election. The gentlemen who have spoken on the Liberal side of the House have argued strongly on the other hand, that the civil servant shall have the right of a citizen to vote but not to take an active part in the elections, and that proposition I say, is in favour of the present opposition and not against it. It seems to me that for the sake of making a political point and a cry before the country, these gentlemen opposite are arguing against what is their own best political interests. Let me say further, from the standpoint of an Independent, that there is something more connected with the civil service than the mere question of whether a man votes Conservative or Liberal. There is the question of the necessity for the office; there is the question as to the efficiency with which the office is filled, and there is the question as to the trust that can be reposed by the Government or by the department in that official. These are questions that are to be discussed and considered and acted upon, just as much, and in fact ten times more so, than the question of the political opinions of an official. These gentlemen who are now raising a cry against what they are pleased to call the spoils system, are, it appears to me, trying to make a point with the country at large so as to protect unnecessary, inefficient and untrustworthy civil servants. That is apparently the object at which they aim, and that is what all this long debate is about. When the Liberal Government is attempting to reform the civil service, and to see to it that the country shall get value for the money paid to officials, this cry is raised by hon. gentlemen opposite to protect their friends who are not needed in the public service, and so the Reform Government who are doing the best they can in the interests of the country are held up as reprobates by those gentlemen and by their supporters. Speaking as an Independent, and as one who has nothing to say against the conduct of the civil servants in my constituency during the last election, I say that the people of Canada, so far as I know, voted in support of the new Government quite as much for the purpose of getting a reform in the civil service as on any other ground. They want the number of tax eaters in this country reduced, they want the burden of their taxation cut down, and they want the service rendered by these gentlemen to be better in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to tax the House with many words, but really I cannot allow to go unchallenged the remarks of the hon. gentleman who I think represents York (Mr. Foster). He has been travelling through so many constituencies of late that I had almost forgotten what constituency he belongs to. While he was in King's county we were able to keep track of him, and I also managed to follow him up in Queen's county the other day, which he has been talking about to-night. Now, for a gentleman such as he to come before a large assembly like this, and to tell them with hardly a smile on his face that no such thing existed in his party as he now denounces to be wrong in the Liberal party, is something which I cannot well understand. I took down some of his words. He said civil servants should be free to vote. I can imagine him now, as I saw him at The Narrows, in Queen's county, the other day, telling the people that they would be ruined if they elected the Hon. A. G. Blair, trying to make out that nothing good could come out of the Liberal party, that they were all corrupt. Was there freedom of speech then, when he declined to allow me the liberty of a British subject, to get up and defend Mr. Blair, whom he had attacked in his absence, as he has done here to-day? When the hon. gentleman said that the civil service should have every chance to vote, did he know that in King's county the railway men on the Intercolonial Railway were not allowed the freedom to vote, but that orders were sent there calling them away from their homes, so that they could not vote at their respective polls? When he said that postmasters were a superior class of men who gave their time and their ability to the service of the country and should have a right to vote, did he not remember that under the late Government certain postmasters had travelled night and day and paid money out on his behalf—nay, that they were called to account by him as to what they had done with the money? I can

name them, if necessary. I can take him to Belle Isle, and show that he dismissed the postmaster there, and put another man in his place. I can take him to Greenwich, where the lighthouse keeper was dismissed without any cause. I can take him to Millstrean or to English Settlement, where Mr. Gamblin, the fishery warden, was put out to make room for a friend of his. I can give other examples from King's county——

Mr. FOSTER. That is only three.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Only three? Do you want any more? I can give you the case of Mrs. Waters, then, if you like. She paid the hon. gentleman the greatest compliment in the world. She said she knew George; they had been boy and girl at school together; they had sat on the same bench together, and afterwards they had taught school together, and she vouched for his being a fine man. I have no doubt she was right, and she was rewarded for it. But it is not necessary to go into these matters, because we all know them down there. We know in our county how we have been handled. My hon. friend spoke of officials of the local government of Ontario taking part in the elections. Let him think of his own county. I can fancy now that I see the great big hand-bills on the walls, announcing that the Hon. George E. Foster, then Minister of Finance, and the Hon. Mr. Pugsley would address the convention called to select a Liberal-Conservative candidate. Who was Mr. Pugsley? I do not say anything derogatory to him; but he was the law clerk of the local House, drawing a salary of $1,000 a year; and yet he was there with Mr. Foster trying to use what influence he could upon the electorate of King's in the hon. gentleman's favour. Mr. Pugsley spoke for him at Hampton, and ran as a candidate of his party; but it was not long until he came to repudiate the hon. gentleman and ran as an independent, because he found that he could get nothing under the umbra or shade of Mr. Foster of King's county. We know that shade down there. The hon. gentleman spoke of my hon. friend as holding a position under the local government of Ontario; and yet he brought out as a candidate, Mr. Morton, Judge of Probate, and asked the people to accept him, though he, was at that very time Judge of Probate, he never resigned that position, and he is Judge of Probate to-day. All these things, I think, go to show that Mr. Foster is not consistent in the position he takes. We know him down there, and we make due allowance. I myself have sometimes, like himself, moments of weakness, and sometimes my health is bad; and when I am in that state, perhaps I do not make as correct statements as I should if I were in a good state of health and strength. I might give other instances. I know in the Queen's and Sunbury election that my hon. friend trotted off one morning to see a large lumber dealer in the county of York in order to get his support. There was a joyous feeling among his friends in St. John at the prospect. If that gentleman would come out for him, they had the county sure. But it is doubtful if they got the gentleman, and I think I may fairly say that they will not when the constituency of York is opened up again, as it will be very shortly; because I can undertake to say for myself, at any rate, that there will be no sawing-off, no swapping. We must get to the bottom of this thing. We must see whether New Brunswick is under the control of the Hon. A. G. Blair or under the control of Mr. Foster.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I apologize, Sir. It is so long since the hon. member drove me out of King's that I have perhaps forgotten some parliamentary expressions. This thing has got to be fought out, and my hon. friend will perhaps find out then that the same power that was wielded for him in York county before will be turned against him then. But be that as it may, we cannot and will not in our province allow public servants to go about again and insult the best friends of the Liberal party in New Brunswick. A postal clerk was actually sent into my county to work openly against me and for the Conservative party—nay, in the election before he used money and bribed the people in broad daylight, and challenged them afterwards, so that they could not vote either legitimately or illegitimately. The hon. member for York must remember that the people of New Brunswick are a discriminating people. They have discriminated in his case, and they will discriminate in the case of the civil servants. There is no doubt that it would be improper to do anything that is wrong or hard towards a civil servant who has merely voted without doing more. I trust that the Government will see that those who have done some of the most outrageous acts in our province—and doubtless the same has been the case elsewhere—shall be replaced by some other gentlemen, notwithstanding the attempt that has been made to assist in keeping them in office. I have not the least doubt that we shall see hon. members of the House coming down there and saying: We have assisted you, and now it is your turn in these by-elections to rally all your friends to help to put us in power. We stood by you when you were out of power, by our endeavours we compelled the Government of the day to keep you there, and now that you have had all the benefit of the time they have been in office, and we have an election coming along, we want you to use all your influence to get us back, who put you there. I do not believe that any hon. gentleman on either side desires to do any injustice, but surely the hon. First Minister and members of the Govefnment must be allowed to use their own judgment without being criticised so severely, when really

they have done nothing to merit such criticism, because the fact that the Minister of Public Works has been able to reduce his staff and do the work of his department at a great saving to the people, will gain for him credit all through the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, taking it for granted that the debate on the general policy and practice of the Government with reference to the civil service has closed, I wish to make a few remarks on another subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to speak on the same question, but wish to make a few remarks on the Estimates.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is the same question that is before the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend would rather I should do so after we go into Committee of Supply, I have no objection.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go into the items, I desire to make a few remarks with reference to the general character of the Estimates, and to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance a few questions with regard to them. In the first place, the statement was made that the Estimates brought down are those which were prepared by myself and presented to the House by the late Government, with some few trifling exceptions. The reason why that statement was made was not very clear; but what I wish to say is this, that, in the first place, it will be found, on looking at the column of Estimates for 1895-96, that they differ in a very material way from the column as presented by myself a few months ago. They are greater than the items in the column presented in the Estimates that I laid upon the Table. What I want to call the attention of the House to is, that the amount of the Estimates brought down by my hon. friend, as compared with those that were brought down by me, does not show any great disparity, are in fact about equal. The column of comparison of the preceding year simply includes the main Estimates and what we may call the main Supplementary Estimates; but in the Estimates my hon. friend has brought down this year, coming six months later or so, he is enabled to place in the column for 1895-96 not only the main Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates, but the Supplementary Estimates which are generally brought down for the current year, and in no preceding Estimates brought down can such a comparison as that be made. The comparison therefore, between the Estimates for 1895-96 and the hon. gentleman's, is more favourable to my hon. friend for that reason, and I just want to make that point clear to the House. While my hon. friend was perfectly right in including all the Estimates in the column for 1895-96, yet the circumstances of the case give him the appearance of advantage as regards the sum he has brought down, compared with the sum I brought down, as compared, in their turn, with previous years. That, however, is not a fault I am finding with my hon. friend, but I simply wish to mention the fact, so that the House may have that matter within its purview. I wish also to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the Estimates he has brought down, and which do not include the Supplementary Estimates which he has promised the House, and do not include the Supplementary Estimates which will be brought down next year for the cost of this session, are yet very high. They are, in round numbers, on consolidated account, $38,222,537. I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, that when my hon. friend brings down these Estimates, which are not the full Estimates, he has brought down an Estimate greater than any preceding year, with the exception of the Estimate that I brought down last March, and but a very little less than that—some few thousands of dollars—and this Estimate, as it stands to-day, being simply the main Estimate, is thirty-eight and a quarter million dollars.

Now, the hon. gentleman has promised that there will be Supplementary Estimates for this year. When these are added, that sum will be increased. There is also not a shadow of doubt that next session there will necessarily be some Supplementary Estimates for the current year, and these will have to be added; so that the total Estimate of my hon. friend, be he as careful as he can, after he has brought down the full Estimates for the year, cannot be less than forty-one million dollars on consolidated fund account—the highest Estimate that ever has been placed before this House. That is emphasized by the remark which was made by the independent member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He votes for the Liberals, and a great many of his supporters voted for the Liberal Government because they want the expenditure reduced, and the number of employees reduced. Well, I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he will look in vain in the Estimates brought down by my hon. friend to see any reduction in the public expenditure and in the estimated expenditure for the employees and officers of the Government. Under the one Estimate that was brought down, with the two to follow, there is but the slightest reduction on the Estimate made in March last. When these are brought down, there is not the shadow of a doubt that they will be millions of dollars more than ever before brought down. Now, if my hon. friend supported the Liberal party with the idea that

the Estimates were to be reduced and that the service of the country was not to cost so much, that civil servants were to be cut down my hon. friend has made his first mistake, if it be his first, in that respect. When we come to the items, what do we find? What charge has been made against the late Government more frequently or urged more strongly or more persistently than this—that we had on this Hill at Ottawa and scattered throughout the towns and counties of the Dominion a vast horde of useless public officials, who were stumbling over each other, who had not work enough to do and whose salaries and expenses the hard-working people of the country were taxed to pay. Well, Sir, this new Government has gone back upon its pretensions of eighteen years. Where is my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). It is a pity he is not in the House just now. The keenest critic the hon. Minister of Finance must expect during the passage of these Estimates is surely the hon. member for North Wellington. Which of us has forgotten how this side of the House resounded with his denunciation of the waste of money upon these useless employees. Would you believe it, Sir, the amount brought down by this Government for civil government is $1,200,000, that is out of consolidated fund and not taking into consideration the statutory amount, and this taking the main Estimates only, and without the supplementaries for the year and a second supplementary which are both still to follow. But I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to another fact. The practice has been uniform since I entered this House that these main Estimates must include the main ordinary expenses of the country, which are foreseen and known, while the supplementaries take in what you may call extraordinary services, a large proportion of which are public works, new expenditures and so on. Now, did not the hon. Minister of Finance know that in the financial year 1896-97 he had to estimate for two sessions of Parliament? There is the session now in progress and the session that the leader of the Government has promised shall take place early in 1897. Both of these are foreseen, but only one of them is provided for. Why is it? Is it in order to make this first appearance of the Estimates a little less awful and terrifying to the hon. member for North Wellington and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who came in with such high anticipations of levelling down. The amount which should have been added for the other session of Parliament is about $600,000. And if that were added to the Estimates already brought down, the amount to be voted from consolidated fund would be $38,825,787, which is much more than the Estimate brought down by myself last year. And yet we must remember that neither of the Supplementary Estimates has yet been brought down. How often have we heard the changes rung on the declaration that this amount of money—aye, that $36,000,000—was altogether too much to spend?

How often has the elector been reminded of the halcyon days of Mr. Mackenzie when $22,000,000 was enough for the current expenses of the country, with the argument plainly implied: Bring us back to power and we will bring you back those good old times. No one ever believed them; no one ever thought they would carry out that implied promise; but a large proportion of the people thought that the expenditures of the country would be reduced below those of the Conservative Administration for the last six or seven years. But they are not. Are we face to face with broken pledges again? Have hon. gentlemen again run up against the difficulty of carrying out when in power the pledges made in Opposition? Are they taking the insidious and immoral advice of an evening paper, which is now supporting the Government, which intimates that it makes all the difference whether the people are in power or out of power with reference to the promises they have made? The present leader of the Government pledged himself to certain things with reference to the expenditures. What were they. I will read one. In the "Globe" of August 20th, 1894, is a report of his speech delivered at Brantford. After going into the enormous expenditure and after speaking of the great amount spent for the civil service, and the low expenditure under Mr. Mackenzie, the hon. gentleman said:

> Do you imagine that there is any justification for this? The Conservatives tell us that there is a justification. The population has increased, they say. Oh, yes, it has increased nine per cent; but the expenditure has increased 100 per cent. There can be no justification for such an expenditure when, as has been stated, the great bulk is corrupt expenditure. Moreover, they tell us that if we were in power we could not retrench and economize. But I don't believe that it would be a very difficult task. (Hear, hear). It would not be a very difficult task to retrench to the extent of one, two, three, and Mr. Mills told his constituents a few days ago that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

The leader of his party, asking to be returned to power and criticising his opponents on the ground of their expenditure, pledges himself that one, two, three millions at least can be taken off the public expenditure, and, if we are to believe Mr. Mills, four millions could be taken off. Now that is not an isolated statement of the hon. gentleman. In the city of Toronto he made about the same statement, according to the report of the "Globe," which is as follows:—

> Has the expenditure gone down? No, it has gone up. It was two, three five, ten millions and more, until it is now $38,000,000. And the Conservatives do not shrink from it, but swallow it all. If we come into power we will fol-

low the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that although we may not be able to bring the expenditures back to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three million dollars a year.

If ever there was a case in which a persistent canvass was made against a party on the ground of large expenditure, if ever there was a case where the responsible leader of a party, now the equally responsible leader of a Government, declared in plain terms that reductions should be made, the present is that case. And yet he sits in this House to-day, and sits in Council before he comes to the House and deliberately authorizes his Minister of Finance to come with an expenditure estimated at $38,828,000—if the extra session of Parliament had been put in—of thirty-eight and a quarter millions without considering that, and the Supplementary Estimates yet to come. What are we to think of these hon. gentlemen? Must we not think that they have lost respect for pledges and promises? Why, Sir, the very essence of parliamentary government is that the party out of power shall be distinct and positive with reference to its great lines of policy and of administration. How else can the electorate judge between the two parties? The electorate took the statements of the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, that the expenditure would be reduced $3,000,000 and perhaps $5,000,000. They saw it was $38,000,000 under our Administration, and the electorate said, On those two statements of the case we will put the Liberals in and save three millions at least per year in expenditure. Now, the very first year they come down with a larger amount than $38,000,000, with the enormous sum in their first estimate of $38,250,000, or with an extra session of Parliament, with $38,800,000. Now, I think it is well that that statement should be made to the House and to the country. I want to ask my hon. friend one thing else. Will it be made an excuse of hon. gentlemen opposite that they are simply laying before the House the Estimates that were laid down by the preceding Government? Imitation is said to be the sincerest form of flattery, but hon. gentlemen cannot hide behind that flimsy excuse. They detailed their position, and their antagonism to our increase of expenditures and our scale of expenditures. They made that pledge I have read. They cannot justify themselves now by saying: Oh, you expended so much, because the whole force of their argument was: You expended so much, and we are going to expend three millions less. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is here, I am sorry he was not here before. Does not my hon. friend from North Wellington know how, on this side of the House, right up in that seat, he thundered against this expenditure of $38,000,000 a year? Does my hon. friend know that this Finance Minister has put down in his first estimate $38,250,000? The hon. gentleman did not hear me read this statement of his leader.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read it again.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I will read it again for the benefit of my hon. friend. This is what Mr. Laurier said at Brantford:

> Do you imagine that there is any justification for this? The Conservatives tell us that there is a justification. The population has increased, they say. Oh, yes, it has increased nine per cent; but the expenditure has increased 100 per cent. There can be no justification for such an expenditure when, as has been stated, the great bulk is a corrupt expenditure. Moreover, they tell us that if we were in power we could not retrench and economize. But I don't believe that it would be a very difficult task. (Hear, hear). It would not be a very difficult task to retrench to the extent of one, two, three, and Mr. Mills told his constituents a few days ago that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

And in Toronto I must inform the hon. member for North Wellington, that he made the same explicit and positive statement. Now, what will my hon. friend from North Wellington do about this? What will the party who has thundered in the very same tones, if not so persistently as my hon. friend, on this same line—what will they say? Before I leave that point I want to ask the Minister of Finance another question. He asks this House first for $38,200,000. Then he must make his estimate for the next session of Parliament, and with the Supplementary Estimates still promised—I want to ask my hon. friend what is the state of the finances to-day, and how is he going to meet the expenditure which is contemplated in that estimate of $38,000,000 and more. The very first essence of any kind of good finance is that when estimates are being prepared and expenditures are being based, there must be considered at the same time ways and means for raising sufficient funds to pay those expenditures. But my hon. friend tells us that we are not to go into ways and means this year. My estimate last year was based on a probable income from receipts of $37,000,000. Up to 20th August, 1896, I find by the return my hon. friend has put in my hands, that they were $36,500,000. It cannot be possible that they will exceed the estimate I made, that is, the income for the year just past cannot exceed $37,000,000. Has my hon. friend any point of view to give us which would strengthen the opinion that in the current year, with no added taxes, and under the condition of things as they are, we will be able to raise more than $37,000,000? If not, is he going to ask the House to empower him and his Government to spend some $41,000,000 on consolidated fund, when he cannot reasonably expect more than $37,000,000 from the receipts of the year? Surely he is not going to proceed upon that system of finance; surely he must satisfy this House, before he asks us to place that sum of money in his hands, that by some means

to be considered he can fairly meet that expenditure. The expenditure actually made hardly ever comes up to the expenditure that is estimated; it may exceed it, but the general rule under careful administration is that it will not exceed it. But my hon. friend must recollect that he is going to expend over forty million dollars on consolidated fund, and that he cannot show, unless the vision has broadened and the condition of affairs has so ameliorated as to make his prospects of income greater—he cannot show by the ways and means at present at the disposal of the Government, that that expenditure can be met. Now, those are points upon which it seems to me my hon. friend ought to satisfy this House before we proceed in detail with the Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a word in reply to the late Finance Minister. He is evidently going to develop into a very minute and pointed critic in the matter of examining the Estimates. No doubt the hon. gentleman, from the experience he has had, is admirably fitted to discharge that particular duty. He has mentioned my name as one who took an active part in advocating reductions in past years. I did so, and I am prepared to do so now, and I intend to do so. But my hon. friend must remember that the Government of the day cannot possibly make the reductions all at once that we earnestly hope they will be able to make, that we predicted we would make if the Reform Government was asked to occupy the Treasury benches. We believe considerable reduction can be made in the salaries of civil servants. But no sooner does the Minister of Public Works make a move in that direction than he is pounced upon by the whole Conservative press, and it is declared that he had adopted the use of the guillotine in order to behead political civil servants and turn them out of office. When we make a move in the direction of cutting down the public expenditure, immediately the Government is assailed by the Conservatives for having done so. Hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware that members of the civil service are employees appointed by themselves. They have incurred the expense to the country. Those officers have to be paid, and until the present Government can make a thorough and exhaustive investigation and effect reductions, which I honestly hope and believe they will be able to carry out, the salaries of those officials have to be paid. Do hon. gentlemen opposite expect the Government to be able without any investigation to dismiss a number of men? Why, we spent the whole afternoon listening to imploring appeals from hon. gentlemen opposite to deal very tenderly and carefully with the civil servants. I think such is the intention. I believe, however, that, after careful and thorough investigation has been made, very considerable reductions can and will be made. The Government is committed to that principle, and I believe it will be carried out; but the Government cannot carry it out themselves until they make investigation into the whole condition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is finding fault with his own Estimates. He declared the necessity that those Estimates should be voted, that those Estimates were necessary, and he sought, last session, to have the House consent to vote them. While the present Government is asking the House to vote these Estimates, it is in the expectation and belief that at the end of the year they will have found it unnecessary to expend all the money granted by Parliament. What has been the experience of the country as regards hon. gentlemen opposite? Every year, not only was the amount voted expended, but more money was required. We hope, under the present regime that a different condition of things will obtain, that economy will be practised, and hon. gentlemen opposite will have to sit comfortably and quietly in the seats they now occupy, and give the Government an opportunity to put in practice those principles which we declared we were prepared to carry out, and which we are going to make an honest effort to carry into effect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The observations addressed to the House by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) render it almost unnecessary that I should say anything in reply to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster); but I can offer him, at least, very sincere sympathy for the very unhappy position in which he is now placed, in being obliged to attack his own Estimates submitted to Parliament. We thought we were going to meet the position of the hon. gentleman and put him in an amiable mood by bringing down Estimates which he himself had prepared. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, that if we had brought down those Estimates, accompanied by an announcement that we expected to expend that money and effect no saving, then, undoubtedly, the hon. gentleman might have had good cause for complaint; but the hon. gentleman will remember that, in bringing down the Estimates, I made the statement—he may call it a confession, if he will—that we had not been long enough in office to make ourselves familiar with all the details of the departments, and we paid him the compliment that, within reasonable limits, the Estimates submitted by him would be accepted as indicating the needs of the public service; but we accepted them with the distinct understanding that so soon as the session closed there would be an investigation made of the public departments. We do hope to effect some savings, even within the present fiscal year. The hon. gentleman is very much alarmed because the Estimates are for the sum of $38,225,000. But his own Estimates amounted to $38,308,000,

and in order to indicate our desire for economy, we have at the beginning asked for a less sum than the hon. gentleman asked from Parliament. But the hon. gentleman appears to think that these are large Estimates. He prophesies, as readily as he did on the day of the election in Queen's and Sunbury, that we are to submit Estimates to the amount of $41,000,000; and then he wants to know where all this money is to come from. I am not prepared to admit that any hon. gentleman has a right to treat the Estimates for the coming year as amounting to $41,000,000; it will be quite time to do so when we submit Estimates for that sum, and then it will be time to hold us responsible for them. Let me venture to say this, that even if the Government have to bring down Supplementary Estimates for a considerable amount, we shall be able, with some confidence, to enter into comparisons, and if hon. gentlemen opposite have been able to pay us the compliment that, in the first step as regards our Estimates there is an apparent advantage in our favour, I hope this credit will be much larger when our Supplementary Estimates are compared with those which would necessarily have been submitted by hon. gentlemen opposite to carry out the promises made by them on the hustings throughout the Dominion. I venture to say that if the hon. member for York had been so fortunate as to return to this House as Finance Minister, and had brought down the Estimates, in order to fulfil the obligations which his friends undertook to assume throughout the Dominion, he would not have had Estimates amounting to $41,000,000, but the amount would have been nearer $50,000,000. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) wishes to know where we will get the money. I will take him into my confidence, and I will tell him that we will get $38,225,000 from the same sources he would have obtained $38,308,000. Our financial resources are just the same; the tariff remains unchanged, the whole fiscal policy remains for the present the same. Hon. gentlemen had the right to assume that, if out of the various measures directed to the raising of revenue, the hon. gentleman would be able to raise $38,308,000, we would be able to obtain $38,225,000. I fail to see where there is any cause for alarm. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks we should turn out members of the civil service at once; but if we were to attempt to economize immediately in that direction, what would become of all the agitation today on the question of dismissals? Hon. members are asking for economy in the civil service, and at the same time they are arraigning the conduct of the Government for dismissing two or three members of the service. My firm belief, from what I have heard, and to some extent from what I have seen here, is that the civil service of Canada is overmanned, and, while I am not prepared at the present time to promise large reductions, I hope that when the current year is closed, and when I am able to bring the result before Parliament, it will appear that we have not needed all the money which Parliament has appropriated, but that we have been able to effect economy. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has complained that we did not introduce estimates of expenditure for two sessions of Parliament. I do not see any good reason for that criticism. We have not had an opportunity of understanding or estimating properly what this session of Parliament is likely to cost. We had cherished the hope that this would be a very brief session; there seems no good reason or necessity why it should be a long session. I can quite understand that if we were adopting a new policy, if we were proposing new measures and introducing subjects open to debate, hon. gentlemen could argue that there was reason for a long session; but as the Government announced at the beginning of the session that they would not propose any legislation beyond granting of supplies, and have not propounded any policy which could be challenged in the House, I fail to see what need there is of a protracted session. We had hoped and believed that a very short and inexpensive session would have been secured and simply the Estimates passed. If, by the action of hon. gentlemen opposite, this is made a protracted and expensive session, we shall have to provide the expenses of a full session of Parliament. But, if we are to realize the expectations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and are going to spend $41,000,000, and only going to raise $37,000,000, at least I shall have a very illustrious precedent for the deficit, for I believe my hon. friend in one year had a deficit of almost exactly the sum which is represented by the difference between those two amounts. I do not desire to enlarge upon the question. The hon. gentleman was informed at the beginning that the Government were not to go into the details of these estimates as fully as the hon. gentleman and his colleagues would have been able to do; but that so far as we have an opportunity of investigating them, we were in favour of making reductions. So, we ask the House to accept these Estimates with the distinct understanding that every effort will be made by us to bring about a reduction, and I have strong hope that our effort will not be a failure.

Mr. FOSTER. One word or two in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), and I will take his last remark first. He says, that if he receives $41,000,000 from the House and only gets $37,000,000 from Ways and Means, it will leave a deficit of $4,000,000, which will be about equal to the deficit which I myself had the year before last. The difference between the hon. gentleman and myself is this: that the deficit of $4,000,000 the year before last was off-set to the country by $4,000,000 of reduced taxa-

tion on sugar alone. If my hon. friend will come down with a measure which will take three or four millions taxation off the people, we will forgive him for his deficit. The hon. gentleman also tried to get out of underestimating for the full legislative expenses, by saying that he hoped this would be a brief session. How brief did the hon. gentleman hope it would be? The hon. gentleman did not suppose that the country after a general election, was to send up its representatives here to simply vote its Estimates en bloc, and allow the Government what time they pleased for maturing their measures of policy which they had promised to hand, without giving them any hint as to the principle on which they would proceed. If the hon. gentleman did not expect a session of less than one month, let me tell him that the larger part of the expenses of the session is mainly that which is fixed by law, namely, the indemnity for members, "Hansard," the publication of papers, and the salaries of the temporary officers of the House. Therefore, his excuse with reference to that matter is not very strong. My hon. friend has given the very best reason why we should not vote him these Estimates, and I will tell the House what it is. Did you ever hear a Minister of Finance come down to a House of Commons, which holds its hands closely on the purse strings, and say to it: give me $38,200,000. I do not think I will be able to spend it all but then give it to me. No, it is too much of a temptation to put in the way of my hon. friend. But, I will make a suggestion. The Finance Minister and the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) are going to join heads together, and see where they can reduce the expenditure. Very well, we will be called early next year. You need not ask for $38,200,000 and take all the temptation. You can just ask for a smaller sum and you can look into it in the meantime, and if you are not successful in making your reduction, then next January or February you can bring down your Supplementary Estimates and the House will see what it will do with you. My hon. friend has given the best reason in the world why we should not vote that inordinate sum of money. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) says that we are inconsistent in growling for two days about dismissals, and then in growling to-night again because the civil service reductions are not made. No member on this side of the House has growled, and never will growl, because of the dismissal of useless and unnecessary officials. What we were arguing about is this: That it was proposed to dismiss present officials and put others in their place, and the whole point of our criticism was on the principle which should guide in dismissing and filling up these vacancies. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) took refuge in what I told the House he certainly would. He tries to shelter himself behind the Estimates of the late Government. He cannot do that because the whole gist of the argument and the canvas of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the pledged statement of their leader was: Not that they would expend as much as we did and find their excuse in our expenditure, but that they would expend three or four millions less. The hon. gentleman must not plead what we proposed to do, as justification for their doing the same, while their whole political propaganda has been directed against our extra expenditure, and has been aided by their promise that their expenditure would be some millions less. I commend to my hon. friend the suggestions, that as he does not think he will use all this money and hopes to economize, that the House will meet again early in the coming winter and he need not ask all the money which he now does. It is a terrible temptation to give it to him, especially when my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) is behind him with that cloud of witnesses who are making their way here, asking for what they have not had for the last 18 years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to take the Militia Estimates first, and I will state the reason why. The delay in the passing of the supplies is embarrassing to more than one service, but there is special reason why we should take Militia Estimates now, and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen will agree with me. The camps are to be held. I believe they are to commence next week and it is highly important that the Militia Department should provide for the payment of their men. I propose that we should take that first.

Mr. FOSTER. I would have no objection to my hon. friend taking that portion of the militia estimate which is necessary for the field drill, but as he knows these Estimates are generally taken up in their order, and we have some little consideration to give to them. If that is what my hon. friend wishes I have no objection at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will accept the suggestion and take that particular item.

Militia Field Drill..... $446,500

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend give us a full explanation as to what he proposes to do with this amount.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The House is aware that there was no drill in camp for the rural battalions last year at all, and that previous to that time the custom was to drill each alternate year. At the present moment a number of battalions have not been turned out to drill for two years, and this will be the third year if they are not sent into camp now. It was the understood policy of the department under the late Government, that there should be a full drill this year. The battalions throughout the Dominion were expecting this, and

I felt that it would be a serious blow to the militia service if that idea were not carried out. A general order has been issued for camps to be held at London, Niagara, Kingston, Laprairie, St. John's, P.Q., Point Lévis, Sussex, N.B., and Aldershot, N.S. Two of the camps are to be held, beginning on the 8th of September; the most of them on the 15th of September, and one of them as late as the 22nd of September. For the camp which is to be held on the 8th of September the money will be required within a very short time, and I have been urging upon the Finance Minister the importance of ascertaining the view of the House, as to whether these Estimates are to be allowed to go through in time for the camp, otherwise the camps will have to be cancelled or further postponed. Everybody knows that it would be impossible to hold the camps at a later date than that which we have fixed. After the postponement of the date of the meeting of Parliament, the date at which the camps were to be held was postponed, and the dates have now been put at the very latest periods possible. Consequently, I hope that the House will grant this particular vote.

Mr. TISDALE. Is this amount supposed to cover next year's drill as well as this year's ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It covers the estimate for the current year. Some of the battalions elected not to go into camp until next June. This whole amount will not be used this autumn, it is true; but it will be used before the 1st July next, in all probability. It is the exact amount estimated by the hon. gentleman himself, or by whomsoever was in office at the time these Estimates were made up.

Mr. TISDALE. Is it intended to drill the whole force—artillery, infantry and cavalry? This Estimate was not made up while I had the honour of presiding over the department. Whatever estimates were made had been made previously, so that I had not the opportunity of examining them; and I am asking these questions more particularly for the information of the force. Do I understand that this amount will be sufficient to drill all the organized force in all the different arms, or only a certain number ? As I understand, it will be sufficient to drill all those in June who are not drilled this year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My understanding is that as there was no drill at all last year, it is intended to drill the whole force this year; and this estimate is expected to be sufficient to cover the drill of the whole force within the present year.

Mr. TISDALE. If that is the case, has the hon. gentleman arrived at any policy for next year, or as to whether he proposes for the future to drill the whole force every year or not ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a question of policy, to be decided later on. It has not been considered, but it is the intention and expectation that the sum of money now asked for will be sufficient to drill the whole force either this autumn or next June.

Mr. TISDALE. Is the hon. gentleman able to state the number of men ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The whole force is to be drilled, but I am not really able to give the hon. gentleman the number of men. The militia list, I presume, contains that information. The statement which has been prepared for me does not give the number.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The statement must be very incomplete. We are asked to spend half a million, and the very first question that occurs to one is the number of men who are to be drilled. As I understand, it has only lately been proposed to drill the whole militia force; and now that the hon. gentleman has very properly asked for the money necessary for that purpose, it seems to me that information should have been given to him, so that he could have explained to the committee exactly the number of men to be drilled.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The increase is $346,500. Speaking merely from recollection, I believe that when I occupied the position which the hon. gentleman now does, the number of men in the annual drill was between 21,000 and 23,000 men. The hon. gentleman should be able to tell the committee how many men are going to be drilled for that increase. I do not think that even with that increased amount of money he contemplates drilling the whole force. I do not think that amount would cover it. But if the hon. gentleman will let me make a suggestion, I think he could very easily ascertain from the department the number of men who are going to be drilled for that amount of money, and that would give a very fair means of ascertaining exactly what his policy is.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken, who presided over this departemnt so long and so well, must remember that only about half the force was in the habit of drilling. That has been the rule. I was at camp myself for many years, and I remember that the regiment to which I belonged went into camp in alternate years. Consequently, the provision made was only for about half the force. This year I understood the provision to be made for the whole force.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think that amount will cover it.

Mr. TISDALE. No one desires to delay the passing of this particular item, but we ought to have some more definite information, not only to avoid the appearance of looseness in voting large sums, but that the militia force may be assured that the provision is sufficient for the number to be called out. I understand that the previous Government intended that a sufficient amount of money should be voted to drill the whole force. If the hon. gentleman will give us the information as to the numbers to be drilled, there will be no delay in passing the item.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In the Estimates which were presented in March last, it is especially stated that all the garrison artillery, city infantry battalions, and independent companies were to be drilled at the cost of $85,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There were the city forces.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The whole of the particular forces I have mentioned, amounting to six or seven thousand men. In the next item it is expressly declared that all the cavalry corps, field batteries, engineers, and all the rural infantry corps were to be drilled. It is quite evident the hon. gentleman desired to include the whole force, and the sum asked for amounts to about $322,000. I think the hon. gentleman will find that that will drill very close on 30,000 men.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The force is 38,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Nominally, but nobody knows better than the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) that it is impossible to muster more than 75 per cent. The provision which the late Government made evidently contemplated drilling all which could be brought forward, which would amount to about 30,000 men.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that the force has been increased. The battalions have been increased and so have the number of men composing them. I think that the drilling force to-day is much larger than it was in my time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is true of the city forces, but is it true of the rural ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think so. The cavalry especially has been increased. The new drill book requires squadron drill instead of ordinary troop drill.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. All I wanted to point out is that that is the calculation made by the late Government. It is quite clear that they contemplated drilling all the forces, and they concluded that $322,000, plus of course the charges for rations and transport, will be sufficient. My hon. friend was a member of the Cabinet that brought down the Estimates which I have in my hands.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend give us some information of the system upon which the rations, forage and supplies are secured ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The system of calling for tenders will be followed, when possible, in every instance.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no desire to embarrass my hon. friend, but he will recollect that he is asking us to vote nearly half a million dollars and does not appear to have much information at his command. It is important to know whether this is really going to drill the whole rural force, and if not, it is for the House to consider whether an amount shall be added to drill the whole force.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These are precisely the Estimates which the hon. gentleman asked us to vote last winter, and which were, no doubt prepared upon the advice of the officers of the department. I am informed by the officer of the department that it is the intention—and it is so stated here in the published Estimates which the hon. gentleman himself gave to the House—to drill the whole force, for the reason that there was no drill in camp last year, and that before that time it was the custom to drill half the force in alternate years. The hon. gentleman wants to know exactly how many men there are. The former Minister says he thinks the force has been considerably increased. I think he is correct in the matter of the cavalry in saying there has been an increase. In the permanent force there has been a reduction, as compared with two years ago, of about two hundred men. In the total of the rural battalions I think there is little or no change. In some of the battalions there has been a reduction, in others there has been an increase. I shall be very happy to supply the committee with further details as to the exact number of men on a subsequent occasion. I was not sure that this vote was coming up to-night, and I had not the advantage which Ministers usually have—which Ministers of Militia have always had—of having an officer of the department present to furnish information. However, with regard to some of the points that have been raised, I may say that the vote is the original one, the vote which the hon. gentlemen themselves proposed to pass. I will ask to be allowed to do, what many Ministers have been permitted to do in the House—to give the information that is desired on these points when some other items of the militia Estimates is being discussed. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), I think, asked us that privilege on many occasions.

Mr. FOSTER. And was refused often.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. On many occasions the Minister of Militia has been given a vote on promise to give the information later on.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the hon. Minister remember a request made on behalf of the Cape Breton battalion to go into camp at Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is the 94th battalion ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes; I think it was last May the request was made, and it was based on the ground that it would be most inconvenient to these people to go to Aldershot, and on the ground that there would be a considerable saving of expense by allowing them to go into camp at Sydney. I asked about the matter some time ago, and at that time the answer I got was that the department thought they could grant the request.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My information is that the battalion is not expected to go into camp this fall at Aldershot. There will be no camp at Aldershot in the spring. It is decided that the battalion shall go into camp at regimental headquarters in June.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not at all informed on these questions. Suppose this money had been voted last session, in the ordinary course when would the drill have begun ? When would the rural battalions have gone into camp ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In July. But in Nova Scotia the camps have almost always been held in September.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As the necessity was urgent, and the money was not provided for by the last Parliament, did it occur to the hon. gentleman to get a Governor General's warrant ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. What we understand is that the hon. Minister's understanding is that all the militia are to be drilled for this amount, those that are called out this fall in September, and those that are not drilled in September next June. I think the hon. gentleman is clear upon that point. I may say there is no desire on this side of the House to obstruct the vote. It is a very important matter that the volunteers should be drilled in September. Under ordinary circumstances we ought to have more information with regard to so large a vote than the hon. gentleman has given us.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand that this provides for city battalions that are not called out to camp, so that they may have their drill at head quarters.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There will be camps held in June. I do not mean to say that the battalions that do not turn out this fall will drill at regimental headquarters in the spring. But there will be camps held in the spring of those battalions that do not turn out this autumn. I think the commanding officers of the battalions and the deputy-adjutant general of the district were consulted with reference to holding the camps this autumn. Some preferred to go out now, and others preferred to wait until spring. And it was left to some extent—as far as it could be—to the officers of the battalions themselves, and it is understood that those that do not go out now can go out in the spring.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The city battalions do not go out now ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the rural battalions.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not sure the question I asked was quite understood by the hon. Minister. We have a number of city battalions that are not called out for drill, but drill in the cities in which they have their headquarters. What I wish to know is, does this sum provide for the city battalions' drill or does it not ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It does.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say to my hon. friend—I am not going to make any further objection to the passing of the estimate to-night—at the next stage, which I hope we may get as soon as possible, I trust he may be able to give the information asked for to-night. But I desire to say that hon. Ministers must not expect to silence our requests for information by saying : These are the estimates that you prepared yourselves. We must ask for full and fair and reasonable explanations, and Ministers, no doubt, will be in a position to give it. With regard to this particular vote, I hope the hon. Minister will take steps to put the matter through as soon as possible and put it into the shape of a Bill and have it passed.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to say in answer to the hon. gentleman's remarks that during the last six sessions of Parliament, a number of changes took place in the composition of the Ministry, and on many occasions the Ministers asked the indulgence of the House on the ground that they had not been long in office. It is a rather remarkable thing for the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) to be questioning the hon. Minister and saying that he must not shield himself behind the estimates prepared by themselves and declaring that he ought to be able to give more information to the House. Every member who sat in the last Parliament knows that when a new Minister rose and asked the indulgence of the House, that request was readily granted.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps our friends opposite forgot that we, as Government support-

ers would have expected those who prepared those estimates to make an explanation to this House. It is due to us and we expect it. Now that we are in Opposition and have not the opportunity of going to the department and making inquiries as to what these estimates mean, we desire an explanation from gentlemen opposite. That is our right, and the public expect it. What would be thought of us, as representatives of the people going to our homes and being asked by our constituents what such an item meant and what it was intended to cover. Fancy us saying that we did not know what it was intended to cover, and being unable to explain to those who asked us. I for one protest against that. If the hon. gentlemen are not prepared to give an explanation of the different items in these estimates, then I say let the item for militia —it only covers one or two pages—stand till they have studied it. The hon. gentleman has sat in this House since the opening of the session while the debate on the Address has been going on, and I do not think it would require a man of great intelligence to post himself in two weeks on the meaning of the different items in these estimates. I for one will insist on an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question with reference to the details of the public debt. There is a reduction in the redemption of the debt, a reduction of interest of 4 per cent stock. What does that amount to?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is half a million dollars of bonds redeemable on the 1st of December, issued for the Ontario Government in 1891. I may say here that I have no doubt we shall frequently have occasion to ask the hon. gentlemen to take the view that they have prepared these estimates themselves, and I hope they will not press too strongly the contention that we ought to know all about them within so short a time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask whether the Government has come to a decision as to their policy in connection with the rate of interest they are going to allow on savings banks deposits? That question was discussed fiercely in the House some time ago.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has been under consideration, but no determination has been reached.

Charges of Management—
Office of the Assistant Receiver General, Toronto $7,100

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend whether he contemplates any changes at present in the officials in that department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no disposition to make any immediate change in this respect, but we shall take the matters into consideration as they arise. Nothing is under consideration at this moment; but if sufficient cause be shown for making a change, we may be obliged to act.

Office of the Assistant Receiver General at Halifax $8,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How is this reduction of $300 at Halifax effected?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appropriation, I believe, has not always been used in its entirety.

Office of the Assistant Receiver General at Winnipeg $6,600

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he contemplates making any changes in the staff at Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall have to give the same answer to my hon. friend as I gave to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). No changes are under consideration at present, but we shall consider any case that may arise.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend whether he proposes to carry out the same policy which was carried out by the late Administration during my incumbency in the office, regarding the transfer of these small savings banks deposits kept in rural districts, and in fact in all the towns, with the exception of those in large cities in which there are assistant Receivers General, that is to say, that when a vacancy takes place by death, or removal, the amounts should be transferred to the Post Office Department, where they can be managed much more economically. That practice has been followed in every case for the last eight years, and whenever an office became vacant by death, or removal, or resignation, the amount was transferred to the Post Office savings banks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have seen no reason to depart from the view taken by the hon. gentleman on that subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman's answer to the member for Winnipeg in regard to dismissals apply to country savings banks as well?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have been informed of one case in which an official is alleged to have brought himself within the rules, I may say laid down by all sections in this House to-day; but no action has been taken on the subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In any case of that kind will the officer be given a hearing

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He will be given an opportunity to know what is alleged against him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will he be heard ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He will have an opportunity to reply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does he propose to do in case a complaint is lodged against an officer in the savings bank, charging malfeasance in office, or respecting his conduct during elections ? Does the hon. gentleman propose to decide such a matter without giving the official in question an opportunity to be heard, and to lay his case before the Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Each one will have to be treated on its merits. In the particular case to which I refer, and in fact the only case which has been brought to my notice, I have no hesitation in assuring the hon. gentleman that before taking action I would see that the party accused was informed of the nature of the complaint, and that would imply that he would have a right to reply.

Printing notes $50,000

Mr. FOSTER. If I remember rightly, the work of printing the notes is under contract with Mr. Burland. Can the hon. gentleman inform me whether the contract has run out or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract will expire on 1st April next.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there not a provision for six months' notice ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The contract may be discontinued on 1st April if six months' notice has been given, which would mean notice given on 1st October.

Governor General's Secretary's Office. $11,112 50

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation on this item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase of $100.

Mr. FOSTER. No other changes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not that I am aware of.

Privy Council Office..... $31,885

Mr. FOSTER. There have been some changes here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE There have been eighteen statutory increases of $50 each. Then, there is a decrease, owing to the difference between the salary of the late assistant clerk and his successor, $600, a first-class clerk at $1,400, another clerk at $400, and another at $500, making a total of $2,900, against an increase of $930.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Were not those changes made by the late Administration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some of them were.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What part of the reductions belong to the late Government and what to the present Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not much reputation for making reductions, but in this case they were rightly claimed by the hon. member for York, and I think he will have to answer that question.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for York will not answer it. It is the place of the hon. Finance Minister to do so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) made no reduction at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There seems to be some difference of opinion. The Minister of Finance says we made the reductions, and a former Minister of Finance (Sir Richard Cartwright) says we made no reduction. We must ask the hon. gentlemen to get together and reconcile their differences.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Finance Minister did not say that the late Government had made any reduction.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not quite correct, although not intentionally so. I do not ask this question to cause trouble, but I wish to know which of the parties should be credited with the reduction on this item in the Estimates. It is a fair question, and, I think, deserving of attention.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Estimates brought down by the late Government amounted to $33,885, being an increase of $30 exactly over the demand for the previous year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, we may well ask by whom the reduction was made.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend has stated that already.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister of Finance give an explanation as to how the decrease was made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand the hon. gentleman superannuated a messenger, and to that extent the reduction was his ; but, I understand, the difference is between the salary of a late clerk and that proposed for his successor. If we obtain a successor at a lower rate, I suppose the reduction will be ours.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I desire to ask the Finance Minister—for I did not catch what was going on—whether, in the superannuations proposed in order to effect a saving,

it is intended to superannuate the Assistant Receiver General at St. John ?

Mr. LISTER. Who is he

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) can answer that question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think there must be some mistake in the statement made by the Finance Minister. Here we have a decrease of $2,000. That sum cannot be made up by the saving caused by superannuating a messenger and the difference between salaries. What other officer has been retired ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difference is between a late assistant clerk and his successor, $600, one first-class clerk dropped at $1,400, one dropped at $400, and one messenger dropped or superannuated at $500. These items make $2,900, against an increase of $930. A portion of that sum will have to be credited to hon. gentlemen opposite, and a portion must be credited to ourselves, if we make the salary of an appointee at a reduced sum.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the name of the clerk at $1,400 who has been dropped ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the name of the clerk at the present moment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is well known that there has been a reorganization of the branch, and the House should be furnished with the particulars. The hon. gentleman will see that it is quite fair we should know what reorganization has taken place in that department.

Mr. FOSTER. Better let the item stand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In a matter of this kind, in which it is absolutely necessary to furnish information to the House as to the manner in which this department has been reorganized, it is unreasonable to propose that the item should be carried before that information is given. Every hon. gentleman knows that it has been customary to allow an item to stand when information cannot be given in reference to it. In this particular it is specially desirable. It is now half past eleven o'clock, and probably the better way would be to adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I might agree to let the item stand until the President of the Privy Council is here, but we certainly should proceed until at least 12 o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We had a late sitting last night, and have made considerable progress. No time would be lost by adjournment.

Mr. LISTER. I think it is very desirable that this House should get through its labours before the thirty days expire. If we are to sit here until only half past eleven every night, it is quite possible that the session may extend to a period of more than sixty days. It is perfectly evident to me—I do not know how it strikes other members of the House—that hon. gentlemen opposite are taking up a good deal of time discussing questions which need not have very much discussion, for the manifest object of extending the session over thirty days. It is remarkable to me that the present Opposition should be so very, very inquisitive. One would think that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) had never occupied the position of Finance Minister at all. He seems to know absolutely nothing about the office which he has just vacated. He is asking questions that I venture to say the present Finance Minister will know all about when he is in the office for six weeks. Here are Estimates prepared by these gentlemen, who as one hon. gentleman remarked, are now in the cold shades of Opposition. May they long remain there in the interest of the country, and it is altogether likely they will.

Mr. PRIOR. You hope so, any way.

Mr. LISTER. I am sure of it. It seems to me the height of absurdity that one hon. gentleman after another should jump up here, and tackle, and heckle, and criticise, and inquire of the present Finance Minister about items which they themselves put into the Estimates and in which there is no increase at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Parliament never got any explanation of them.

Mr. LISTER. While the late Government were in power, I never heard any member of the present Opposition inquire about a single item. They swallowed them holus bolus and acted as though their Government could not do anything wrong. Without wishing to be offensive, I venture to say that when they get up here now in this manner, they are only pretending. If this Government were presenting Estimates of their own, I would not wonder at hon. gentlemen opposite requiring the fullest information, but when they act in this way under the circumstances, one must feel that their object is really not to get information, but that it is either to prolong the session over the thirty days or to embarrass the hon. gentleman who has recently taken charge of the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) could have listened to the whole debate, or he would not have made the statement which he did. These are not the Estimates, so far as this item is concerned, which were brought down by the late Government. A reorganization has taken place in that department, and I think we ought to know in all fairness what the reorganization was. None of us I am sure, wish to prevent the item passing, but I supposed when I asked the question that the

information would be forthcoming. I quite recognize that the Finance Minister has not had that experience in the department nor in his office, that would enable him to be free and ready at once with an explanation, and I quite recognize what was stated by the member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) that when some of us were new in our departments every generosity was extended to us. I do not object to the item passing, if the hon. gentleman will give us the information later on ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had hopes that as there is a reduction of $2,000 in the item, the House will be willing to accept it without requiring the President of the Privy Council to be present. If it is thought desirable that he should explain the changes made, I do not think I can reasonably object to the item standing over.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We must ask this item to stand over. A matter of reduction may be just as important when connected with the reorganization of a department as any other. When gentlemen on this side of the House were on the Treasury benches, these questions were always asked with great fulness by the Opposition, and it is in the public interest that explanations should be given. We had to-night a most important subject before us in the matter of the militia estimates, in which the most intense interest is felt throughout the country. This is not simply for the information of members of the House, but the information is given to the public throughout the country, and that information the public are entitled to. There is no object on the part of any gentlemen on this side of the House to embarrass the Minister in the slightest degree. Every consideration must be made for gentlemen who have recently taken office and who have not had an opportunity of requiring such thorough acquaintance with these subjects as Ministers who have been long in office. I am quite sure that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) will recognize now, as fully as he did when he sat in Opposition, the propriety of having full and complete explanations given as these various estimates are submitted. The suggestion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has made, that there is any disposition here to prolong the session, is, I think, unworthy of him, and could only have been thrown across the floor in badinage. I do not think that he is at all serious. There has been no disposition shown on the part of the Opposition, from the opening of the session down to the present moment, to consume unnecessarily a single moment of time in regard to any subject. We have been discussing questions of very great importance, and we would fail altogether in our duty if we did not avail ourselves of the opportunity of having a full and free explanation of matters of great importance to the public as well as to the House. I again suggest that, as we had a late sitting last night, and it will be midnight before we can reach home, and as we have made considerable progress and have got fairly launched in the Estimates, the House might now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that that item may stand over until the President of the Privy Council can be here to explain the proposed changes. I hope, however, that the hon. gentleman will not press for an adjournment at present. I think we might take the items for the Department of Justice while the Solicitor General is here to explain them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rose to my feet, a few moments ago, to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who threw out the idea that this side of the House intended prolonging the session for thirty days. I am credibly informed that that question was discussed by the supporters of the Government to-day in another room. I understand that they fully decided that the session should last thirty days, but that the country and the galleries must be led to believe that the members on this side of the House were the obstructionists. The majority to-day, as I am credibly informed—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Name your informant.

Mr. TAYLOR. The informant is all right. I just wanted to remove the impression, which was thrown out by the hon. member for West Lambton, that this side of the House was responsible, because it is already settled by that side of the House that the session will last thirty days.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has made a statement which might possibly go at par in the country, where the hon. gentleman is not very well known ; but no hon. member of this House will take what he has said seriously. In the first place, the hon. gentleman had no means of knowing what took place in caucus ; and, in the next place, I desire to tell him that no such thing took place in caucus—that his statement is the creature of mere imagination. The hon. gentleman is apparently as correct in his statements in the House as he was in North Grey, and I think they will meet the same fate.

Department of Justice—Penitentiaries Branch $3,125

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Solicitor General whether the department has considered a proposal that was on foot some time ago to reorganize the system of keeping the accounts of the penitentiaries ? In that connection, there were to be, as I understood, some changes in these Estimates. Has the subject been dealt with ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It has been dealt with. When the item for penitentiaries comes up, I shall be prepared to explain it. That does not affect this item, which only provides for the statutory increases.

Resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the motion for adjournment is put, I wish to ask the Government whether there is any foundation for the statement in the press to the effect that it is their intention to ask the House to adjourn from Thursday until Tuesday, as Monday is Labour Day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman some information to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it the intention of the Government to ask the House to adjourn at six o'clock to-morrow? There is a rumour in the lobbies to that effect.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think that, all other things being equal, if it pleases hon. gentlemen opposite to consent to an adjournment, we shall possibly ask for it. But we wish to exercise no constraint.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return:

Of the Hon. William Paterson, for the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Grey; and

Of the Hon. Andrew George Blair, for the electoral district of Sunbury and Queen's, New Brunswick.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. William Paterson, member for the electoral district of North Grey, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Mr. Sutherland.

Hon. Andrew George Blair, member for the electoral district of Sunbury and Queen's, introduced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) and Mr. Domville.

"LA CANADIENNE."

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

Whether the Government are aware that the cruiser "La Canadienne" was placed at the disposal of the Conservative candidate in the county of Gaspé, at the late general election?

Who gave instructions to Commander Wakeham of "La Canadienne" to convey the Conservative candidate, Dr. Ennis, to the Magdalen Islands?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am not in a position to answer that question yet. I have written to the commander of "La Canadienne," and have not yet received his answer.

BUREAU OF MINING INFORMATION.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

Is the Minister of Agriculture correctly reported in the statement that he promised that a Bureau of Mining Information would be opened in Montreal?

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a Bureau of Mining Information in Toronto? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). To the first question the answer is, No. As to the second, I would say that the Government has not yet had this matter under consideration.

ELECTION LITERATURE AND THE MAILS.

Mr. POULIOT asked:

Are the Government aware that the election literature of the Conservative party, during the late election, was distributed throughout the country gratuitously?

Are the Government aware that a certain leaflet intituled "A Political Review," (of which three hundred and fifty thousand copies—350,000—were struck off) singing the praises of the Conservative party, and the virtues of the Kootenay Cure, was distributed all over Canada through the channel of the post office of the House of Commons, franked with the initials: S. R., M.P.?

Is it the intention of the Government to enquire into the said charges and punish the guilty parties if they be true?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The Government has been informed that election literature of the Conservative party was distributed free of postage through the mails during the recent election. Also that a certain leaflet intituled: "A Political Review," advocating the Conservative cause and the merits of the

Kootenay Cure was distributed through the mails through the channel of the post office of the House of Commons, franked with the initials "S. R., M.P.," and with initials of other members of the late House of Commons. Nothing has been determined as to what action, if any, may be taken.

DUTY ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Was the Hon. Minister of Agriculture correctly reported in the Moose Jaw "Times" as having said at Moose Jaw, on the 28th September, 1894: "In Mr. Foster's reformed tariff the duty on implements was cut down from 35 to 20 per cent and Mr. Foster claimed he had removed a great burden from the farmers. Why did he not remove the whole burden?" Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government will remove the burden now? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). My memory is not sufficiently good to enable me to vouch for the verbal accuracy of any particular speech which I delivered in the North-west Territories, but what the hon. gentleman has read is the substance of many speeches I delivered there. In regard to the second question, I may say that there will be no revision of the tariff this session.

THE DREDGE IN THE OYSTER FISHERY.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to prohibit the use of the dredge or drag in the oyster fishery of Prince Edward Island, this season?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Yes; the Commissioner of Fisheries has advised that, pending fuller investigation as to the effect of the use of the dredge or drag, it should be prohibited in Prince Edward Island on all public oyster beds this year.

MEASURE FOR THE SALE OF OYSTERS.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a standard barrel measure for the sale of oysters?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). It is not the intention of the Government at present to introduce legislation in that direction.

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BETHUNE asked:

1. Has the Government yet received any report from the engineer, Mr. Millege, on the survey made at North Harbour, Aspy Bay, county of Victoria, N.S., with a view to making it a harbour of refuge? If so, and the report is favourable, does the Government intend to make an appropriation for carrying on the work during the present year?

2. Does the Government intend to complete the breakwater commenced years ago at French River, in the county of Victoria, N.S.? If so, how soon?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to build a wharf at or near Iona Station, Victoria County, N.S.? If so, will provision for the work be made this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1st. The department has a report from Mr. Millege for improvements at South Harbour, Aspy Bay, but it has received no report yet from Mr. Millege on survey made at North Harbour. 2nd. The matter is under consideration. 3rd. Same answer as No. 2.

ELECTION IN NORTH ONTARIO.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked:

Has the attention of the Government been called to the following article in the Toronto "World":—

"Whitby, Ont., July 11.—Major McGillivray is confirmed in his seat by Judge Burnham as a result of the recount before him, concluded this morning, but the developments of the case promise startling results to others as well as to the doughty Major, for it was found that the most flagrant example known to the election trials, of tampering with ballots, is the distinguishing feature of this election. Twenty-one ballots, reported by deputy returning officers to have been cast for Warden Duncan Graham, the Patron-Liberal candidate opposing Major McGillivray, have utterly disappeared, and twenty-one ballots for McGillivray, which were found in envelopes with Graham's ballots, had no initials of the deputy returning officer on them, and some had never even been creased."

If so, is it their intention to amend the return and award the seat to Mr. Graham, who received the majority of votes polled, in place of John A. McGillivray, the minority candidate? Also, is it the intention of the Government to take any steps to punish the parties guilty of tampering with the ballots at said election?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The attention of the Government has not before been called to the article in the "World." I understand that a protest has been filed against the return, and when the legal proceedings have been closed, the Government will then decide upon the course to be taken upon that record, and the punishment of the offenders.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. McINNES asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to grant any railway subsidies this session?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is not the intention of the Government to grant any railway subsidies this session.

STEAM SERVICE BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to change the policy of establishing a twenty-knot steam service between Great Britain and Canada, and substituting therefor a seventeen-knot freight service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The whole question of a steam service between Great Britain and Canada is now engaging the attention of the Government.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What amount of the sums granted by Governor General's warrants of the 16th July and 18th August, 1896, respectively, have been spent ? What amount remains still to be paid on account of services contemplated by the July warrant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Of the amount granted, $1,066,627.53, by the Governor General's warrant of the 16th July, there have been spent to the night of the 1st September, $848.394.68. Of the amounts granted, $937,894.87, by the Governor General's warrant of the 18th August, there have been spent to the night of the 1st September, $255,863.40. Of the amount still to be paid on account of services contemplated by the July warrants, credits are outstanding for about $218,000, and it is estimated that nearly the whole of this amount will be spent.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What temporary loans are now current ? What is the date of the commencement of these loans ? For what time do they run ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. One temporary loan for £400,000. 2. 1st July, 1896. 3. Six months to 1st January, 1897.

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What is the amount of imports, for home consumption, dutiable and free respectively, for the year ending 30th June, 1896, and what is the sum collected for duty thereon ? What is the amount of exports of home and foreign products respectively for the year ending 30th June, 1896 ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Giving the unrevised figures, the total value of dutiable goods entered for home consumption during the year ending 30th June, 1896, amounted to $67,234,470. The total value of free goods entered for home consumption during the same period, amounted to $43,348,822. The total sum collected for duty on goods entered for consumption during the same period, amounted to $20,182,393.14. The total value of home products exported during the same period, amounted to $106,586,274. Estimated amount short returned at inland ports of home products exported to United States, $3,329,053, making a grand total to home products exported, $109,915,327. The total value of foreign products (including coin and bullion) exported during the same period, amounted to $11,098,285.

COIN AND BULLION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What is the amount of coin and bullion imported and exported for the last fiscal year ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Giving the unrevised figures, the total value of coin and bullion imported during the last fiscal year, amounted to $5,077,437. The total value of coin and bullion exported during the same period, amounted to $4,699,309.

POSTMASTERSHIP OF MARSH HILL, ONT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

When was G. G. King, M.P., appointed to the postmastership of Marsh Hill, Ont. ? Has he since been performing the duties of that office ? What salary is due him and has it yet been paid ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). G. G. King, M.P., was appointed to the postmastership of Marsh Hill, Ont., on the 4th day of August, 1896, at an annual salary of $10, payable at the end of each quarter, and no portion thereof being due, no sum has yet been paid to Mr. King on such account. It has not been customary to exact actual personal service of such officers.

COW BAY BREAKWATER.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

Is the Government aware that the Cow Bay breakwater at Port Morien, Cape Breton, is in a dangerous condition and requiring urgent repairs ? If so, is it the intention of the Government to make provision in the Supplementary Estimates for such repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The Government is aware that the Cow Bay breakwater at Port Morien, Cape Breton, has required repairs for some years. This matter is now being considered in connection with the preparation of Supplementary Estimates.

BREAKWATER AT GABARUS.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates for the pro-

posed pier or breakwater at Gabarus, Cape Breton County ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No.

DISMISSAL OF JOHN HANNAN.

Mr. QUINN asked :

Is it true that John Hannan, an employee of seven years standing has been dismissed from the Lachine Canal ? If so, why ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, John Hannan, lockman on Lock No. 1 on the Lachine Canal, has been dismissed. He was dismissed on the 20th of July last, for frequently absenting himself from the lock without leave.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AT ELECTIONS.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for :

Copies of all instructions given on the Intercolonial Railway by the authorities to remove the employees shortly before the 23rd June, 1896, the day of election, to prevent them voting in the counties in which they resided, the names of the authorities giving such instructions and their authority therefor.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to occupy any considerable portion of the time of the House. I simply desire to bring before this House and the Government a flagrant occurrence during the late election. Unfortunately it took place in the constituency of King's, N.B., which was lately represented and adorned by the late Minister of Finance, the present member for York (Mr. Foster). Why this was done, how they could have the audacity to remove men from certain places so as to prevent them voting —I speak now from personal knowledge and not from hearsay—it is difficult to understand ; and it is unnecessary to quote cases because I am informed that a petition has been submitted to the Railway Department asking for an investigation. I have personal knowledge of one case, that of Mr. Ryan, who was ordered up to Moncton and told to stay there, that he should not return to work at his former place but that the Government would give him work there, and thus keep him away from his home. He had the manliness, for like myself he has a little Irish blood in him, to risk the loss of his position in order to vote for me and for the policy and party in which he had faith and confidence. There were instances of this character all along the line. Hon. gentlemen opposite, through the Railway Department, issued orders to men to come up there, and when the men were before the officials they withdrew the written orders given them, compelled them to surrender the orders, so that no evidence might remain. I will leave this matter now in the hands of the House and the Minister of Railways. I am satisfied no defence can be put up by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), although he has defended a great many bad cases. If he is able to defend this, I will think better of him than I have done in the past, although I admit he will justify almost anything in the interest of his party. I have nothing more to say beyond asking the Minister of Railways to have this matter investigated, and to bring down the papers before the House before the investigation is commenced.

Mr. SPROULE. As this subject is under consideration, it might not be out of place to furnish a little information in regard to an election which took place in North Grey lately, because it appears that this trick is not confined to one political party or to members on one side of the House. I hold in my hand affidavits made by several gentlemen, who say that one Mr. Spiers, on Sunday afternoon and night engaged them to go up the Georgian Bay to work at a lighthouse or look after some timber. I thought it was probably a lighthouse which the Minister of Public Works had ordered to be repaired. At all events on Sunday night eighteen or twenty men were hired for two or three days at $1.50 per day and their board ; they were to be taken up the lake on Monday morning to commence work, presumably the following day, which was election day. This was done to keep them from voting. Fortunately some members of the other political party got wind of the matter and were able to frustrate the whole scheme. I have affidavits sworn to by these parties. This action was done for political purposes, which no one will deny : it was done by the friends of the Government, and if there is to be an investigation I should like it to extend to these cases as well as to those to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I should like to ask if those cases occurred on the Government railway ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before this motion is passed, I should like to draw the attention of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to an election held in his constituency on 23rd June last, when he had as his financial agent the collector of customs at Meaford. If it was wrong in the case of the parties to whom the hon. gentleman referred, and if it was wrong for civil servants to engage in elections, I hope my hon. friend will take the trouble to bring before the attention of the Government the case of this collector of customs at the port of Meaford so that his case can be dealt with, and that in future he will not be called upon to handle the exchequer of the hon. member for East Grey at elections.

Mr. SPROULE. He was not engaged in the election at all.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). This motion is worthy of more than passing notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I allowed the last two hon. gentlemen certainly to go outside the motion, and the only justification for doing so was the very general remarks of the hon. mover. But I think it would be far better, unless the hon. gentleman is going to speak to this motion itself, that any general discussion should be raised in another way.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The two hon. members referred to may have done wrong, but what I propose to say will be strictly to the motion. So far as this matter is concerned, I too know something about it. In the county of Pictou, for example,—I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to this matter, because it could not have been done with his consent—books of passes were in the hands of boys who gave passes to anybody and everybody. At New Glasgow there were four or five pass books, countersigned by Mr. Pottinger, and any one who wanted a pass could get it over the road. Over 160 voters came into Pictou from outside on Government passes. In the county of Antigonish and in the county of Guysboro' it was the same. Who gave the orders, I do not know, but in the county which I represent, there were two unfortunate employees who wanted to vote for me on that day, and it was arranged they could not. One of them, who is an excellent bicyclist, asked the superintendent for seven minutes, and he would ride to the poll on his bicycle, but he was not allowed to go. He only had to go to Mulgrave, but that day he was taken across the Strait of Canso. He said: "Give me seven minutes, which is less time than is required to take the luggage from the car, and put it on the boat, and it will enable me to give my vote for Mr. Fraser." But he was not allowed that time. The only two men who had any desire to vote for me, among the men employed on that railway, were not allowed to vote at all. A more shameful use of a Government railway was never seen than during the last election in the province of Nova Scotia. I can give to the ex-Minister of Railways the name of the chairman of the Liberal-Conservative Association of the county of Cumberland, who had a free pass for two months during the election. The active Conservative party men in Nova Scotia was supplied with a pass. It was not always a single pass either, for there was one man from Cape Breton who came with a lot of voters to the county of Pictou and he had a pass for twenty. They took them up en bloc. Now, Sir, as a Liberal voter had to come at his own expense, I submit that this was a misuse of the railway. I call the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to the fact that he should exercise great care as to who should have the right to issue passes on that road at election times or at any other time. Fancy three or four persons in the town of New Glasgow with a book of passes. I could understand, on some occasions, for example, how a person in charge of men on a railway should have one of these books in order to allow those working on the road to move from one point to another, but it certainly is highly improper that party workers should have them. The only reason why these men got the passes, and it was so stated on the pass itself—"employed by the Government." And, Mr. Speaker, so they were employed by the Government: employed to come from one county to another to vote. It is a shameful state of affairs. I care not whether the Liberal party or the Conservative party be in power, it is disgraceful that the Government railway should be used for the purpose of carrying, on free passes, voters to the polls. I hope that more supervision will be exercised by the present Minister, to see that no person is permitted to issue these passess, except for good and sufficient reason. Sir, even special trains were run on election day. One special train, I know, was run for 180 miles, to carry one voter, so as to get in his vote. Of course, all this was done without the consent of my genial friend the ex-Minister of Railways, who, I know, would not permit of such a thing, if he knew of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I draw his attention, and the attention of the present Minister, to these facts, for the purpose of showing that great care ought to be exercised by the Minister of Railways during election time, lest his subordinates should act in this improper manner. It was a crying shame during the last election. Of course, the road was always used for political purposes, but I never knew of it being used so flagrantly in that direction as it was during the recent campaign. I hope that the Minister, in bringing down these papers, will discover the parties who are responsible for that state of things, who disregarded all rule in the matter, and who, to a certain extent, disgraced the genial ex-Minister of Railways, who, of course, would never have permitted it, had he known of it.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to add to the testimony given in this matter by my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser). I am credibly informed—not by men who take an active part in political warfare, but by men who take an active part in the commercial interests of our country—orders were given to the officials of the Intercolonial Railway that on the 23rd day of June last there should not be a freight train moved on the whole of that railway system. This was done by the orders of somebody, and I call the attention of the present Minister to it. It was done in order to enable the employees of the road to go and vote for the Government candidates. My hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) has spoken so well with reference to the pass question, that I need not refer to it further than to add this: that passes were sent all

over the country to bring the voters in, and it happened in some cases that the voters could not afford to lose their time, and so their good wives or their sweethearts availed themselves of the opportunity and travelled upon the passes that were intended for the voters.

Mr. HAGGART. A few words in reply to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. When the papers come down, they will disclose no such state of facts as hon. gentlemen have spoken of. There were no unusual orders given on the Intercolonial Railway, and I do not think that any course was pursued on that railway different from that pursued on other occasions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was always the same.

Mr. HAGGART. I am sure of one thing, and that is, that no orders were given by me, and no orders came from headquarters here, in reference to anything of the kind. The course that was pursued down there would be the course which was usually pursued by the authorities of the railway on such an occasion. These statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) are entirely new to me. It is the first time that I ever heard of them, and I am sure, when the papers come down, and an inquiry is made, no such state of facts will be shown as has been represented here.

Mr. McMULLEN. In view of the statement made by the late Minister of Railways, I earnestly hope that a thorough and exhaustive investigation will be held into this matter, so that those men who have assumed the responsibility of carrying voters to the poll at the expense of the country, may have meted out to them the just punishment that they deserve. The conduct of officials of the Government taking a prominent part in the interests of a political party has been exhaustively discussed in this House, and I hope that the question with regard to these railway employees will be carefully noted by the Minister of Railways. Those officials who have so abused a railway that has been constructed at the cost of the people, and has never paid one cent of interest upon the money invested in it, to carry voters to the poll on free passes, shall receive that measure of punishment which they justly deserve. I hope the matter will not drop here. If the papers do not disclose the facts stated to this House, and if there is sufficient evidence to substantiate these statements, I trust that these officials who have been guilty of such misconduct, will be rebuked and punished.

Mr. ELLIS. Notwithstanding the denial of the ex-Minister of Railways—and perhaps the facts are not within his knowledge—it is an undoubted and a notorious fact, known to a great many people in the province of New Brunswick and around Moncton, that the chief train-despatcher of the Intercolonial Railway was directed to send out of Moncton, on the day of the election, certain men who were presumed to be favourable to, and would vote for, the Liberal party in that contest.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I wish to add my testimony, Mr. Speaker, to the statement made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, as to the shameful use of the Intercolonial Railway in the interests of the Conservative party during the late elections. Let me give you one instance of this. Shortly before the polling day, a joint meeting was to be held in the county of Temiscouata, at which my good friend the present member for that county (Mr. Pouliot) was to appear. Both candidates were to be there, and I was to speak for my hon. friend (Mr. Pouliot). On the morning of the meeting I sent word to Mr. MacDonald, superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, asking him if a special train was going down in order that I might travel by it, and the answer I received was, that there was no special train. My friends and myself had to take a train at a very early hour in the morning, but about eleven o'clock the Intercolonial Railway shops at Rivière du Loup were closed down, and the men were ordered to go on a special train to St. Eloi to prevent the Liberal speakers being heard. These are facts which have come within my own knowledge, and the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) knows them, too. In the evening, I spoke to Mr. MacDonald, the superintendent, about the matter, and he told me that that was his order. He declared that he and his friends had heard in the morning that the Tory candidate would be prevented from speaking, and he said he had received orders—I do not know if it was from the Minister of Railways, or from whom—but that he had received orders from headquarters to make up a special train and to ask the men from the shops to leave their work and help the Tory candidate in St. Eloi. This, Sir, is a fact, and it is not the only occurrence of the kind which took place during the last election.

Motion agreed to.

FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LINE.

Mr. LANGELIER moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, tenders, correspondence and papers in relation to the establishment of a line of fast steamers between Canada and the United Kingdom.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is no objection, of course, to this motion passing ; but I would remark to my hon. friend that there is some correspondence still going on between the Government here and the Imperial authorities, which we may not be able to bring down. But all that we can bring down will be laid on the Table.

Motion agreed to.

CREAMERIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That in the opinion of this House, it would be expedient to apply $20,000 to aid in establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west Territories, and that this sum should be considered as an addition to the immigration grant.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the third or fourth time that I have brought this matter before the House; but as this is a new Parliament, I will speak for a short time upon the motion I make. I am urging upon the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and of the Government of which he is a member, a policy that was adopted by the late Government. The acting Minister of Agriculture, at last session, agreed that $20,000 should be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of doing what I explained then and in 1895 and on a previous occasion. What we propose is this. We propose that for four or five years the sum of $20,000 should be placed in the Estimates for the purpose of loaning to, say, thirty farmers in a district the sum of $2,000 to aid in the establishment of a creamery, on condition that they themselves raised $500. The site would be selected and the buildings put up, under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. The cost of making butter is said to be 4 cents a pound, and that much would be deducted by the officer of the department, and the butter would be marketed by him. We have had experience of this system at Moose Jaw, at Indian Head, and, I think, at Prince Albert. The result has been that at Indian Head there is an output at the present time of 300 pounds a day; at Moose Jaw the output is, I think, nearly double that; at Prince Albert I do not know what the output is. But the result is that in these three cases this policy of the Government has been most successful, and therefore we propose that it should be extended. We do not propose that security should not be taken for the repayment of this $2,000; for there is an element in the scheme that one cent a pound should be taken by the Government to go to a sinking fund to pay off the loan. The actual cost of this is estimated at ½ cent or ¾ cent a pound, and therefore you would have to add that much, say ¾ cent to 1 cent, and so you would have 1¾ cents a pound for paying off the loan. We are asking the Government and the House, I say, only to proceed on a path that has already been taken; we are asking them to take a course similar to what has been taken on the continent of Europe, in Denmark and in Russia. In Russia, in 1894, when the hon. Minister of Agriculture found that agriculture was depressed, he at once set about helping that industry, especially in dairy matters. Experts were brought in from abroad, courses of lectures were given, just as we have had lectures here from Prof. Robertson and the others, and the result was that such an impetus was given to the dairy industry that great relief came to the agricultural community in Russia. One of the expedients with which we are now familiar was adopted in that great Empire, namely, cold storage by means of which butter could be sent great distances. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), will be able in Council to powerfully second the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), should he submit a proposition similar to that made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), when premier of Nova Scotia. I think it was in 1894 that in Nova Scotia, an Act was passed containing this clause:

Any person, firm or association establishing a creamery and cheese factory in Nova Scotia shall be entitled to receive from the Treasury the following sums: $200 in the first year in which such creamery is in operation, $100 in the second year, and $100 in the third year—$400 in all, and not more than three factories to be established in any county.

I believe there are 17 counties in Nova Scotia, so that this would give a little over what I propose to ask the Government to place in its Supplementary Estimates for the North-west Territories. I am only asking the Government to do what the acting Minister of Agriculture in the late Government promised me last session to do. I believe he had arranged everything in Council, and that a sum was to have been put in the Supplementary Estimates. I asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to place $20,000 in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of aiding creameries in the North-west Territories, as I have suggested. By voting this sum every year, say for five years, the result would be that under this policy—which is no longer an experimental one because it has been proved successful—by the time the last creamery was established, the first creamery would no doubt have paid back the amount expended. There is a feature about the scheme that I should mention, namely, that the patrons of a factory will get stock in it, in proportion to the cream that they supply it. The scheme, in its details, has been worked out by Prof. Robertson, who is entitled to the whole credit of working out the details, but the main features of the scheme, which we proposed in this House a few years ago, is this, that it should be held to be part of the immigration grant. We ask that these sums of $20,000 shall not bear interest. Of course, to lend $20,000 without interest does not strike one, at first, as a business transaction; and the only way it can be justified is by considering it as part of the immigration grant and intended for the purpose of putting the North-west in such a position that it will be attractive to immigrants the world over, and so, by the very best possible means,

carry out our immigration policy. So far as the money is concerned, there can be no objection to the grant. So recently has it been pointed out in this House that we are entitled to more money than we get, that it is not necessary for me to go over the argument and point out that 91,000 people—which I think is more correct than even 84,000 people—but that 84,000 to 91,000 people in the North-west Territories are entitled to a great deal more money than we are getting, and that something like a million and a quarter dollars is due to us on arrears, if we get our deserts. Therefore, I do not think that the most economical member on either side of the House will have the least objection to the proposal I make. I may say that there will be a good deal of disappointment, at all events in my constituency, if the hon. Finance Minister does not place a sum in the Estimates, as I suggest, and for this reason. We did not anticipate a change of Government. I told my constituents everywhere that it was the intention of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to place $20,000 for this purpose in the Supplementary Estimates, and that that would have been placed there had the late Government been enabled to proceed with its Estimates, and I of course argued with my constituents, the electorate of Assiniboia, that they should support a Conservative Government which, in so many ways, and this among the rest, had inaugurated policies for the advantage of the North-west Territories. I hope, Sir, that there will be no objection to passing this motion. I may say that I divided the House on it a couple of sessions ago, and on that occasion I had the support of the hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier), and I think the great bulk of his party, and I think there can be no objection to it now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad to support any proposition made to aid in any way the industries of the North-west Territories. Such a proposition is certainly entitled to the support of every member representing those Territories, but I do not see any reason why any particular sum should have been mentioned in this motion. I fail to see by what calculation the hon. gentleman arrives at the conclusion that $20,000 is the exact amount that should be taken out of the immigration grant for the purpose of aiding creameries.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not propose that this shall be taken out of the immigration fund, but that it be considered as part of the immigration grant and added to whatever the immigration grant is.

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly satisfied to consider it as part of the immigration or as an addition to that grant, for it does seem to me that the immigration grant we have received in the past, judging by its results, has not been altogether a very valuable grant. It seems to me, therefore, there is no necessity for limiting the amount to $20,000. It might have been $30,000 or $40,000, and in fact it seems to me entirely unnecessary that a sum should be mentioned at all. It would have been quite sufficient for the hon. gentleman to say that he desired the Government of the day to assist creameries in the Territories. That proposition I would have been glad to support, but the hon. gentleman has seen fit to attach to his motion a certain proposition in which I cannot agree. His motion reads :

> For the purpose of establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west.

That is to say, that the Government of this country is to go into competition with industries already established in those Territories. Now, I certainly cannot agree with any proposition such as that. In the district which I represent there are in operation now four creameries, which represent a very considerable investment of capital by private individuals. I would certainly object to a proposition that would bring the Government into active competition with private capital in this business. It seems to me that that is not the way in which we can arrive at the best development of the creamery industry of the North-west Territories. Nor can I agree with the details of the scheme as presented by the hon. gentleman, as it seems to me that his proposition is one that is not based upon the facts of the case. The drawback to the creamery industry of the North-west is not the lack of capital to build creameries or to run them. The trouble, as any practical man knows, lies in the scattered nature of the settlement and the lack of cows, or the lack on the part of the settlers of capital that would enable them to purchase cows. This proposition to build up the creamery industry by building creameries begins at the wrong end of the business ; it is not more creamery establishments that we want, but more settlers and more cows. If we had the country more closely settled and the people in possession of an adequate number of cows, the creamery industry would follow as a matter of course. That is what is wanted, and to spend Government money in building creameries would simply be to waste that money and would not benefit and advantage the creamery industry as it should be and as I hope the Government will see its way clear to benefit and advantage it. In one part of the country in which I live there are a large number of poor settlers, brought in through the active immigration policy of the Government. These people have come in, in many cases with empty hands. You may build them all the creameries you like, but unless you can increase the number of cows available to supply the creameries, you had better save your money. Much as I wish to see the creamery industry developed, and much as I wish to see

this Government assist that industry in the North-west, I cannot, with my knowledge of the situation of the case, support a motion that will simply ask this Government for money that will not be put to a proper use or to the use for which it is most needed in the Territories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before this motion is put, Sir, I wish to say a few words which I think are justified in view of the importance of the scheme. The hon. member who introduced this motion has alluded to the fact that on former occasions in this House this same motion had been brought forward by him, therefore the older members of the House, no doubt, are familiar with the facts of the case. It is evident that there is a difference of opinion as to the means of developing the dairy interests of the North-west Territories. I am sure that nobody, least of all myself who have been so long earnestly engaged in developing the dairy industry of the country and who have studied very carefully the best means of developing that industry, would wish to minimize or in any way interfere with any proposition which would tend to the development of the dairy industry of the North-west Territories. I can remember on a former occasion, when I was a member of this House, I myself pointed out the necessity of the introduction and encouragement in the North-west Territories and Manitoba of mixed farming in preference to the sole cultivation of the cereals. I do not know any way in which mixed farming can be more profitably carried on than in the dairy industry. It is only by the maintenance of herds of cattle, it is only by the profitable development of stock keeping that the fertility of the plains of the North-west can be maintained. It is true that we have there a virgin fertility, a fertility on which the people of our country are disposed, perhaps, to draw too freely, a bank which, perhaps, may very easily be overdrawn; and I am sure that in the interest of the future of our country and the future of our great North-west it is important that that bank, that store of fertility should be maintained and not exhausted. This can only be done by the maintenance of stock on these North-west plains This being the case, I am greatly interested in the development and encouragement of the dairying industry there. As I said a few minutes ago, there is an evident difference of opinion in regard to the way in which that industry can be best encouraged and developed. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Davin) in this motion has given in detail not altogether, but still in some detail, what he wishes to do. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have already discussed this matter and discussed the proposition which Professor Robertson had made in regard to this same vote in last year's proposed Supplementary Estimates. While desirous of doing everything that can possibly be done to develop the dairy industry of the country, I feel that the time has not yet been reached at which a definite proposition in this form can be accepted by myself as Minister of Agriculture or by the Government. The establishment of creameries in the North-west by this scheme, I think, has been fairly described by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and I must thank that hon. gentleman for what he has said and acknowledge the very practical and business-like way in which he has put before the House, the needs of that part of the country which he represents. The difficulties are no doubt those which he has pointed out—that in a country where population is sparse, where herds of cattle, and especially of cows are small in number and scattered, the ordinary creamery industry, as carried on in the eastern part of Canada is made very difficult and is subjected to very great disabilities. What we want there is population and the introduction of herds of cattle. I believe Professor Robertson's proposal was to establish eight creameries with a grant of $20,000. It seems to me that this assistance to the dairy interests of the North-west would be very much localized, and that it would not really encourage the development of the industry by the people themselves. We should so act that the people themselves, with such assistance as we are able to give them will undertake the work, will be interested in the work and so will be better able to carry it on to a successful issue. I believe that by encouragement of that kind we can accomplish more than by the scheme the hon. gentleman has laid before the House. I trust, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will not press this motion to a division. I would ask him to allow the motion to be withdrawn and trust to the Government and myself as the special representative of the Government in regard to the agricultural interests, to take this question into serious consideration and try in the near future to make such provision in the ordinary way as may accomplish the end he has in view. I may say, that while the hon. gentleman puts this in as an addition to the immigration grant, the estimate in the proposed Supplementary Estimates of the late Government was in the estimates of the Agricultural Department, a department which does not now, as hon. gentlemen know, deal with immigration matters. If the hon. gentleman would agree to this proposition, I can assure him that the dairy interests of the North-west Territories will not suffer in the future, and that I, as Minister of Agriculture, will promise him that anything that can be done will be done to develop and to encourage these industries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I sincerely hope my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia

(Mr. Davin), who has made this motion, will accept the proposition of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. I am quite sure that, after the statement the hon. gentleman has made, the matter may safely be left in his hands to adopt measures substantially on the line suggested by the resolution, to promote the dairy interests of the North-west. I am quite certain that the House will agree with the statement made by the mover of this resolution to-day, that no more efficient means of promoting immigration into the North-west can be adopted than by carrying out proposals that are calculated to render settlement in the North-west successful. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that mixed farming is undoubtedly of the utmost importance in the North-west, and that great as the crops of grain which may be ordinarily looked for in that country, at the same time the experience of some years has proved conclusively, and to the satisfaction of all who have paid special attention to that important section of country, that in mixed farming the agriculturist will find a much safer and more secure means of advancing his interests than by relying simply upon the raising of crops of grain. The agricultural capabilities of that country are enormous. The facilities for raising cattle are of the very best character, and the dairy interests, therefore, may be looked upon as one of the great means of bringing success to the settlers who go out to that country. These creameries have proved so successful under Professor Robertson's instructions in various parts of Canada, and have resulted in such vast advantage to the country, that I believe, if the same policy is adopted in the North-west and is carried out under the auspices of the Government in the same way, it will be found, not only calculated to enhance the value of property there, but to increase the prosperity of the settlers, and, by increasing their prosperity, it will become one of the most valuable immigration agencies, and will induce large numbers of people to settle in that country who otherwise might not do so. I am quite sure that, after the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the question may be safely left in the hands of his department, and that it will receive the attention that so important a question deserves. I trust, therefore, that my hon. friend will accept the proposal which has been made.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister thanked my hon. friend the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) for the business-like way in which he had dealt with this question; and the chief argument of the speech of the hon. Minister was that there was evidently a difference of opinion in the North-west Territories. The only evidence of difference of opinion was the speech of the hon. member for Alberta; that was the only evidence I noticed, and I noticed that that speech followed on the Minister of Agriculture going up and whispering to the hon. member for Alberta, when he rose to move this motion. The hon. member for Alberta is an independent member of a peculiar type.

Mr. GIBSON. Like you.

Mr. DAVIN. No, not like me. I have taken no independent course; but the member for Alberta is a North-west member who comes down here to be perfectly independent and to support North-west questions, but when a North-west question like this comes up, on which the heart of the people is set, and which is of the greatest importance to the North-west Territories, up he starts and tries to put a spoke in the wheel of the proposal. I hope that the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) will prove an independent member of a different type. The newspaper in the principal town of Eastern Assiniboia, the Moosomin paper, last session called on the North-west members in the House to support this proposal—the "Leader" called on all the North-west members to support the proposal, and here is the language of the "Standard," edited by a gentleman who is certainly no friend of mine:

> This is an infant industry natural to the country, and affecting the interests of those on whom the future of the country almost entirely depends. It is not an industry that will require to be coddled for 18 years. It is merely proposed as a public educator, as a means of helping our agriculturists to help themselves by co-operation, and by the application of practical experience which each individual cannot obtain for himself without great sacrifices. It is to be earnestly hoped——

This is from a gentleman who ran north by north-east as a candidate in support of the First Minister; and when I tried to bind him at future meetings to the fact that he was a supporter of the First Minister, he said that, no doubt, the Government of Sir Charles Tupper would be beaten, but when the Governor General would send for Mr. Laurier, Mr. Laurier would say: Your Excellency, I do not find myself equal to forming a Government; you will please send for Mr. McCarthy. But at one place he did declare that he was a supporter of the First Minister:

> It is to be earnestly hoped that the Hon. Sydney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, will duly appreciate the necessity that exists for the development of dairying in the North-west, and give due attention to the plan which the wide experience of Professor Robertson suggests. Our farmers are desirous of utilizing the pasturage which our soil freely produces year after year, rather than depend entirely upon raising grain, which has not been uniformly successful, and which involves much labour and great expense. In improving their own condition they will add materially to the wealth of the country, and thus conducing to its prosperity, will spread its fame and induce population from other lands.

Now, Sir, one would think, from the speech of my hon. friend from Alberta, that I pro-

posed that dairies should be established in uninhabited portions of the North-west. I am quite sure there are broad acres of vast extent in the North-west Territories where it would be very undesirable to establish creameries; but the proposal I advocate here to-day requires that at least thirty farmers shall go into this stock company for the purpose of establishing a creamery. It requires that they should guarantee there will be 400 cows. I do not propose to establish creameries where there are no cows. The proposition made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, as I understood him—and I ask his attention to what I say because I may have misunderstood him—is not a generous one. I do not understand that he accepts my proposal. What I understood him to say was this, that he made a cleavage between the policy of the late Government and the policy of the present Government. I understood the Minister to say something like this,—to show in fact that he was falling back on a laissez faire policy from the cardinal and leading principles of Liberalism in every country; that this proposition of mine would in fact be inimical to the North-west Territories because what we wanted in the Territories was a larger number of people, a still greater increase in the number of flocks and herds. We have large herds now. We have, for instance around Lumsden, to speak of that part of the Territories which I know best, plenty of cows and a good population, but no creameries. Around Balgonie there are plenty of cows and considerable population. Both of those sections have asked for, and still ask for, creameries. As regards Maple Creek, the statement is true, and if it is not true in parts of Alberta, I will be very much surprised, as also in Eastern Assiniboia. I know when it was suggested that part of the eastern section should come into my constituency, I received letters from that portion of the Territories asking me to press this policy on Parliament and on the Government which I then supported. I do not propose, I need hardly say, to denude those people of their self-reliance. Our experience in Moose Jaw is not that the granting of such aid has denuded the people who went into the scheme of self-reliance; but our experience is, that it has aided the farmers who needed the help and special instruction, and the result of such aid has been that self-reliance was developed instead of being retarded or injured. What I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say was this: that the Government of which he is a member will inaugurate some policy that will crowd the North-west with people, with, I suppose, extraordinary rapidity; that it will crowd the North-west with herds, with, I suppose, extraordinary rapidity, and as such there will certainly be increased opportunity for the establishment of creameries. But the same argument so used will surely apply against this policy. The hon. gentleman spoke of such a policy as not being conducive to the self-reliance that would be produced by people being left to themselves and allowed to enter into projects on their own resources and entirely without Government aid. Sir, I cannot take that view at all. I shall be glad if the hon. Minister will tell me that I did not understand him correctly, and I shall be glad to learn that I failed to catch some sentence, in which he stated that he would adopt the policy of the late Government. Of course if the hon. gentleman is going to adopt the policy of the late Government and give those sections of the North-west those creameries which they would have had if the late Government had been allowed to bring down their Supplementary Estimates, that is all I want. But if the hon. gentleman is not going to adopt that course, I certainly think it very desirable that we should urge him to carry out that policy as best he could. I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would tell me whether he said anything that would lead the House to believe that he was going to carry out that policy.

Mr. TALBOT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will ask him a question. I understood the hon. gentleman in the first part of his speech to say that he did not anticipate that the late Government would be defeated and that there would be a change of Government; and on the strength of that anticipation he assured his constituents during the late campaign that he would forward their interests by securing a grant of $20,000 from the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not what I said. What I said was: that the Government had agreed with me to place in the Supplementary Estimates the sum of $20,000 for the purpose of carrying out this policy, and if they had been allowed to pass those Estimates we would have had that money, and I used that as an argument why the people should support me as a supporter of that Government.

Mr. TALBOT. I am very much pleased with the answer given by the hon. gentleman. The effect of that answer to my mind is that if the hon. gentleman had not made that promise I do not think he would have had occasion to obtain the casting vote of the returning officer of his constituency. Under the circumstances, the Government are quite justified in refusing to grant the demand of the hon. gentleman, because it would enable him to put into execution a promise made at a time when such a statement could be interpreted as bribing his constituents.

Mr. LISTER. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government may fairly be trusted to look after every interest and to do everything that will promote the growth and prosperity of the North-west. I do not think

it is altogether necessary that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should continue, as he has done for six or seven years, and in fact ever since he has been a member of this House, pretending to advance and promote the interests of the North-west, when as a matter of fact he has been trying to catch votes.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going too far. He should not use the words "trying to catch votes." Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to make that statement.

Mr. LISTER. Let us look for a moment at the record of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman withdraw those words?

Mr. LISTER. Certainly; it was not to promote votes. Let us look at the record of the hon. gentleman, who assails a new member from the North-west, an hon. gentleman who from what we may judge of him, will no doubt look after the interests not only of his own constituency but of the whole North-west. He will not be found speaking for a motion and voting against it, or dodging the vote. What do we find prior to the last election? The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) suddenly became a free trader, and if we look at the record we will find that the hon. gentleman spoke eloquently in favour of removing the duties upon certain articles, which he said intimately affected the best interest of the North-west. What the record shows is that while he spoke in favour of the removal of these duties, he voted against the motion.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. LISTER. Let the hon. gentleman turn to "Hansard" of 1893, and he will find that when my hon. friend the Postmaster General introduced a resolution in this House that it was expedient to admit binding twine free into this country, the hon. member for Assiniboia spoke in favour of the resolution and voted against it. Let the hon. gentleman look at "Hansard" for 1894, and also for 1892, and he will find that when the same resolution was introduced into this House he spoke in favour of it, but his vote was not recorded in favour of it.—to use a common expression, he took to the woods. What are we to infer from such action? That the hon. gentleman was talking to his constituents, that his party fealty was so strong that he could not vote against the party when the motion was put to a vote. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman called the Cabinet which he supported, and which included many hon. gentlemen now leading the Opposition, a Cabinet of antiques, but antique as they were he was found supporting them, and if the interests of the North-west and his party affiliations clashed, he was always with the party. I venture to say that my hon. friend who sits behind me (Mr. Morrison), when questions affecting the North-west are before the House for consideration, will be found supporting them by voice and vote; and we know he will always be able to support the Administration in power, because, as I said at the outset, the Administration is deeply interested in the advancement of that great territory, which has been so sadly neglected during these past years. Millions of dollars of the public money have been wasted, absolutely thrown away without securing any appreciable advance for that country. Under the policy of the present Administration that country will advance and prosper. The people may rely upon that, because there is a live Government in charge of their affairs to-day, and not one such as the concern which was turned out on the 23rd day of June last. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is now full of zeal for that country. Is it new-found zeal? The hon. gentleman represents his constituency by virtue of the returning officer's vote; after all he has done for that country, and after all the speeches he has made for the people. Session after session he has brought up the grievances of the people, and introduced Bills which were never carried to a conclusion, but which enabled him to say to his electors: "See what I said for the people of this county." But, Mr. Speaker, he could not show what he did for them. The hon. gentleman is now in the peculiar position of representing that constituency by virtue of the returning officer's vote. After all he has done for that county; after all—I won't call it "wind" that he has expended in the House, but I will say, after all the eloquence he has ventilated—after all this eloquence, when he comes to ask the people for an appreciation of what he has done, they say to him: Mr. Davin, we don't want you any more. Sir, there is a protest pending against him, and the chances are that that one vote will not secure Mr. Davin's further sitting in this House. The chances are that his election will be set aside, and somebody else will take his place whose vote will not be inconsistent with his speech.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. The hon. member (Mr. Lister) has reiterated the statement he has made in the early part of his speech, that I was accustomed in this House to speak one way and vote another. That statement is not true to fact. I do not say the hon. gentleman means to say what is not true, but objectively it is an untruth. Therefore, I rise to order. The hon. gentleman had better send for "Hansard" and try to establish what he said.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a question of order; that is a question of fact.

Mr. LISTER. I will show you presently. I have looked up the records very carefully.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, then refer to them.

Mr. LISTER. I was going on to say, Mr. Speaker, that this zealous member from the North-west, this gentleman who is always willing to belittle every one else in this House, this gentleman who thinks that no other member from the Territories is competent to speak as to the interests of the community; has an election coming on, and if the signs are not very deceiving indeed, the strong probabilities are that that gentleman has sat in this House for the last time. When a constituency is served as his constituency has been served—matters affecting the North-west being constantly brought before this House by him, and nothing more done by him than to bring them before the House—it is hardly likely that the peopie of Assiniboia will be satisfied with such representation as the hon. gentleman gives them here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit to you, Sir, whether in a question that is before the courts, it is not in contempt of court, and therefore improper in this House, for any hon. gentleman to make statements that are calculated to prejudice the case. I cannot but think that in the case of an election being protested, and that matter being before the court, that it is entirely contrary to everything in the shape of good taste (not to say anything further) for an hon. member in this House to discuss a question of that kind, and to make statements that are calculated to prejudice the position of parties.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be improper for an hon. member to make statements which would prejudice before the courts the rights of any litigant, but I can hardly think that the fact of a petition being filed against the return of an hon. member would preclude in this House all reference to the facts of the election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of statements made with reference to the result of the trial.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member (Mr. Lister) to speak with reference to the election. I hope the hon. member (Mr. Lister) will refrain from referring to the trial and confine his remarks to the election.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think there is very much doubt as to what the result of the election will be, if the past is to be any indication at all as to the future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was supporting a Government in power and as he sits here only by the grace of the vote of the returning officer, it seems to me pretty safe to expect that even that vote would not continue him as a member of the House. Let me refer again to the inconsistent position which the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has always taken in the House. Need I refer only to the last session, when on the question of the monopoly in the agricultural implement trade, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) withdrew his motion, so as not to embarrass the Government which he was supporting. If you take up the "Hansard," or the Votes and Proceedings of this House, for the years that the hon. gentleman has been here, I do not think that you will be able to find one session during which the hon. gentleman has not introduced legislation which he supported by his speech, but which he allowed to drop. Motions were brought in here for the purpose of relieving the people of the North-west from the burden of taxation they suffered under, and you will find on almost every occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken in favour of the reduction or abolition of the taxes, but has voted in some instances against such motions, and in other instances he has not voted at all. Look at his position on the binder twine question. You will find that on Mr. Mulock's motion, the first time he spoke in favour of it and voted against it, and the next time on the very same motion he spoke in favour of it and did not vote at all. That is the consistent position which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has occupied while supporting the late Government. Of course he has a freer hand now, and it is altogether likely, judging from the Order paper, that he will deluge this House with all sorts of motions. Why, if we are to judge from his motions on the Order paper, the world will believe that he is an advocate of free trade, pure and simple. He can be free now. He can support the Conservative party in the House here, and can go to the North-west Territories and say there: "See what I have done for these people. I have moved this motion. I have moved that motion, I have moved the other motion, all in the interest of the people of this country." The hon. gentleman can be consistent now, because he can vote in the way he moves. That is something he could not do before. Fortunately for him, his hands are now untied, and he can play the role of a reformer to his heart's content, and can at the same time appear in the country to be consistent. Now, I suppose it is hardly parliamentary for me to say that the hon. gentleman is not always sincere in the motions he brings before the House. Because it is not parliamentary, I will not make that statement; but it is evident that the electors of his constituency think he is not sincere, or they would have returned him by a much larger majority. However, one thing is clear, and that is, as I said before, that this Government has pledged itself to promote in every way possible the interests of that country; and there is in this House a gentleman from that country who occupies an independent position, but who, I venture to say, will always be found, by speech and by action, support-

ing, consistently and conscientiously supporting, the interests of that great country. Sir, we all recognize as fully as it is possible for people in this country to recognize, that the greatness of Canada is bound up in the development of the North-west. We feel that Canada can never become great, can never become anything more than provincial, unless that vast tract of territory is settled. People that territory with a hardy population, and you do more than all other things to develop the great resources of this Dominion and to make it rich in everything that contributes to the wealth of a nation. The policy of the old Government has been to cripple, to shackle that country, to make it shrink up; and, strange as it may appear, the addition to the population of that country is hardly appreciable for all the years these hon. gentlemen have been in power. How little has been done for that country. Why, the hon. leader of the Opposition told us, years and years ago—so many years ago that it is almost forgotten—that if this House would advance the millions upon millions of money which it did, in a certain number of years, fixed by that hon. gentleman to a day, there would be an enormous population in that country, and there would be 640,000,000 bushels of wheat a year produced there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that the statement which the hon. gentleman has made was shown during the last session to be entirely unfounded in truth.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I think it is an abuse of parliamentary privilege for a gentleman in this House to endeavour to repeat constantly a statement of that kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition should be satisfied with correcting a statement of fact, and to let the hon. member proceed. I think it is hardly right to criticise his language or his habit of speech.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman says that he never made such a statement——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do.

Mr. LISTER. Then, "Hansard" is all wrong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, "Hansard" proves it, in the clearest manner, a fiction from beginning to end.

Mr. LISTER. A fiction prepared by the Deputy Minister of the Interior and read in this House, and now in "Hansard." If the hon. gentleman denies that he made such a statement——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do.

Mr. LISTER. Then I am bound, for the present, at all events, to accept his denial. But I desire to say that we shall turn up again, as we have turned up many times before, the "Hansard" containing the statement, signed by the present leader of the Opposition——

Mr. CASEY. And endorsed.

Mr. LISTER. And endorsed, that that country would produce, in a certain number of years—which he fixed, and about which he desired to be so accurate that he mentioned the very day; I think it was the 31st of December, inclusive—640,000,000 bushels of wheat per year. If that statement was ever made——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It never was made.

Mr. LISTER. Well, I am bound to accept for the present the denial of the hon. gentleman. But I say if that statement ever was made, the hon. gentleman forgot that the total quantity of wheat produced in the world does not amount to 640,000,000 bushels, and if we produced that quantity in the North-west country, it would not be worth 5 cents a bushel. Sir, referring to the hon. gentleman who is so ready to get up and deny the statement I made, I find that, on the 6th of July, 1891, Mr. Mulock moved that binding-twine be placed on the free list. Mr. Davin, the member for Assiniboia, is recorded in the Votes and Proceedings as having voted "nay.". He was against having binding-twine put on the free list. Then, Sir, if you will look at "Hansard" of the same year, volume 1, page 1822. On the 1st of March, 1893, Mr. Mulock moved to put binding-twine on the free list. Mr. Davin, of Assiniboia, made a strong speech in favour of the removal. Ah, there were eloquent passages in that speech. No man in Canada but the member for Assiniboia could have made them—eloquent, feeling. To read that speech now, Sir, after all the excitement has passed away—to sit down in your chamber and coldly go over it—it excites you with enthusiasm. It makes you feel that the poor settlers of the North-west have been down-trodden and oppressed. And what must the speech have been, delivered on that day, when even now, four years afterwards, it moves any man with feeling in his breast at all to read it? But after making that speech, eloquent, powerful and convincing, appealing to and touching human feelings to a degree that I can scarcely express, and when the vote was called for, a few minutes afterwards, the Votes and Proceedings do not record the name of Mr. Davin in favour of the motion. So that we had the hon. gentleman speaking in favour of the resolution and then dodging the vote. But my hon. friend, talking to the electors of that grand constituency which he represents, could read to them his very eloquent oration and say to them; See what I have done for the poor settlers of the country. Unacquainted with the forms of

parliamentary procedure, of course nobody ever thought of asking Mr. Davin: Well, how did you vote? That speech was sent, no doubt, at the expense of the country to every elector in the constituency, that speech was in the hand of friend and foe alike, and even his foes would say: What a noble soul must beat in the breast of Mr. Davin. They all had it, they had read it, they knew all about it, convincing as it was. When the elections came on, the friends of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) could point to that speech as one indication, at all events, of the overpowering interest he took in the affairs of that North-west country. But the hon. gentleman had been there for several years, and there must be some reason why that speech did not convince the electors of that territory.

Mr. DAVIN. It convinced the Government of Canada.

Mr. LISTER. You never convinced them of anything.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, they brought down the duty 50 per cent.

Mr. LISTER. Year after year the hon. gentleman made himself the special and particular champion of the people of the North-west. There was no grievance, real or imaginary, that he did not ventilate here, and most of them were imaginary. He assailed the Government in the House. One would have thought he would be found working with the Opposition, but whenever he found that he would embarrass the Government, my hon. friend was silent and did not press his motion. He never demanded a vote, and I cannot, at this moment, recall one instance when the hon. gentleman was ever found voting against the Government except on one occasion, and then the Government's majority was so large that the hon. gentleman knew he ran no risk of imperilling its life. You will always find that the hon. gentleman supported the Government and sacrificed the interests of the Territories. The hon. gentleman takes a great interest in butter-making. There is hardly anything that he does not understand. He is an adept at cheese-making. Now, he is going to tell the Minister of Agriculture all about butter-making and creameries and all that sort of thing. No doubt the hon. gentleman knows a great many things, but I venture to say that he knows very little about the making of butter. He has suddenly become very zealous. He is now pressing on his demands to such an extent that the treasury of the country can scarcely satisfy them. No doubt his desire is to make himself solid with the electors, but with such representatives from the Territories as we have behind us, who look well after the interests of that country, who know what they are talking about, the North-west country may be certain that the Government in power to-day will watch the North-west carefully and do everything possible to develop that country, and I believe that when that country has an opportunity of speaking again it will show its appreciation of what this new Government has done and is doing and intends to do for that great country which is the hope of Canada.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As representing a constituency largely interested in this dairy industry, I desire to say a few words on this motion. I may say, in the first place, that I am opposed to any definite sum being passed by this House for this purpose. It cannot be said that this motion is really necessary in view of the expressed policy of the new Government toward the North-west. I have applications from two or three quarters for creameries, but we would much prefer that the whole matter should be left to the good judgment of the present Government. There are already three creameries in operation, and the people are satisfied that the scheme of Professor Robertson is feasible and likely to succeed. I do not want to be put on record as being opposed to any aid to the North-west Territories, but would like to say that I have implicit confidence in the good intention of the Government with reference to this whole question. I can readily understand why the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is exceedingly anxious to have a definite sum voted. I can readily understand that in view of the coming election this motion would tend to strengthen his hands, and secure to some extent the lost confidence of the people. We desire to leave the matter solely with the Government to decide according to its declared policy. I think that I am presenting the sentiments of a people who are largely engaged in mixed farming, and who are just getting their business into shape and to take advantage of the scheme which has already been initiated. when I say that they are perfectly satisfied to allow Professor Robertson to carry out his plan and are ready to fall into line with him. There is no need for anything further at the hands of the Government of the day than to leave the matter with the commissioner and we have confidence in the policy expressed by the Government from time to time. I shall not occupy the time of the House any longer, but shall conclude by expressing my hope that the interests of the North-west shall have all due attention.

Mr. SPROULE. As this question is very important, especially to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and as I have collected some data which I intended to use when it came under consideration but which I have not at my hand at present, I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REMOVALS FROM OFFICE.

Mr. HAGGART moved for :

Return showing the names of all persons who have been dismissed or removed from office or who have been superannuated, and the causes of such dismissal, removal or superannuation, or who have resigned or been requested to resign since the 11th day of July, 1896, showing the office or position such person occupied and whether on the permanent staff or in the temporary employ of the Government or otherwise in the public service, and when such dismissal, removal, superannuation or resignation took place. Also, the names of all persons appointed to positions in the public service, temporarily or permanently, and the office to which they were so appointed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I desire to move in amendment :

That the following words be added to the motion : Also copies of every letter, report and document relating to each of the dismissals in question.

Amendment agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have no objection to the resolution except that I would move as an amendment that the papers be brought down not from 11th July only, but from 23rd June.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will hasten the bringing down of this return as much as possible. It will tend a great deal to the speedy discussion and passing of the Estimates if we have the return down in time.

The PRIME MINISTER. It will be brought down at the earliest possible moment after that intimation from the hon. gentleman.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

On the order being called :

That the time has arrived when the North-west Territories should be treated on the same footing as the organized provinces, that an annual subsidy should be voted for carrying on the government of the Territories, which subsidy should be calculated on the same grounds as those on which the subsidy voted to the province of Manitoba is based.

Mr. DAVIN. The ground of this motion has already been occupied by a motion of my hon. friend from Alberta. If my hon. friend had informed me that he had given notice of the motion, I would not have given notice of this. I shall not move this motion.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (translation) moved for,

Copies of all memorials, reports of engineers, documents and letters, in relation to the great inundation on the St. Lawrence, between Quebec and Montreal, in the months of April and May last (1896), its causes and the best means of preventing the recurrence or mitigating the disastrous results thereof.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion, I wish, to call the attention of the Government to the urgent necessity of preventing, if possible, the recurrence of the disasters almost yearly resulting from the inundation on both shores of the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec. Nearly every year, Sir, when the snow thaws and the ice-bridge breaks on the St. Lawrence, ice-dams are formed, which obstruct the passage of the water and cause the lands on both shores of the river to be flooded. In 1865, an inundation caused considerable damage. On that occasion not only did it result in an enormous loss of property but it was accompanied by a deplorable loss of life. Since that time, the water has not reached so high a level ; but this year, it rose by two feet and a half above the level reached in 1865. The losses suffered from the flooding of the lands are more considerable than in 1865, notwithstanding that, no loss of life had to be deplored this year. In the town of Berthier, chief town of the riding which it is my privilege to represent in this House, all the houses with one single exception were flooded and the water reached up to four feet and even seven feet. The hon. gentlemen may easily infer from that the extent of the losses inflicted on that locality. The town of Berthier was not the only one to suffer from the inundation, but the list of the sufferers was swelled by the parishes of St. Cuthbert, St. Barthélémy, Sorel, Ste. Anne, and the Islands. In those localities, the losses are still more considerable than at Berthier. A great many houses and a still larger number of barns have been carried away by the water, and the hay and grain are a total loss. In the parish of St. Barthélémy, the losses are estimated at $40,000. In the county of Richelieu, for which sits my hon. friend who is unavoidably absent to-day, forming part of a delegation for waiting upon the Postmaster General, and who entrusted me with the task of inviting the attention of the House to the damages caused by the floods at Ste. Anne of Sorel, it is estimated that the losses suffered there reach no less a sum than $60,000. The total losses suffered by all the localities of the two counties situate on the two shores of the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, are estimated at the outside at $500,000. After the great inundation of 1865, some reports were made by engineers sent to the spot with a view to inquiring into the position and taking some action if possible, in order to protect the town of Berthier from the ravages of the flood. With this end in view they had an ice-breaker built, but so low that, in the spring of the year, it is several feet under water, so that it serves no useful purpose.

Flooding, as all the hon. gentlemen know is produced by ice-dams which form at certain points on the St. Lawrence, the effect of which is to cause the river to overflow its banks. The banks of ice break and are strewn about the shores, carrying away with them houses, barns and cattle, and leaving, after the river has resumed its normal course, numberless germs of disease. The hon. members thus see to what extent public health is imperilled. In order to protect the town of Berthier from the floods, it would be necessary for the Government to build three ice-breakers, at different points, and to raise up that which was built after the flood of 1865, and which now serves no useful purpose. From the opinion of engineers whose advice I asked, I should be led to think it necessary for the Government to take such action as would prevent those dams from forming or would shatter them as soon as formed. I am told that such a precaution would prove efficient and could be resorted to without the Government having to incur any considerable expenditure, or at any rate quite below the damages caused by a single flood. I move for copies of documents, letters and reports of engineers which may have been drawn up under directions given either by the Government of the day or by the late Government, with a view to ascertaining what expenditure need be incurred in order to reach the desired end. I trust that the Government, if they have not yet taken any action in the matter, will take all necessary and efficient means to prevent the recurrence of such damages in the future, and that they will not fail to put in the Supplementary Estimates a sufficient sum to afford adequate protection to that immense tract of country from the disastrous flood whose periodical, and I might say yearly, recurrence results in such losses.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). (Translation.) The Government are well acquainted with all the facts submitted to this House by my hon. friend and are fully alive to their high importance. The Government are not aware whether the late Government concerned themselves with that question. No preliminary work, so far as I know, was made with a view to ascertaining what would be the best method of protecting in the future those localities from such ravages. Should there be found in the records of the department any reports or documents such as mentioned in the motion they will as soon as possible be brought down and laid on the Table of the House. But should there be no such reports on record, that is to say, if the late Government did not take this question into their consideration, the duty will be incumbent upon us immediately to deal with it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT POINT CLARK.

Mr. SEMPLE (for Mr. Tolmie) moved for :

Return of all complaints made against Mr. Rae, lighthouse keeper at Point Clark, in the county of Bruce, Ontario, and of all correspondence relating to such complaints and of any action of the Government thereon.

Mr. CAMERON. I trust the Government will deal with this matter promptly. I put a question on the Paper some days ago and obtained an answer from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—by the way I do not see him in his seat—that this man was complained against over and over again. He was complained against on the ground that he allowed the lights to go out ; he was complained against on the ground that on more than one occasion during business hours, he was beastly drunk. I do not know the man. I do not know what his politics are ; I only know that several of my constituents who live in the neighbourhood of this lighthouse, have complained to me and asked me to bring the matter to the attention of the Government. I submit that if the answer given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a correct answer, this man's services ought to be dispensed with promptly, in the public interest, and in the interest of navigation on the upper lakes.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE SERVICE.

Mr. GIBSON moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council appointing persons to the several departments of Government service from 1st May, 1896, to 10th July, 1896, giving their names, the nature of their appointments and the salary attached or recommended thereto. Also the names of all persons in the Government service recommended for promotion, the positions held, the salaries paid, the promotion and position recommended, as well as the increased salary and the dates of such recommendations.

He said : Shortly after this Government came into office the Conservative press from one end of the Dominion to the other, took the trouble to count the number of men who were coming down to Ottawa, as they stated, to ask the new Government for positions of place and trust. I think, Sir, that when this order is brought down, it will be clearly shown to the House and to the country how very few appointments were left to be made by the new Government by the greedy Tories who were after the positions, and who came down in hordes, I may say, and applied for positions from the late Government after they had no business to make appointments of that kind. Sir, I am not a lawyer myself, but I may mention that when the papers announced the number of

lawyers that had been recommended for appointment as Q. C's. by the late Government, I questioned a friend of mine whom I met, and asked him if there were any more lawyers left in the country, as all the rest of them had been made Q. C's. We find also that veterinary surgeons were appointed in every part of the country, and positions of every kind were sought to be filled by a Government who had lost the confidence of the people. And yet, Sir, the supporters of that party to-day accuse members on this side of the House of trying to make provision for their friends. Why, Sir, there was not a nook or loop hole left in the whole civil service from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that was not sought after by the friends of the late Government, and if the members of that Government did not succeed in making provision for them, it was not their fault. For instance, they placed a man in the Department of Railways and Canals; I believe, he was an appointee of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who, I may say, took the trouble to find places for his constituents, not only in the county which he represented, but also in the counties of Lincoln and Welland, because the hon. member for Welland in the late Parliament and myself, were in the cold shades of opposition. This man was, as I understand, in the employ of the Government, he was in the canal office, but his name did not appear on the pay-roll. He was paid, perhaps, out of the secret service fund that the late Government has had at their disposal, or paid perhaps in some other way. I notice the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) laughing; but it is well known to all the members of this House that many men in the Government service who were supposed to be clerks, were put down as doing something in the North-west, while they were in reality working for the Government in the city of Ottawa, or some other place. This kind of thing has been going on. The Government, not having had enough offices for their friends, have created offices by making these men appear on the various pay-rolls of the Government as doing some other kind of work, and have paid them for some other kind of work than that which they were supposed to be doing. I think when this order comes down we will then see with what care the late Administration made provision for their supporters. I think it would have been just as well for themselves and for their friends to have refrained from any criticism as to the number of applications that were being made by the friends of the present Government. There is an old saying that it is not well to holloa until you are out of the woods. The late Government is not exactly out of the woods yet. There are a great many things, I fancy, that will be shown in this return; and I am safe in saying that this return will be given in full, and the members on both sides of the House will have the satisfaction of knowing that when a return is asked from this Government, it will be brought down in toto, and not garbled as has been the custom in the past. I think when we are furnished with the documents asked for in this return, we will see what care the members of the late Government and their supporters had for their friends in securing for them positions and promotions.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all letters and other papers in the possession of the Government relating to the repairs and extension of the Belle River breakwater and the Red Point pier in the province of Prince Edward Island.

He said: This is a subject in which a large number of the people of Prince Edward Island are interested. I had the honour, a few days ago, of asking a question in regard to this matter, and the answer which I obtained from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was that those public works had not been taken over by the Dominion Government. That may be the fact, but it does not detract from the importance of those two public works. One of them, Belle River breakwater, on the southern side of the Island, serves as a shipping port for a large number of residents in the surrounding sections, and extension of that pier or breakwater is of the utmost importance. The province is a very small one, and its harbours are likewise small. It is a very thickly settled province, and its exports are very large: indeed, I suppose, comparing exports and area there is not another part of Canada which can, acre for acre—or rather that the same area as Prince Edward Island cannot be found in any part of Canada which can ship as much produce as Prince Edward Island. It is, therefore, necessary in the interests of our people, especially in view of the large public works constructed in other parts of the Dominion, that they should have good shipping accommodation. This is all the more necessary because the prices received for produce are very low; it has to be carried long distances, and the prices received by the growers are not very high. Much of it is perishable—as the root crop—and every convenience is required in order to have it shipped expeditiously. The first of these public works to which I refer is not a new one; it is one to which attention has been given by the local government, and I can justly claim a grant for its extension by the Dominion Government. The late Government, by Order in Council, had agreed last session to place $2,000 in the Estimates for its repair and extension; and the Government were also prepared to place

a sum, not quite so large, in the Supplementary Estimates for the Red Point pier. I hope the present Government will, in that respect at least, follow the footsteps of their predecessors. Such grants would confer great benefit on the people of this part of the Island, who were justified in making those claims on the Government of the day. It must be remembered that the people of the Island have no direct or indirect interest in the money expended on the canal system of the Dominion, and other public works. They are cut off from communication with the rest of the Dominion for many months of the year, and, therefore, it is necessary that the few small public works on the Island should be kept in good repair. I may say, Sir, that the harbours of that province do not cost this Dominion a very large sum of money. Although they are numerous, they are very small, and the money expended on them is a mere bagatelle. I trust that the House and the Government will take this question into their serious consideration, and insert in the Supplementary Estimates a sum of $2,000 for the Belle River breakwater and $1,000 for the Red Point pier. I do not wish to detain the House, as it is nearly six o'clock, but this much at least is due to the little province from which I come. The fact that these works have not been taken over by the Dominion Government should not stand as a barrier in the way of these grants, because, if you look over the records of Parliament, you will find that moneys have been expended at different times on similar works, not only in the province of Prince Edward Island, but in many other parts of the Dominion. I again ask the attention of the Government to the matter, and I trust that they will attend to it in the interest of the people of that province, who are handicapped in many ways as compared with their fellow Canadians in other provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). All the papers connected with the case will be gladly brought down.

Mr. HACKETT. I wish to make a remark or two on the subject before the motion is declared carried, and to supplement briefly what has been so ably said by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Martin). I am well acquainted with that locality, and I know that the hon. gentleman, in putting forward his case, is not only doing his duty to his constituents, but that he is asking what is due to this part of the province. With regard to the hon. gentleman's remarks that these works, which are of Dominion importance, have not been taken hold of by the Government, I desire to say that there is in my county one pier and one breakwater which have been taken by the Dominion Government, and which are now badly in need of repairs. I was very glad the other day when I asked a question of the Minister of Public Works to find that he had provided for the repairing of two very important works in my province, namely, the breakwater at Tignish and the breakwater of Miminegash. There is, however, a small work taken over a few years ago by the Dominion Government and which has been allowed to fall into disrepair. I refer to the pier at West Point. This pier is of great importance to the people of that section of the country. Most of the inhabitants there are about twelve miles from the line of railway, and while they have every facility by means of water to transport their products, they are deprived of that facility, because of the want of proper accommodation which a pier would afford. They have to take their produce by land, a distance of ten or twelve miles in the most inclement season of the year when the roads are in poor condition, and the expense incurred in this way lessens, of course, the value of their products and the profits from their sale in the market. I trust that the Minister of Public Works will seriously consider this matter. The expenditure of $2,000 at West Point would place that pier in such a state that it would be of great advantage to these people. It would afford them many facilities which they are now deprived of, and they would be able to transport their products from that pier to railway communication with the rest of the Dominion at Point du Chene, N.B. Those people instead of being obliged to haul their produce a distance of ten or twelve miles over land, could then ship it from West Point to Point du Chene, a distance of thirty miles, by water, and they would be enabled to take advantage of the markets of the Dominion, on an equal footing with their fellow-citizens who reside near railway communication. I know that my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Yoe) will corroborate me, when I say that the people residing around the shores of the Island of Prince Edward, are a hardy, active and intelligent race. However, they have for a number of years been placed at a great disadvantage. I will advocate as strongly as I possibly can the building of a railway to West Point, because I believe that the building of that branch railway would be a great advantage to the people of that district. I do not ask now for the building of a pier there, because part of the pier has already been built. I simply ask that it be repaired in such a way that the people should be able to take advantage of it. There is also another breakwater which has been undertaken by the people of the locality themselves. I refer to the breakwater at Brae. After waiting for a number of years the people there subscribed a sum of money for the building of this breakwater. After the money was subscribed and the work commenced, a certain amount was voted by this Parliament to complete it. It is, however, yet uncompleted, and a small grant

of $1,000 or so would tend towards its completion and would render it of some advantage to the people in that section. As it is nearly six o'clock, and as I wish to hear from my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Yeo) I will now take my seat.

Mr. YEO. Mr. Speaker, as it is six o'clock and the House is about to adjourn, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all memorials, reports, correspondence, plans and papers in relation to the construction of a bridge in front of Quebec, or in the vicinity, to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Return giving the names of all fishermen holding fishing licenses in the county of Lincoln and Niagara from the Dominion Government, and the amounts paid by each during the year 1895, and the names of license holders for the same district for the year 1896.—(Mr. Gibson.)

ADJOURNMENT—CORRESPONDENCE WITH HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, as we have very nearly exhausted the Order paper, and under the circumstances with which the House is familiar, I will now move the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government if he would be able to lay upon the Table of the House the papers referred to in my letter to His Excellency the Governor General: the list of precedents and the list of appointments made by Mr. Mackenzie's Government?

The PRIME MINISTER. The list of precedents to which my hon. friend alludes will be laid upon the Table of the House to-morrow. The papers which he moved for the other day respecting the appointments made by the several Governments after their defeat, the Mackenzie Government and so on, will be laid, I hope, upon the Table of the House on Friday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman of course, knows to what papers I refer. In my letter to His Excellency the Governor General, I referred to papers which I had placed in His Excellency's hands, containing the precedents to which I wished to draw His Excellency's attention: also, the list of appointments made by Mr. Mackenzie's Administration after its defeat and previous to its resignation. I presume that these papers, being referred to in the letter, form part of that correspondence, and I would be glad to have them both laid on the Table.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly, they will both be laid on the Table of the House to-morrow. My hon. friend also made a motion the other day on the subject of the appointments of the Mackenzie Government after its defeat. All these papers, I hope, will be laid on the Table on Friday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the leader of the House whether he proposes to adjourn the House from Thursday night till Tuesday.

The PRIME MINISTER. The House will sit to-morrow and on Friday as well. As to whether it will sit on Monday or not, I shall be able to make a definite statement to the House to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this motion is put, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. leader of the Government to the fact that when it was proposed a few days ago to make Wednesday a Government day, it was decided that we should have Wednesday after six o'clock for public Bills and Orders. I have on the Order paper a most important Bill referring to alien labour, and I am receiving letters and petitions by every mail, urging that it shall be pushed through this session.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why did you not push it through last session?

Mr. TAYLOR. Simply because hon. gentlemen opposite would not allow us to reach it. There is a demand made by both sides of the House that this Bill be pressed to a conclusion this year, and I hope that, if the time allotted to private members on Wednesday be taken away, the hon. leader of the Government will place this among the Government Orders.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say to my hon. friend that the Government do not intend to place that Bill on the Government Orders, but we will give my hon. friend every opportunity to bring it before the House and have it discussed. The hon. gentleman understands the reason why the House is not sitting this evening. We have among us a most distinguished stranger, who is to be entertained this evening, and I am sure that every member of the House wishes him to be entertained in a suitable manner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to give the hon. gentleman notice that before the House goes into Supply to-morrow, there will be something said in reference to Governor General's warrants, followed by a motion.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE BAR IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have to announce for the information of the House that a petition signed by a number of members has just been handed to me, requesting that I should cause the bar in the House for the sale of liquors, to be closed. This morning a meeting of the Committee of Internal Economy of the House was held, at which all its members were present, namely, Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Davies, Mr. Fielding, Mr. Tarte, and myself as Chairman, which committee unanimously passed a resolution that the bar in the basement of the House of Commons be absolutely abolished, and directions have been given to that effect.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier), from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday, the 20th August last, presented the following report :—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Angers,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blair,
Borden (Halifax),
Britton,
Bruneau,
Cameron,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Casgrain,
Choquette,
Davies,
Davin,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortin,
Fraser (Guysboro'),
Geoffrion,
Haggart,
Ives,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Lount,
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McInerney,
McIsaac,
Madore,
Mills,
Monet,
Monk,
Mulock,
Pouliot,
Powell,
Quinn,
Russell,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Wood (Brockville.)—44.

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Bazinet,
Beausoleil,
Bell (Addington),
Bennett,
Bourbonnais,
Carroll,
Chauvin,
Copp,
Cowan,
Desmarais,
Dugas,
Earle,
Ethier,
Ferguson,
Fitzpatrick,
Fortin,
Hale,
Harwood,
Hurley,
Legris,
Logan,
Marcotte,
Meigs,
Roche,
Rogers,
Seagram,
Somerville,
Tyrwhitt.—28.

And that the Quorum of said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Angers,
Beattie,
Beausoleil,
Belth,
Belcourt,
Bell (Pictou),
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Bethune,
Blair,
Blanchard,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Britton,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Chauvin,
Choquette,
Christie,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davies,
Davin,
Dechene,
Desmarais,
Devlin,
Dimock,
Dobell,
Domville,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyment,
Edwards,
Ellis,
Erb,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fiset,
Fitzpatrick,
Ingram,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Kendry,
Klock,
Kloepfer,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Lister,
Livingston,
Logan,
Lount,
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
Mackie,
MacLaren,
Maclean,
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McCormick,
McDougall,
McGregor,
McHugh,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
Madore,
Martin,
Maxwell,
Mignealt,
Mills,
Monet,
Monk,
Montague,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Osler,
Parmalee,
Penny,
Pope,
Pouliot,
Poupore,
Powell,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Proulx,
Quinn,
Ratz,
Reid,

Flint,
Fortin,
Fraser (Guysboro'),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Godbout,
Guay,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hale,
Haley,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Henry,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Hutchison,
Richardson,
Robertson,
Robinson,
Rogers,
Rosamond,
Russell,
Savard,
Scriver,
Sproule,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Tisdale,
Tucker,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Turcot,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Hamilton).—165.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Bain,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bell (Addington),
Bell (Pictou),
Bennett,
Bethune,
Boisvert,
Boyd,
Bourbonnais,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Carscallen,
Casey,
Choquette,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Cowan,
Craig,
Desmarais,
Dupont,
Dyment,
Earle,
Edwards,
Ellis,
Ethier,
Fitzpatrick,
Fortin,
Fraser (Guysboro'),
Fraser (Lambton),
Gilmour,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Hodgins,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Kaulbach,
LaRivière,
Lavergne,
Legris,
Lemieux,
Livingston,
Logan,
Macdonald (Huron),
MacLaren,
Maclean,
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McDougall,
McGillivray,
McHugh,
Meigs,
Migneault,
Monet,
Moore,
Morin,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Paterson,
Penny,
Pouliot,
Prior,
Proulx,
Roddick,
Rosamond,
Russell,
Savard,
Stenson,
Tucker,
Yeo.—73.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Bain,
Bazinet,
Boisvert,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Cargill,
Copp,
Douglas,
Dupré,
Earle,
Erb,
Ferguson,
Fiset,
Fisher,
Flint,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Ingram,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Kaulbach,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Mackie,
McGugan,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McMillan,
McNeill,
Marcotte,
Maxwell,
Mills,
Monk,
Moore,
Morin,
Pettet,
Ratz,
Rinfret,
Roche,
Scriver,
Semple,
Stubbs,
Tolmie,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville).—46.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bourassa,
Charlton,
Dupont,
Ellis,
Foster,
Gibson,
Landerkin,
LaRivière,
Macdonald (Huron),
Maclean,
McMullen,
Montague,
Oliver,
Parmalee,
Préfontaine,
Richardson,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Tisdale.—22.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Bergin,
Blair,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (King's),
Cameron,
Campbell,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casgrain,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davies,
Devlin,
Dobell,
Domville,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Foster,
Fraser (Guysboro'),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Haggart,
Henry,
Hughes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Lister,
Lount,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McGregor,
McInerney,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McMullen,
Madore,
Mills,
Montague,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Powell,
Quinn,
Rinfret,
Somerville,
Sproule,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wallace,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Hamilton).—65.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of nine members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Angers,
Bain,
Beattie,
Beausoleil,
Beith,
Bell (Pictou),
Bernier,
Blair,
Blanchard,
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Britton,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Calvert,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Charlton,
Chauvin,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Corby,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davies,
Dechene,
Devlin,
Dimock,
Dobell,
Domville,
Dugas,
Dupré,
Earle,
Edwards,
Ethier,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fiset,
Fortin,
Foster,
Fraser (Guysboro'),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Ganong,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Godbout,
Guay,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hale,
Haley,
Henderson,
Henry,
Hughes,
Hutchison,
Ingram,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Kendry,
Klock,
Kloepfer,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Legris,
Lewis,
Lister,
Livingston,
Logan,
Lount,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McCormick,
McDougall,
McGillivray
McInnes,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McLennan (Inverness),
McNeill,
Madore,
Migneault,
Morin,
Osler,
Paterson,
Penny,
Pope,
Poupore,
Powell,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Reid,
Richardson,
Robertson,
Rosamond,
Russell,
Scriver,
Seagram,
Stubbs,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Tisdale,
Tolmie,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wallace,
Wilson,
Wood (Hamilton),
Yeo.—127.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of nine members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Bain,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Bell (Addington),
Bell (Pictou),
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Boisvert,
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyd,
Broder,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Casey,
Christie,
Clancy,
Cochrane,
Davin,
Dechene,
Dimock,
Douglas,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dupré,
Dyment,
Edwards,
Erb,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Ferguson,
Fisher,
Frost,
Gauthier,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Godbout,
Guay,
Guillet,
Haley,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Hutchison,
Ingram,
Joly de Lotbinière, (Sir Henri),
Lang,
LaRivière,
Legris,
Lewis,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
Mackie,
MacLaren,
McCormick,
McGillivray,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McHugh,
McInnes,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
McNeill,
Marcotte,
Martin,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Montague,
Moore,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Parmalee,
Pettet,
Pope,
Poupore,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Richardson,
Rinfret,
Robinson,
Roche,
Roddick,
Rogers,
Rosamond,
Seagram,
Semple,
Sproule,
Stenson,
Stubbs,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Tyrwhitt,
Wilson,
Yeo.—107.

And that the quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven members.

THE PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved :

That the said Report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved :

That a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz. :—Messrs. Bergeron, Bergin, Bourassa, Charlton, Costigan, Dupont, Ellis, Gibson, Landerkin, LaRivière, Macdonald (Huron), Maclean, McMullen, Montague, Oliver, Parmalee, Préfontaine, Richardson, Somerville, Sutherland, Taylor and Tisdale, will act as members on the part of this

House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to suggest to the hon. leader of the Government that in view of the absence of Mr. Costigan the name of Mr. Foster be substituted for Mr. Costigan's name on that committee, at all events during the latter's absence.

The PRIME MINISTER. I consent to the change.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 9) to amend the Criminal Code of 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(Mr. Charlton.)

RESIGNATION OF THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government if he is ready to lay upon the Table of the House the remaining correspondence with regard to the resignation of the late Government?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have the correspondence here, that is to say, the memorial which was laid by Sir Charles Tupper before His Excellency at the time the correspondence took place between His Excellency and himself; and I now lay this correspondence on the Table. I move that rule 94 of the House be suspended, and that the papers just brought down be immediately printed.

Motion agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like also to ask the leader of the Government when he expects to be able to lay on the Table of the House further correspondence covered by the motion?

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope to bring it down to-morrow.

FIRE AT TIGNISH, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the notice of the House a very serious disaster which occurred in Prince Edward Island a few days ago,—I refer to the fire at Tignish. The fire occurred on Sunday, and within three hours the greater part of the town was swept away, nothing being left but smoking ruins instead of the happy homes which formerly existed. I will read for the information of the House a brief description of the fire as printed in the Charlottetown "Guardian," as follows:—

Tignish has suffered a severe loss. Probably never has such a fire occurred on this island as that which happened on Sunday. It broke out at about 2.30 p.m. in the carriage factory of Mr. Peter Kinch, caused by the owner's daughter igniting some shavings. A strong south-west wind was blowing at the time, which bore the flames around the business part of the village. The large Chaisson block was soon a mass of flames, and almost simultaneously, the residence of Dr. Murphy. It swept through the principal part of the village, burning furiously as though no power on earth could stop it, and many buildings were soon consumed. The railway round house, one engine and a number of cars were burned. The flames spread so rapidly that only one engine could possibly be saved. This was pushed out by hand, there not being time to get up steam. The sight was a pitiful one, and the excitement was intense. Tignish has no fire protection, and the citizens were obliged to work together to their utmost, using buckets of water and other similar methods, but the flames were too powerful, and in the short time of three hours from the time it began, the village was a mass of ruins. There are about seventy buildings in all burned to the ground, and fourteen families left homeless. A relief committee is organized for the purpose of coming to the aid of the poor people who suffered by the late fire. Any contributions will be thankfully received by the parish.

(Signed) FATHER DUGALD.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion on which an appeal may fairly be made to the generosity of both parties in this House. I remember fourteen or fifteen years ago being a spectator of a fire across the river in Hull, when many people lost their homes. On that occasion, Parliament being in session, an appeal was made to it, and immediate aid was asked and afforded by this Parliament. A resolution was at once brought down to the House, and passed to afford relief to the sufferers. I ask the leader of the Government, who is a very humane man and one who would desire to relieve the sufferings of distress, if on this occasion he will not be prepared to bring down a resolution as was done on that occasion, and have a grant passed by Parliament so as to afford some assistance to the sufferers at Tignish. A sum of $2,000 granted now would relieve the sufferings of those people more than three times that amount obtained at a later period. I ask the consideration of the leader of the Government, the Finance Minister and their colleagues to this matter, and I trust they will be able to grant some assistance.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I heard only indistinctly the remarks that fell from my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett), but I understood him to refer to a disaster which had befallen the town of Tignish, which forms part of one of the ridings represented in this House. I understood the hon. gentleman to desire not only the sympathy of the Government but expression of their sympathy in a way more substantial than mere sentiment. The hon. gentleman will recognize at once that it is impossible for the Government on the spur of the moment to give an answer to this demand. It will be taken into due consideration, but the particulars given in the newspaper report being scanty,

I shall feel obliged if the hon. gentleman will call on me and present more definitely and exhaustively the details.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions adopted in Committee of Supply 1st inst.

Annual Drill of the Militia..... $446,500

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has the information which he promised to supply ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). When this item was considered in Committee of Supply, I was asked to give some details as to the number of men who would be drilled this year. The question arose as to whether the whole force or only a portion of it was to be drilled in camp. I have now the figures and details to give to the House, which I will read as follows :—

Officers and Men.	Horses.	To provide for Twelve Days' Drill.	Pay and Allowances.	
10,624	93	City and Independent Companies at their local headquarters, viz. : City Infantry Battalions and Independent Companies....	.....	$85,000
24,411	2,697	Drill in Camps of Instruction—All the Cavalry Corps, Field Batteries, Engineers and all the Rural Infantry Corps, including Brigade Staff at Camps....	$226,000	
		Camp kettle allowances.....	3,000	
		Marching and baggage allowances	8,000	
				237,000
		Rations, forage and fuel.....	66,000	
		Incidental expenses of camp.....	3,500	
				69,500
		Artillery competition—Field and Garrison Artillery ...	.....	5,000
		Transport.....	70,000	
		Less for eleven battalions to drill at local headquarters.	20,000	
				50,000
35,035	2,790		$100,000	$446,500

It is proposed to drill the following men this autumn :—Officers and men, 10,300, horses, 1,000 ; total number of camps, 11, with 12 days' drill at each. The camps will be held on 8th, 15th, 22nd and 29th September, as authorized by General Order No. 70, of 24th August, 1896. There will be 8 brigade camps and 3 local headquarters' camps.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Did I understand the hon. Minister the other day to state that there will be no militia drill in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not say so.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) You mentioned all the other provinces, and you evidently omitted Prince Edward Island.

Resolution concurred in.

The FINANCE MINISTER moved that consideration of the remaining resolutions in the report of the committee be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I am obliged to ask the attention of hon. gentlemen on both sides to a short statement in reference to what all will agree to be a very important matter, namely, the principle and the practice, as illustrated by the issue of Governor General's warrants in the months of July and August. In doing so, I may be at some disadvantage in the discussion of this point as far as the legal aspects are concerned, as I am not a lawyer, but I shall endeavour to place the view of the Opposition, and, I hope, the view of the whole House, in a calm and temperate way. I ask the attention of members to it—not as we may be divided as sitting on your right and your left, Mr. Speaker—but the attention of the House to it, as representatives of the constituencies of Canada, and viewing it from that standpoint alone. What I mean is this : that I think it would be a pity if we undertook the discussion of an important matter like this from a purely party standpoint, and so far as I am concerned, whilst I propose to put my own opinions as strongly as possible, I do not wish to give the matter that tinge in the slightest degree. Probably this question is of more importance at the present time, under the view that we are a new House of Commons, coming together,

many of us, for the first time in our representative capacity, and that is added to somewhat by the fact that it is also the advent of a new party to the Government of the country, commencing its record and basing its acts upon certain principles and framing its practice on its view of those principles. In the first place, I will not insult the intelligence of this House by dwelling to any extent at all on the principle that the House of Commons holds within its peculiar power the supply for the administration of the services of the country. I will not ask hon. gentlemen on either side of the House to review that long course of historic struggle which commenced centuries ago, and which, after continuing for years, at last culminated in the gaining by the representatives of the people in the Commons of the country of the undoubted and absolute control of public money. What through centuries of struggle has been gained by the Commons, it is equally important that those who represent the people in the Commons, should keep intact. For, if it is worth centuries of struggle and labour to gain an important and vital principle, it is worth the best and most serious attention of those who succeed to the legacy of representation, to keep these privileges intact. When the House of Commons in Great Britain had gained this vital principle, the importance of that principle was typified still by the struggle, but it was typified, and remains typified until this day, by the guards that have been thrown around the appropriations of moneys before they can go into the hands of the Executive for distribution and for administration. There are three ways in which the House of Commons may grant to the Executive power the financial aids that they are willing to give. They may do it by the regular course, of Estimates proposed to the House, on the initiation always of the Crown. The peculiar care which is thrown about the appropriations after the initial step has been taken by the Crown, is of great interest, and marks the strength and importance of the vital principle of control. These Estimates are submitted to the House, and each item becomes a resolution which has to be passed in committee. These resolutions have to be reported at another stage to the House, and finally concurred in. Even after that, formal resolutions have to be submitted and passed as a basis for a Bill of Supply, and then that Bill of Supply has to take its three formal stages, and go to the Senate, and be assented to by the Crown. All these guards, with the appropriate legislative pause between each step, is an attestation of the vitality of the principle of parliamentary control, and show us who come in after the struggle has been made, how strongly the responsibility rests upon us of maintaining intact that vital principle. Now, Sir, the Government may be given money for expenditure in another and more expeditious way. A credit may, on short notice and with few formalities, be granted to the Government for the expenditure of a certain sum, or an Address to the Crown may be passed, by which the Crown is authorized or asked to undertake a certain expenditure, with the assurance and guarantee that the Commons will stand at the back of the Executive so far as that appropriation is concerned. These three methods are the only parliamentary methods by which supply can be given to the Executive. Whilst Parliament is in session, there is no other possible way by which the Government of the country can get hold of one single cent of the consolidated funds for expenditure. But common sense also has its reign, and it is acknowledged that certain circumstances might arise which would render the application of the rule of parliamentary appropriation rather against the public interest than for it, on certain occasions and in certain emergencies. By statute a method is arranged and made legal whereby under certain circumstances and conditions, moneys other than those which have been appropriated by Parliament may be taken by the Executive and may be applied for certain expenditures. This cannot be done while Parliament is in session, and that it is important for us to remember in this discusson. There are certain conditions upon which, in accordance with the Act to which I have alluded, Governor General's warrants may issue; for that is the machinery, and the only machinery by which the Government can put its hand into the public treasury. At the beginning of the discussion I will read the clause in the Audit Act which gives that authority. It is this:

> If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good,——

These are the conditions precedent.

> —then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent,——

These are the conditions sequent, which never can have force and operate unless the conditions precedent have place.

> —the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required, which shall be placed by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to a special account, against which cheques may issue from time to time, in the usual form, as they are required.

Now, as I have stated, there are in that Act two sets of conditions. The two which I have called the conditions precedent to any action whatever, are the two first quoted—that there shall be some accident to a public work or public building, the necessity for

the urgent repair or replacement of which is, in the opinion of the Government, undoubted. For instance, suppose there is no parliamentary appropriation made by Parliament for any repair or extra work upon this parliamentary Chamber in which we are convened; and suppose that in the interim of the sessions a fire takes place, and this Chamber is partially or totally destroyed, and it is necessary that it shall be repaired or rebuilt for the approaching session of Parliament: then, in that case, the condition precedent is complied with, and a Governor General's warrant may issue, under the Act which I have quoted, for a sufficient sum of money to repair or replace this Chamber. If there is a public wharf, at which a large and important amount of business is transacted, and by a storm or other accident it is destroyed, and the conditions of trade and commerce make it, in the public interest, urgent that it shall be at once repaired or replaced; and, if there is no parliamentary appropriation, and the accident has not been foreseen: then, in that case, a Governor General's warrant may issue, and the work may be replaced or repaired. There is also a second condition precedent, and it is this: when any other occasion arises for an expenditure which is not foreseen or provided for by Parliament, and for which there is an urgent and immediate necessity. That forms the second condition precedent, and if that has place, then a Governor General's warrant may issue, under the terms of the Act which I have quoted. These are the two precedent conditions, and until these two conditions, or one of these conditions, is complied with, neither the Minister of a department or the Finance Minister has any right to take action with reference to the procurement of a Governor General's warrant. If one or other of these conditions precedent is complied with and has force, then the conditions sequent come in—that the Minister of the department shall, by report to Council, set forth the urgency of an appropriation—because he is to be the judge of that—and that the Finance Minister shall perform the formal duty of certifying that there is no appropriation provided. In that case, the report may be adopted by Council, and the Governor General may sign it, and the warrant will have executive force, and the expenditure may take place under it. I take it that there is not a single member in this House who disputes the accuracy, in the main, of the position I have taken so far with reference to this matter. Now I come to a most important matter, where a difference of opinion may occur, on the second condition precedent, as to what the Act really means. I leave that more especially for the legal gentlemen on both sides of the House to determine; but I still am obliged to take a common-sense view of the meaning of that second condition precedent. It has been argued that it means, not that the expenditure should be both unforeseen and unprovided for, but that it may be either unforeseen, in which case the second condition holds, or it may be simply unprovided for, in which case also the second condition holds. Two observations, I think, may be made upon that argument, if it be advanced. If that argument is a true and valid argument, we are face to face with two things: first, an evident surplusage in the Act itself; for, if the contention is true that all that is necessary to fulfil that condition is that the expenditure shall not have been provided for by Parliament, there was no necessity for putting in the words "not foreseen," because the words "not provided for" fulfil both conditions, whether it was not foreseen, or whether it was foreseen but still not provided for. It is a matter for discussion as to what the legal view may be: but certainly the argument may be taken, I think, and pressed to its full, that the surplusage exists, if we admit the contention that is sometimes made. But a graver consideration is this: that if that contention is true, estimation by the Government and appropriation by Parliament comes to be a complete farce and nullity, or may be made so at the will, or the wish, or the whim of the Government of the day. If, for instance, it is sufficient to say that an appropriation or an expenditure is simply unprovided for in the Estimates, then you get upon the range of a possibility which bears within it the germ of total extinction of appropriation by Parliament and Estimates submitted to Parliament for the sake of appropriations. I do not imagine that any gentleman on either side of the House, taking in the spirit of the Act, taking in the long struggle which resulted in the vital principle of parliamentary control being gained, and taking in the fact that this Act is given, not to nullify parliamentary control, but under certain grave and emergent conditions to allow the public service a little latitude for its fulfilment—I do not imagine, I say, that any person can look at these things and at the Act itself, and the purpose for which it was enacted, and argue seriously that any item that was simply unprovided for in the Estimates, may be expended by the mere will or whim of a Government, or the honest and well-reasoned opinion of a Government that it is necessary or that this fulfils the conditions precedent which are necessary to the issue of a Governor General's warrant. What I mean to say is this, and I call the attention of my hon. friend, the Solicitor General, to it. I read over to-day carefully his defence. There have been two defences given—that of my hon. friend and that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). I read over the defence of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who is a lawyer, and who it would be supposed, would take the legal view and argue it closely; and I beg leave to say that I think the error he has fallen

into is that he has taken the necessity for the appropriation to be a warrant for it. My own view is that the necessity is not the warrant for it. The warrant for it is the unforeseen nature of the expenditure ; and if the expenditure has not been unforeseen, there is no necessity which can be shown that will suffice to fulfil the interpretation and intent of the law. The necessity is the secondary consideration, the unforeseen circumstance is the main and essential condition. Now, I need not go far from my hon. friend's side to bring that view of the case most strongly before this Parliament. I need not go farther than to read the opinion of one of the ablest lawyers that Canada has ever produced, who was the leader of the hon. gentlemen opposite as well, and who has given as his opinion, almost in the very words which I have put before the House to-day, that the necessity of the case cannot be called an argument for the issue of a Governor General's warrant, if the unforeseen circumstances be not an attendant and precedent condition. I want to give a little more emphasis, and I do it at the risk of repeating myself—to this view. I want to ask every representative of the people here, whose right it is to make and to control parliamentary appropriations, and whose bounden duty it is to guard that sacred right and keep it intact ? I want to ask what may happen if we take the interpretation that simply because an expenditure is not provided for in the Estimates and appropriations, therefore, if it be necessary, it can be got by the use of Governor General's warrants. If so, what might happen ? What might happen is that, that in any political emergency the Government of the day might not be disposed, at the time Parliament was in session, to ask for a certain appropriation, and consequently not have it approved, but, after Parliament had adjourned, take advantage of a Governor General's warrant, and on the ground that the expenditure had simply not been provided for by Parliament and was necessary, proceed by this way to make an appropriation which Parliament alone could make. And if in one case they could do that, they could do it in all cases, and they could go to the extent of nullifying entirely parliamentary control, the vital principle which has been gained after such long struggle and which should be sacredly kept intact by the representatives of the people in the interests of the people. Now, having laid down that, which I consider the correct view of the position, and which is, I hope, the view of all members of this House, I ask the House to consider what the position of hon. gentlemen opposite has been, both as to the principle and the practice which condition the use of the Governor General's warrants. I want to put the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, their reasoned opinions, their well-arrived at convictions, uttered again and again on the floor of this Parliament, and ask the House to consider whether or not these opinions tally with the sentiments and opinions which I have expressed so far with reference to this matter. First, let me go back to the year 1872, and quote the opinion of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who was the strong man at that time of the Liberal party, and became its leader when he formed his government in 1874. He is reported —and it was quoted by my colleague the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in the debate the other day —in the "Globe" of July 6th, 1872, as having said :

> The policy of the Liberal party is to make parliamentary government supreme, to place the Government directly under the control of Parliament, to take from them all power to use any portion of the people's money without a direct vote for such service.

That is the strong expression of the view of a former leader of the Liberal party upon the principle of parliamentary control. Now I come to the year 1887, when a debate arose in this House on Governor General's warrants, which debate was participated in by several gentlemen on the opposite side of the House at that time, most of whom are now either on the front benches opposite or supporting my hon. friends who sit on the Treasury benches. In the course of that debate, Sir Richard Cartwright said :

> Now, I do not suppose that there is any member, young or old, in this House, who is not aware that it is a very cardinal principle, on which all parliamentary institutions hinge, that Ministers of the Crown and the Crown itself should not, under any pretext whatever, expend public money until that money has been voted by Parliament and until the reasons why the Crown asks for the money have been fully explained and discussed. To that rule there is but one exception, and that is very well defined under the statute under which these same Governor General's warrants are issued. In cases of public emergency, in cases of unforeseen expenditure, in cases where things arise which could not reasonably be foreseen or arranged for the several departments, then and in such cases, if Parliament be not in session, as the Act states, the Governor General's warrant may issue with certain formalities and under certain precautions and safeguards.

That statement derives additional force from the fact that the hon. gentleman was talking, as I am to-day, to a new House, and he prefaced his remarks by saying that it was important that, at the beginning of a new Parliament, these principles should be clearly defined and set forth. I find that Mr. Mills also took part in that discussion, and that he ended a fairly long and well-reasoned speech with these weighty words :

> Not a dollar had they the right to take from the public treasury under the law, and every dollar which has been taken in that way has been a flagrant violation of the law.

Then I find that Mr. Davies, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is reported as saying, in answer to the Minister of Finance :

He has said this was necessary and that was necessary. The point is not whether it might have been prudent for the House to vote the money. The point is that the Government, not recognizing the powers and limitations prescribed by the statute, have chosen to vote moneys by Order in Council which should only have been voted after having received the sanction of Parliament. Two things that must concur are—first, that the expenditure is unforeseen, and next, that it is urgently and immediately required. Has the Minister of Finance attempted to say that half one of these expenditures were urgently and immediately required ?

And so he goes on with his argument. He says also, later on in his address :

I am glad that this new Parliament at its first meeting should take the opportunity of putting on record clearly and distinctly its views of this matter.

I next quote from Mr. Blake, who was then in the House. There came up a discussion on these warrants as to one Order in Council having been passed the day before Parliament met. It is odd, but it is still striking that the second Governor General's warrant issued by this Government is on an Order in Council of the day immediately preceding the day that Parliament met ; so that Mr. Blake's statement comes in apropos of the present discussion. He says :

It is a technical point to pass Orders in Council the day before Parliament meets in order to escape from the jurisdiction and control of Parliament as to the votes of money required.

He says further :

It is only in cases of urgent necessity, in which the public interest does really require an expenditure to be made, that, owing to certain circumstances beyond the control of Government, and which could not be foreseen in time to obtain parliamentary approval that this power of issuing special warrants ought to be used.

He says further :

But on what grounds does the Finance Minister justify it ? In almost every case he confines himself to the statement that the money ought to be voted by us because the expenditure was a good and proper one. This would be a good reason, if true, for hon. gentlemen, when bringing down an estimate, to ask Parliament to pass it, but it is no reason for asking us to vote him this money which he has expended in this unauthorized way.

That bears upon the statement I made a little while ago that the mere fact of an expenditure being necessary does not justify its being made by Governor General's warrant. Later on Mr. Blake said :

If the public good required the immediate expenditure of such moneys, the duty of the hon. gentleman was at the earliest possible moment to have brought down a vote of credit to us, to have brought down a proposal to us to ask us to assent to the expenditure of money on the ground of the public urgency, and not to have waited for estimates, but to have said : We cannot wait for the estimates, but the public good requires that we should ask for this expenditure, and we ask you now and at once to grant this money for the public good ; but it does appear, and I repeat it, that this power is prostituted when, just on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, warrants for this large amount are issued, warrants for moneys which are not paid until long after the time of our meeting, warrants which were not issued at all until the date of our meeting.

Now, Sir, that applies with peculiar force to the warrant for $935,000 odd which was issued one day before this Parliament actually met. One day more and the Government would have been face to face with Parliament, and could have asked for a vote of credit, and would have got the vote of credit from this Parliament, and consequently had the least of all reasons for proceeding to the extreme of a Governor General's warrant, even if the conditions precedent had been in favour of its issue. I have one other authority to read from, and I read from this authority mainly because the hon. gentleman is now in the House. I refer to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who rose in his place and said, in that peculiar style to which we are so well accustomed, the style of the mentor of Parliament and the guardian of its sacred rights :

It is time that a stop was put to this expenditure of money without the consent of Parliament. We ought not to allow this system to go on, and it is no reason, when hon. gentlemen say their predecessors possibly violated the law in this matter, that we should go on and perpetrate the same wrong for years to come. We, as a new House and as new members, coming fresh from the country, should express our views and should let hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side, understand that this is to be put a stop to.

That sentiment is good and wholesome. I hope it as good and wholesome to-day as it was in 1887, when my hon. friend so felicitously expressed his views to this House. Well, Sir, the subject of Governor General's warrants came up in 1891 on a motion made by the present Minister of Trade and Commerec (Sir Richard Cartwright). And that motion was put to the vote. Certain expresions were made use of at that time which I propose to read. The first is by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. After first affirming the correctness of the principle of parliamentary control, he proceeds to say that there are certain cases in which the executive can expend money by getting it through Governor General's warrants, and then he goes on to give his view of the circumstances under which alone this can be done. He says :

The exception to which I refer is defined in our Audit Act. Whenever any extraordinary accident occurs to a public work, or whenever some extraordinary event happens, which could not be reasonably foreseen and which required an outlay of public money under penalty of great injury to the public service, then under certain protections and provisions, which I will presently enumerate, the Governor General is allowed to issue his warrant, provided Parliament is not in session.

This is as plainly and as clearly expressed by a master of expression in English as it possibly can be, and it coincides exactly with the view I have been trying to express to the House. Later on he reads the section of the Act, and then goes on to illustrate its meaning. He says :

It is scarcely necessary for me to point out that the obvious meaning of this clause is, that when any occasion arises when any expenditure which cannot fairly be foreseen by the department or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required, then and then only, is it intended that such a warrant should issue.

And the hon. gentleman goes on to appeal to the House. He says :

Both sides of the House ought to be at one upon this question, both sides of the House ought to feel, that whether they have confidence in the Ministry of the day or not, it is their duty as members of Parliament, it is their duty above all as members of the House of Commons, to insist that the Government do not put their hands into the treasury or use large sums of money without the previous sanction of Parliament. Unless that principle is laid down, unless that principle is enforced, it is obvious that it is utterly hopeless to have any proper control over the acts of Government.

I reiterate those words to-day, I reiterate them in the face of a new House of Commons, and I ask that members on both sides of the House entirely outside of their party predilections, take the view of this question which my hon. friend so strongly enforced at that time. He goes on later to say :

As I have said, this is a matter which does not concern one side of the House more than the other. This is a matter which goes to the root of all parliamentary control over Government expenditure. If you are going to allow our constitution, founded as it is on British practice and precedent, to be torn up in this fashion, if you are going to allow the Government to expend millions of public money without the slightest reference to Parliament in the fashion that I have now indicated, I say there is an end to all proper parliamentary control over Government expenditure.

Then the hon. gentleman ended with his resolution. Now, I want to call the attention of the House very clearly to what that resolution was. That resolution was a different resolution, and founded on a different set of circumstances, to the resolution which I propose to put before the House. The argument in 1891 was as to whether the Government had really foreseen the expenditure, and having foreseen it had neglected to provide for it ; but there was no question, so far as the contention of the Government went, that it was an expenditure which, either through not being foreseen by the department, or through neglect of officers of the department, had not been brought to the Minister's attention and to the Government's attention, and so it had not been submitted in the Estimates. The hon. gentleman's motion is directed to that side of the case, for his resolution ends in this way :

That no accident had occurred upon the said railroads, nor was there any reason whatever why said expenditure should not have been foreseen and provided for by Parliament. That under such circumstances the issue of a Governor General's warrant for the said sums was a gross abuse of the power vested in the Governor in Council under the said Act, and that the conduct of the Government in neglecting to apply to Parliament in due time for said sums, indicates great laxity of administration and deserves the censure of the House.

This motion was directed against the Government for laxity of administration, for neglect in foreseeing something which they ought to have foreseen, and the circumstances in that way are entirely different from the circumstances of to-day, where as we contend, there is no question as to whether these expenditures were foreseen or not; they were foreseen, and the House refused to grant them. Now, Sir, there was another gentleman who spoke on that occasion, that was my hon. friend who is now the Postmaster General, and who, when upon this side of the House, on sundry and several occasions, took it upon himself to speak very strongly on behalf of the people's rights, and against the action and practices of the Government. This is what he said in 1891 :

Sir, I think that the Government could not in any other way better manifest their indifference to the supreme power of the people than by taking their money without authority. There is no higher crime that an Administration can commit in a country such as Canada, where the people are supposed to control their own funds.

So much on the principle. The hon. gentleman also gave his interpretation of the Act, and I wish to call the attention of the House to it :

These warrants can only issue under certain circumstances, namely, where there has been an accident to a public work and that repair is necessary. That is not the case here—also where some unforeseen circumstance arises which is not before provided for, and which the public good demands shall be provided for.

The principle that he takes in expounding that Act is the very principle I have contended for—making "unforeseen circumstances" the basis for the issue of a Governor General's warrant, and not the necessity or reasonableness of the expenditure. He says :

The Act must mean that where a demand for some expenditure exists, and that with reasonable diligence the Government have not been able to anticipate that need, then the power of this Act may be invoked, but not until then.

This ends the quotations I am going to make from hon. gentleman's opinions with reference to the Governor General's warrants, with the exception of one which was expressed by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. During the last Parliament, incidently the matter came up,

and as reported on page 7162 of the "Hansard," of 1896, he says:

If the expenditure occurs for something unforeseen, you may ask a Governor General's warrant, but a Governor General's warrant ought not to be asked for under other circumstances. No expenditure should be incurred without the authority of Parliament.

Now, Sir, I have taken up that much time in laying before the House the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the issue of Governor General's warrants. I contend that the statements I have read from them, and the statements I have made myself, are exactly coterminous and of exactly equal import. They both lay down the vital necessity of keeping the principle of parliamentary control, and keeping it intact; they both agree that the nature of the circumstances should be as I have detailed, something that was unforeseen and not provided for, and that the mere necessity of an expenditure is not ground upon which a Governor General's warrant can be issued; and they agree in all their remarks in condemnation of a practice which contravenes and goes contrary to those well-understood and forcibly expressed principles which govern this matter.

I now come to inquire what was actually done by the present Government with the Governor General's warrants. Well, these are the facts of the case. On July 16, $1,067,567 were authorized by Governor General's warrants on the very day—and I ask the attention of Parliament to that—on the very day that Parliament had been called to meet for the prosecution of business. Again, on the 18th day of August, exactly one day previous to the time when Parliament actually did meet, a Governor General's warrant for $935,561 was issued, and certain other smaller warrants, bringing up to the whole the sum of $2,006,022. The next point that is to be noted is the purpose for which these warrants were issued. I have detailed the two conditions precedent. The first of these conditions does not hold at all in reference to the issue of these warrants. No accident to a public work or to any public building that required to be urgently repaired or renewed called for the use of these Governor General's warrants. We are all at one upon that point. The Governor General's warrants were issued to pay departmental salaries and contingencies, a class of expenditures that are always foreseen and are always provided by the Parliament of one year for the service of the year which is to succeed that session of Parliament. So that every one of those expenditures which were authorized under those Governor General's warrants were not only foreseen by the Government, but they were actually brought down in the Estimates to Parliament, they were recommended by the Governor General, they were asked for at the hands of Parliament and every member of Parliament knew exactly seven or eight months ago, what they were, knew they were necessary, that they were asked for and were not granted by Parliament. They therefore did not come under the category of expenditures which were unforeseen and unprovided. They were foreseen; we tried to provide for them. Parliament in the exercise of its good pleasure, mainly through the power of the Opposition, said they would not grant them; but that does not take away in the least from that fact that they were foreseen that an effort was made to provide for them, and that Parliament said it would not provide for them. That gives no warrant to an incoming Government to get those moneys in any other way than at the vote and at the will of Parliament; and I think hon. gentlemen are all the more bound to come to Parliament—if they could be more bound—because Parliament had already had these estimates before it, had been asked to grant them and had not passed the appropriations. What more Sir? I wish to call attention to the fact that there was ample time in which those appropriations could have been granted, and granted for the services for which those Governor General's warrants were finally issued. I wish to say that over and over again the House was asked to go into Supply, that it sometimes did go into Supply and succeeded in passing some items; that when the whole year's expenditures were refused the proposition was submitted to the then leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Trade and Commerce, that the then Government should at least take six months' supplies, or if the hon. gentleman did not agree to that we should obtain three months or even two months' supplies, so as to avoid the necessity and expense of holding an extra session of Parliament, and to preclude all necessity of the trouble that civil servants and employees would be put to from the non-payment of their salaries at the end of the month. There is more than that. If we were to grant for a single moment, which we cannot do, that the first Governor General's warrant might have been properly issued, what have we to say with respect to the second Governor General's warrant, which was issued with haste one day before this House of Commons came together, when it was to be asked by the Government to vote the necessary expenditures for the year. Those salaries are paid, few of them before the middle of the month, some of them not until the end of the month, and if we take this list as scheduled, I think we will find that the larger proportion of that money was not payable until the end of the month; that on 18th August, Parliament met, and although hon. gentlemen opposite were not called on to expend a large proportion of this money until the last of August, with haste, which I will not characterize as indecent, but I will characterize as imprudent, hon. gentlemen opposite to forestall the House of Commons and Parliament, placed

$1,000,000 in the hands of the Executive, every dollar of which would be expended after Parliament was in session. But there is something stronger than that, which shows the utter disregard which hon. gentlemen opposite have displayed in this matter with respect to Governor General's warrants. Who signed the application for the Governor General's warrants, and whose word as a Minister of the Crown was it stated that all this money was urgently and immediately required, when the Act states that even when these conditions precedent are fulfilled, there must also be this, that the money is urgently and immediately required? I ask who signed the application for the Governor General's warrant for the sum of $7,000, and who passed it through, when it stated that it was for salaries for the Printing Bureau for the month of September, 1896, after Parliament had been in session, during which there could not be any expenditure of money for cause either urgent or immediate, when in fact supply had to be passed by Parliament before a single dollar could be expended? And yet we have a Governor General's warrant for what was not urgently needed, but for which provision was made, although Parliament was in session for a whole month or thereabouts in advance. That I suppose must have been done by the Secretary of State: but I cannot exactly make it out from the details. Certainly the Secretary of State and the whole Cabinet are responsible for it. I think it is a grave matter, not so much from the amount of money involved, which is only $7,000, but if in a matter of $7,000 the Government is prepared one month before the money is required to declare that such money is immediately and urgently required and pass a Governor General's warrant therefor, with Parliament called and coming into session immediately, it is an indication of the principle on which they have acted and the principle and practice which they may carry out in larger and greater matters. I desire to call the attention of the House to one more point. Those expenditures, as I have stated, were expenditures which were foreseen in February of last year and even in January, the appropriations for which were brought down before the House last January, and which the House was repeatedly asked to pass and refused to pass. What was the reason why those votes were not passed during the last session of Parliament? I want to call the attention of the House to the principle on which this action with respect to Governor General's warrants must, if we are logical, be based. The principle on which hon. gentlemen appear to have based their action in respect to this matter is that party tactics and party convenience afford a sufficient reason for violating the law and having recourse to Governor General's warrants. Why did the hon. gentlemen last year refuse to grant the ordinary supplies for six months, three months or two months? They, upon their own declaration in debate last year and even this year, did not take that course, because they believed it would not be their party advantage, and so they took on themselves the responsibility of refusing to grant those appropriations which might easily have been passed. Then again if Parliament had met on 16th July, the period for which it was called, a credit would have been obtained for all the expenditures contemplated under the Governor General's warrant, because Parliament was called to meet on the 16th, it might have met on that date, I think it would have met on that day, and a vote would have been obtained for all those salaries, and recourse would not have been necessary to Governor General's warrants. Why did not the House meet on the 16th day of July? There is no reason, except the reason that it was not for the advantage or convenience of a political party. But, the convenience or advantage of a party can hardly be a valid excuse for postponing Parliament and putting hon. gentlemen of the Government in the position of having to take hold of Governor General's warrants for expenditures which might have been voted by Parliament if it had met at the proper time. Then in the second place, when Parliament actually did meet on the 19th of August, and where a warrant was issued on the 18th, I have already elucidated that. There was no necessity for a Governor General's warrant then even if the precedent conditions had justified it. The deduction that we must take from this, is simply, that the party opposite, looking to its own interest and in pursuit of its own tactics, thought it best to refuse supplies last session, and I submit again that although party tactics are perfectly legitimate, they ought not to be made an excuse for action which is illegal and against the great principle of parliamentary control with reference to expenditure.

Now, I want for a few moments to notice the defences which have been made by the only two gentlemen who have yet attempted to defend the course of the Government in this matter. An attempted defence was made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his reasons for justifying the action of the Government divided themselves into two categories. One reason was, the alleged faults of the late Government as appearing to the party with which he is identified, and which must be taken with a grain of salt as being faults, because they were only faults in the opinion of a party which was opposed to the Government and its policy at that time. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not pretend to defend the issue of Governor General's warrants on the merits of the case. He says, that we had no right to hold a sixth session of Parliament, that usage was violated by doing so, and that the holding of a sixth session was an indecent clinging on

to office and power. In the opinion of my hon. friend that may be his conviction, but I submit again, that that is no ground upon which to base the refusal of supplies, or even if it be a good ground, it is no ground for the incoming Government to issue Governor General's warrants in lieu of the appropriation of supplies by a Parliament which has been called and which could be asked for these supplies. But had we not a right to hold the sixth session? It is within the legal terms and limits of the law. The only compact that is made by a government or by the people's representatives when they are given the mandate of representation, is, that they shall continue to perform the duties which devolve upon representatives in Parliament, during the legal time which Parliament has to live. If Parliament does not transgress that legal limit, it is a mere question of opinion as to whether it shall dissolve one year, or two years, before the legal limit expires, or whether it shall be continued on to the end of that limit. That is certainly not a valid argument. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us again, that the late Parliament did not represent the people and had no right to ask for supplies. That is a mere supposition of the hon. gentleman. He had no certain or absolute ground at that time for stating that the Government did not represent the people. At the best it was a mere calculation of what he considered to be the chances; but it is absolutely no reason why supplies should not be granted. Sir, if his contention, that we did not represent the people in 1896, was a good reason for not granting supplies, was it not equally as good a reason in 1895? The hon. gentleman might have urged it them and refused supplies, but he did not do so. And last year, if it were thought proper by hon. gentlemen then in opposition not to grant supplies, it was certainly not a reason why they should have had recourse to Governor General's warrants. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), also gave as a reason, that we might have sat in power longer. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) went further, and he said, that the reason why supplies were not granted was because he feared, and his party feared, that if supplies were granted we would use them for corrupt purposes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has a logical mind, and he must know very well that that was no ground at all for refusing supplies, and it was the least possible ground for refusing the kind of supplies that were asked for. My hon. friend knows well enough that the kind of supplies which are provided by these Governor General's warrants—and which I asked for at last session, and was willing to take for two or three or six months—are supplies which are under the absolute control of the law and the Auditor General. It is not within the power of the Government of the day to use them for corrupt purposes, even though they had the wish or the desire to do so. Therefore that argument falls to the ground.

Then my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave the last and worst reason, as to why we were not granted supplies last year. That was, as he told us: because we bungled in matters of legislation, because in his opinion, our policy upon the Manitoba school question was not what it ought to have been. The Government of the day is in the judgment of the country as to whether these measures are proper or not. It is responsible to the country for them, and although an Opposition may have the most decided views as to whether these measures are wise or not; this is the first time that I have heard it put forward seriously, as ground for the refusal of supplies by Parliament, and for the extraordinary course of obtaining them by Governor General's warrants. Now, Sir, the second set of reasons put forth by the hon. gentleman are on the ground of necessity. He says: "We did not expend anything that was not actually necessary." He says: "We did not expend anything that you did not estimate for." He says: "We did not expend anything corruptly or wrongly." Grant all these things, and I simply place before my hon. friend the irresistible reply of his former leader, Mr. Edward Blake, that the necessity or the prudence of an expenditure has nothing at all to do with the issue of a Governor General's warrant, unless the precedent conditions which we have discussed are met and fully satisfied; and thus falls the only defence which has been offered by hon. gentlemen opposite for their peculiar course in dealing with the Governor General's warrant.

Now, Sir, I stated to this House when I commenced, that I did not propose to do more than open the subject to the House, in as fair and argumentative way as I could, and I appeal to hon. members on both sides of the House to look at the practice which has been introduced, and to say whether they think it is right and wise or not. As I said at first, it is the duty of every representative sitting in this House, no matter what his party views may be, to guard jealously the principle of parliamentary control, which is the outcome of centuries of struggle, which is essential to good and responsible government, and which we cannot allow to be violated and go back to our constituents and tell them that we have performed our duty. The question is not introduced with any other wish than to prevent the growth of a method of getting appropriations by what I must call a usurpation of power by the Executive, such as has commenced within a few weeks of the accession to power of a new Liberal Government; because if that usurpation is condoned in this case, you give the Government a warrant in the future to nullify the power

of this Parliament over appropriations, and you strike a blow at the principle of parliamentary government. This is a case in which we ought to take into view the consequences of our decision. I am sorry these Governor General's warrants have been used. Applying the argument ad hominem, supposing that last session, when supplies were refused to me as Finance Minister by my hon. friends opposite, I had turned round and said to the Opposition : Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen refuse us these supplies ; let them refuse them ; on the 1st day of July, if we are in power, we will take Governor General's warrants for these, and we will call the House together when we please. I ask my hon. friend what would have been his attitude if I had made that statement to him ? What else has he done ? He has taken that very position and in these Governor General's warrants, which he has issued, he has carried out the exact line which I would have enunciated if I had made that statement to the Opposition at that time. No, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary control is the vital point. The unforeseen character of the expenditures is the condition precedent to the Governor General's warrants being issued. If hon. gentlemen are excused in the case of these warrants, they could, Sir, have prorogued Parliament from the 19th day of August to the 19th day of September, and taken another Governor General's warrant if it had suited the party convenience ; they could have prorogued Parliament until the 19th day of October, and taken another Governor General's warrant ; they could have gone on until January ; they could have gone on until they were brought up by the statute which makes it necessary that Parliament shall meet at least once every year. You must look at the consequences which follow on the line which has been adopted ; and if one step is allowed—and by parity of reasoning, the second step may be taken on the same principle—it is time that this House, without taking into account party predilection, should make its voice known with regard to a principle so important and so vital, a principle in which the people of this country are most interested at this present moment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move :

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following added instead thereof :—" the sixth session of the Seventh Parliament met on January 2nd, 1896, and on the 27th day of the same month the Government submitted His Excellency's Message transmitting the Estimates for the year 1896-7, which were forthwith referred to the Committee of Supply.

That these Estimates provided appropriations for the foreseen and necessary salaries and contingencies of the several departments of Government and for the maintenance and construction of public works and for other services.

That on the 28th of January the House was asked to go into Committee of the Whole for granting supply, and to consider first the appropriations for departmental salaries and contingencies.

That neither then nor on the several occasions thereafter when the House was asked to grant supply did the Opposition agree thereto.

That appeals were made by the Government setting forth the urgent necessity for making provision for the ordinary and regular expenditures for the approaching fiscal year, or in view of the impending dissolution and of the fact that the new Parliament could not possibly assemble before July 1st and would probably meet shortly thereafter, for a part thereof.

That despite these representations and although the circumstances were well known and there was ample time at the disposal of the House, supplies for the year 1896-7 were refused and Parliament rose on the 23rd day of April without these supplies being granted.

That Parliament was dissolved and a new Parliament was summoned to meet for the despatch of business upon the 16th day of July, 1896.

That the Government resigned office on the 10th day of July, 1896, and the Hon. Wilfred Laurier was called upon by His Excellency to form an Administration which he undertook to do.

That thereafter, Parliament was on the 13th day of July, 1896, prorogued to meet for the despatch of business on the 19th day of August, 1896.

That by chapter 29, 49 Victoria, R. S. C., the Governor General in Council is empowered to issue special warrants authorizing the payment of money not previously voted by Parliament under the following circumstances only, to wit:—

'If when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repairs thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.'

That on the 16th day of July, 1896—the date when Parliament had been summoned to meet for the despatch of business—His Excellency was advised to issue his warrant for the expenditure of $1,067,576 for departmental salaries and contingencies, and on August 18th—one day before the actual meeting of Parliament—was again advised to issue his warrant for $935,561 for similar expenditures, and that these warrants did issue and the sums named were accordingly placed at the disposal of the department.

That these amounts were not called for by any accident to any public work or building, nor were they required for any expenditures which had not been foreseen, and which could not have been provided for, but were used to pay ordinary salaries and contingencies, for which Parliament had been asked to provide, and which had been refused by the House of Commons.

That, under these circumstances, this House is of the opinion that the issue of the said warrants was in contravention of the well understood principles of parliamentary control, an abuse of the powers vested in the Governor General in Council by the said Act, and a usurpation fraught with danger to public liberty and constitutional government."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, I do not at all regret that the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) has brought this question under the notice of the House. I am quite in accord with him on one point, that this is a matter of extremely great importance. And I admit frankly that the present Government assumed a grave responsibility, for which they may be rightly called to account before this House, in issuing the Governor General's warrants which they did on the two dates the hon. gentleman has referred to. I do not at all desire, for my part, to minimize the responsibility we undertook; but I shall be prepared, I think, to show to the House that there were very good reasons indeed why we should incur that responsibility, and that we would have been in a high degree recreant to our duty as guardians of the public weal if we had failed to incur it. Now, it is not my intention on the present occasion to indulge in any mere recriminations with the hon. gentleman. Were I disposed to do so, I could show that he and his colleagues and his predecessors had, over and over again, violated all the provisions of the Act under which Governor General's warrants have been issued, in every possible respect, and that they had on several occasions issued a number of Governor General's warrants on the day before Parliament met. If the hon. gentleman challenges that statement I can give him the proof; if he does not challenge it, I simply call it to his attention and the attention of the House. Not that I intend to allege that it would be a justification for us if we could show that our predecessors and opponents had done the same as we have done or done worse, but simply to point out to the House that these gentlemen who are now, at long last, learning from us certain constitutional maxims, during the eighteen years that they held office most assuredly paid little attention to the doctrines the hon. gentleman has laid down. And, by the way, it is noteworthy that he did not quote one single declaration in support of his argument from any hon. gentleman on that side of the House; all his arguments—good arguments, so far forth, they were—were derived from statements and speeches of myself, Mr. Edward Blake, Mr. David Mills, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and others, at whose feet I am glad to see the hon. gentleman is content to sit for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of true and sound constitutional principles. Now, Sir, this is pre-eminently a case in which one ounce of common sense, which the hon. gentleman often refers to, is worth a whole ton of precedents. I am not in the slightest degree disposed to disparage or deny the value or importance of precedents, particularly in matters of constitutional usage. The only trouble is this, Sir: that precedents are good—and I call the attention of the hon. member for York to this—only when they are on all fours with the case under consideration. The trouble is that they are very seldom on all fours, as every lawyer knows and as everybody who has had to pay legal fees knows also, I fancy. There have been two totally different questions raised in connection with this matter, and to these I shall refer. But first I will call attention to one or two remarks of the hon. gentleman. The House will note that the hon. gentleman made one admission of some importance, as I shall show in the future discussion of this question. He admitted that the Governor General's warrants were the only machinery at our disposal by which money can be raised, except through grants obtained in the regular way by Estimates or votes of credit. He admits, therefore, that, under the circumstances, we used the only means at our disposal; and, as I proceed, the House will see that this is a material point in the discussion of the case. Although I shall imitate the hon. gentleman, and will not dwell very much on the legal aspect of the case, I will just call his attention and the attention of the House to a statement which lay at the foundation of a great deal of the hon. gentleman's argument.

The hon. gentleman says that here are two cases only in which, according to him, Governor General's warrants can issue, and as to one of these there is no dispute. But in point of fact there are three cases. One case is that of accidents occurring to public works from any cause whereby an expenditure is required in the public good. The second case is the case in which any expenditure, not foreseen by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good. But, Sir, I think, as the English language goes, I am warranted in pointing out to him that there is a third case, and that is the case we are now considering: "when any expenditure not provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good." The hon. gentleman talks of the words "or provided for" being an utter surplusage; he talks as if they had no meaning and no place in that Act, and undoubtedly, if his construction of the Act is correct, the words "or provided" are mere surplusage and have no business in this Act at all. Now, Sir, I am speaking here simply of the extreme legal and technical construction which may fairly be put upon this clause, and I believe if the construction that I now point out to be correct, then this clause, read in this way, will make good sense, and I think it is a maxim of law that if you can make an Act of Parliament read sensibly all through, you are bound to do it. Judges, I believe, have occasionally found that very difficult, but I think it is a maxim of law, and my hon. friend will agree with me,

that any words that occur in an Act of Parliament must be so read as to give them force, and not as being mere surplusage. I think that is a legal maxim which most of my legal friends have often asserted, and won't deny, and I think it is also a matter of common sense. Now, Sir, there are these three cases. You take out the words "foreseen or," and you get a perfectly sensible declaration; you take out the the words "or provided for," and you get a perfectly sensible declaration. When you have got the words "not foreseen or provided for"—and I contend that is a matter of legal construction—there are not the two cases, as declared by the hon. gentleman, but three cases, one, I repeat, the case of an accident, as to which we are all agreed; and another, the case of things which are not foreseen: and the third, the case of things which are not provided for, but which, in the words of this Act must be provided for in order to prevent great injury to the public weal. That is the condition to be added to it, undoubtedly. More than that, whenever a Government on its responsibility undertakes to put that construction upon it, that Government is bound by law, in a very short time, three days, I think, after Parliament meets, to submit to the House what it has done, to stand and demand just such a scrutiny and investigation as the hon. gentleman has properly enough subjected us to and of which I do not in the slightest degree complain. Sir, the hon. gentleman remarked truly enough that these Governor General's warrants had not been necessitated by any accident to any public buildings. That is quite true, the accident was an accident to the late Government.

Mr. FOSTER. You admit, then, that we would not abuse that power.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not in the slightest degree do I admit what you would not have done. I admit in the frankest possible fashion that the hon. gentleman would not have had a scintilla of right to do it, having reference to the antecedent circumstances which have brought us into the position in which we now stand, which were owing to his conduct from the second day, or the fourth day, of January outwards. Now, I want to call the attention of my hon. friends to these facts. There are two totally different questions raised by the hon. gentleman in this discussion. The first is the question: Who are to blame, after all said and done, for the position in which we found ourselves, and the country found itself, on or about the middle of July last? That is a matter on which I have no doubt there will be considerable difference of opinion: but I think the opinion of the majority of this House, and I know the opinion of the majority of the people of this country, will be that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were preeminently and emphatically the people to blame for deliberately and with knowledge bringing about a state of things which rendered it necessary to have recourse to what I describe and what he described properly enough, as very extraordinary expedients to avoid a grave public injury. Now, Sir, that is one side of the case, as to which I will say a little more by and by. In regard to the other side of the case, I will depart from its legal aspect, I will simply deal with it as plain, common sense business men in this country will deal with it. Without reference to the constitutional pedantries and cobwebs with which it is exceedingly easy to envelop a question of this sort, Sir, I want to ask the hon. gentleman for a moment this question: Waiving for a moment, and granting that we were to blame, for argument's sake, if he likes, granting, as we allege, that he was to blame, what was to be done under these circumstances? What was, in the interest of the people of Canada, best to do—because that, after all, is the controlling and determining factor in this matter. Now, what did the Government do? The hon. gentleman knows that we have met this Parliament at the earliest possible moment that we could; we met it before all our colleagues had been re-elected, we met it with our ranks partly filled; we certainly lost no time whatever in calling Parliament together, and the hon. gentleman cannot pretend that we did. Nevertheless, with all our exertions, after all our efforts, two whole months, speaking in a fiscal sense, had practically gone by, and in all human probability it would have been three whole months before it would be possible for us, under the ordinary machinery of Government, to obtain supplies, whether we got them by vote of credit or whether we got them by estimates; and I think we know enough for the hon. gentlemen to know this, that if we had come down with a proposition for a vote of credit, long, long indeed would have been the discussions with which they would have honoured us before they would have seen their way to put a vote of credit in our hands. Now, Sir, let us consider this matter as business men would consider it. Remember that the Government of Canada are at this present moment common carriers on a very large scale. The Government of Canada own, and control, and administer, I think, about a thousand miles of railway; they own, and control, and administer the entire canal system of this country. They are responsible for the management of the entire postal service. We have got a small permanent military force which has to be provided for. Now, I want to know what the hon. gentleman would have advised us to do. Would he have advised us to shut up our canals? Would he have advised us to shut up our railways? Would he have advised us to disband our permanent force? Would he have advised us to dispense with the postal

service, so far, I say, as the employees who earned their bread by their daily labour are concerned ?

Mr. FOSTER. No ; I would have advised you to call Parliament together, not to shut up anything.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I call the attention of the House to that remark, Mr. Speaker, from those hon. gentlemen who stayed in office until the guns were fired from Nepean Point ; from those hon. gentlemen who, after that, with the full knowledge that just such exigencies would occur, waited two whole months before they held the election, and who did not call a meeting of Parliament until the middle of the month of July, with the full knowledge that if they were defeated, several weeks must elapse before a new Government could be formed. The hon. gentleman has said just what I wanted him to say, what I thought he would say ; and having said it, I think he has shown as clearly as mortal man can show, how utterly impossible it was for us to take any other course than that we did take, Sir, I want to ask any business man in this House : Do you suppose that you could have kept the Intercolonial Railway running for three months, or even for two, without paying the brakemen, the conductors, and all the other employees on it ? Could you have kept your canals going, and not have paid your lockmen ? Could you have kept the Post Office Department in proper operation without paying your messengers ? It might be true, and I make the hon. gentleman a present of that suggestion, that the civil servants in Ottawa might have contrived to borrow at very usurious rates, enough to keep them going from day to day, and from month to month; but most assuredly the classes of men that I refer to have no alternative : if we did not pay them, the work must have stopped. Was the hon. gentleman prepared to advise that we should do that ? and if he is not so prepared, then his whole case is ended, because he has admitted that he cannot show any other way of dealing with the difficulty, one of an extraordinary character, where ordinary rules failed. This is not a question of precedent ; it is one commonly called "casus improvisus." Let me ask this question : Had we not asked for a Governor General's warrant, what course would the hon. gentleman have recommended to be pursued ? It would have been practicable, as the hon. gentleman is well aware, to have obtained from our monetary institutions the necessary advances as regards supplies. Would the hon. gentleman, when he learned that we had borrowed for the purposes of the public service in this hidden way one or two millions for the purpose of averting disaster, have commended our action, instead of having recourse to Governor General's warrants ? The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is evidently not disposed to answer this question. Of those two alternatives I leave it to the House, the country and to the common sense of every reasonable man to say which is the better, the more straightforward and the more honourable course. Had we done so—and we might have done it without my hon. friend in Parliament getting at it by making motions—we would have been tampering with the true essence and principle of the constitution, rather than by availing ourselves of what the hon. gentleman himself declared, a little while ago, was the only machinery for obtaining money for those purposes. Passing over, for the moment, the question of the strictly literal construction of the Act, let us consider what is perhaps more important, the spirit of the Act, that extraordinary power granted to His Excellency, under certain restrictions, for the purpose of meeting grave emergencies, that extraordinary power provided. I contend, for cases which could not have been foreseen ; and I am bound to say, in one important respect, this case could not have been foreseen, because I do not believe it ever entered into the mind of any man professing to be a constitutional authority, to expect that a Parliament of Canada would sit up to the very day of its dissolution and expire by efflux of time, the Ministers knowing perfectly well that by doing so they would be likely to incur great embarrassment and cause a very difficult state of things to arise unless Parliament should be called together by 1st July. The hon. gentleman, with the exception of one trifling matter of $7,000 granted to the Queen's Printer's Office, did not state—and that is a matter of some importance—we had used this power wantonly for anything not really required. I admit that if the hon. gentleman has stated the facts correctly, an error appears to have been made in that particular case ; but I believe that case was discovered almost immediately it was done, and that no payments had been made out of the warrant, and could not be made.

Mr. FOSTER. They could not be made.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not, in the slightest degree, desire in any shape or way to defend the use of those warrants for any purpose that necessity does not require, and if, in looking over the matter, the hon. gentleman was able to show any other case of a similar kind, no doubt the Finance Minister would be perfectly ready and perfectly willing to see to it that none of those moneys should be expended under such conditions. I should like to call the attention of the House to a certain statement which was laid on the Table of the House by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Fielding). I find that, up to 31st August, 1896, we had expended a total sum of $3,268,000. I find—what is also a little significant—that up to 31st August, 1895, the late Government expended $3,900,-

000 ; that is to say, they found it necessary to spend about $640,000 more than we did. I am not attaching any blame to hon. gentlemen opposite for that expenditure. But the House will see in those two facts to which I call attention, there is proof that we did not unnecessarily have recourse to this extraordinary means for avoiding a great public disaster, and that we were exceedingly careful not to go an inch beyond what the necessities of the case required. Sir, of the $3,900,000 spent by hon. gentlemen opposite, and of the $3,268,000 spent by us, more than $2,250,000 were statutory expenditures, for which the authority of Parliament was not required. Of the rest, $1,700,000 expended by them, as against $1,000,000 spent by us. I find, on looking into the details, that $710,000 were required for railways and canals and post offices ; $90,000 for customs and excise, which also could not be dispensed with, if we were to collect any revenue : and $170,000 or $150,000 for civil government. It is perfectly clear to any man who can understand what these figures mean, that absolutely nothing outside of railways, canals and civil post offices and civil government, has been spent by us beyond the statutory requirements—of course, I do not mean that a few hundred dollars might not be spent for other purposes—and that is very good and clear evidence that, up to the present date, nothing has been expended beyond what those imperative necessities of which I have spoken, required.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman mean to institute a comparison between the expenditure of last year and this year, up to a certain date ? My hon. friend knows quite well that it is an unfair comparison, because last year the Government were in possession of all the supplies, and this year hon. gentlemen opposite are not.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman has entirely mistaken the point. I am not complaining that he and his colleagues spent $3,900,000—I dare say they were perfectly right in doing so—but, when we have only spent $3,268,000, and of that sum $2,250,000 were statutory expenditures, it affords tolerably clear proof that we were exceedingly careful in all our expenditures.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman's comparison holds. If the hon. gentleman had been in full possession of the Estimates for 1st July, this year, as we were last year, does he pretend to contend that those expenditures would have been as small ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What must I do to explain this matter to the hon. gentleman, for he is not usually obtuse ? I was pointing to the fact that we have spent very much less than the ordinary sum which hon. gentlemen opposite spent last year, and that is tolerably clear evidence that we have not been improperly using Governor General's warrants. Does the hon. gentleman wish any further explanations—for I do not want to be obliged to go over it in French, Gaelic and English.

An hon. MEMBER. State it in French.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And now, Sir, a word or two remains to be said as to who, after all said and done, are the parties who are really responsible for this position of things. Mind, Sir, I admit we take the full responsibility of having availed ourselves of the strict legal construction of the law in order to enable us to meet the overwhelming public necessity I described. We accept the full responsibility. If our friends here, after they have heard our explanation, think we have done wrong, think that we ought to have stopped the canal service, stopped the post office, stopped the railway service of the country, in place of using a Governor General's warrant, we know our duty and we will bow to the opinion of the House in that matter.

Mr. LISTER. You were dead right.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. When we consider the question, who are the parties primarily and directly and absolutely responsible for this state of things, we must go back to that unfortunate epoch of the 2nd of January. I have got to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, that this position of things is a direct and plain result of their own exceeding misconduct. The House met on the 2nd January last, but when was the Budget brought down ? The Estimates were brought down on the 27th of January, and I think the Budget Speech was made somewhere about the 1st of February, more or less. Why under the circumstances was that month thrown away ? Knowing as they did that time was of the essence of the contract ; knowing that do all they could it would tax their utmost ingenuity to get their estimates under the Remedial Bill through, why was it they wasted the whole of the time from the 2nd of January to the 1st of February ? Sir, I will not pursue this unpleasing theme other than to say, that men who so conducted themselves, men who were solely responsible for that profligate waste of public time and money, ought be very cautions indeed when they cast stones at the men who have been called upon to rectify the effects of their folly and culpability. I will not gainsay the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that he had strict technical legal right to hold this House in session up to the 23rd of April. But, Sir, all students of English history, all students of constitutional law, know that there are an enormous number of powers, vested in Her Majesty for example, which powers are extraordinary powers, and which powers practically are never exercised and ought never be exer-

cised. Among these, I contend, is the pretension of the Government of the country to hold Parliament in session under such circumstances as existed in the early part of 1896. Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says, that he had a right to assume that the late Government represented the people then. Well, as a mere mathematical fact, he and his friends were elected on lists eight years old, and they knew they could not and did not represent the people at that particular time. This is one among many reasons why it is extremely inexpedient that the House of Commons should be kept sitting for five years and three months, when the well understood custom of our people is that no Parliament sit for more than five years. More than that; these gentlemen were responsible for the good government of the country while they occupied seats on the Treasury benches. They knew perfectly well long before the first of April, that there was not the ghost of a chance of their getting their Remedial Bill through under any conceivable conditions of things. They knew perfectly well that there was not a ghost of a chance of their getting their Estimates through. They knew perfectly well when the fiscal year expired on the 1st of July, that they could not get supplies as they had lost control of the Parliament. What would honourable men have done in such a case? What would men imbued with the spirit of British usage and precedent have done? Why, Sir, they would have dissolved the Parliament they could not control, and found out whether or not they did enjoy the confidence of the people of Canada. More than that, they would have taken care to have dissolved in such time that they might have had their election early in May, and met early in June at the very latest in order that Parliament might deal with the questions which it was clearly impossible for Parliament to have dealt with at the time I have referred to. That is not a question of opinion. That is a matter of fact recorded over and over again in our "Hansard." The motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) shows the truth of one part of my assertion, although he does not tell in it—perhaps he has good reasons—what they were about from the 2nd of January until the 27th of January. Sir, the hon. gentleman puts in another plea, and if I am not mistaken, he repeats in this document. He declares: So lost were the Opposition to all sense of duty and shame, that the Opposition, under the circumstances I have detailed, would not give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and his friends three months' or six months' further leave to employ themselves as to them might seem best, after they had lost the confidence of the people of the country. Does the hon. gentleman think that the members of the then Opposition were fools? Does he think that we had been blind to the little devices and tactics by which these hon. gentlemen had maintained themselves in power? Does he think that we did not know what kind of pranks and tricks might and in all human probability would have been practised, if these gentlemen had had six months' Estimates and had not required to meet Parliament until the year 1897? Sir, we knew our duty, and we did it. It was our duty not to allow these gentlemen, under such circumstances, to get the Estimates. They had no right, according to English constitutional usage, to ask for any considerable grant of money. If our experience of these gentlemen had been such as to have entitled us, as public men, to have trusted them entirely, we might have granted supplies for four weeks, or six weeks even; but I am bound to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that the circumstances which occurred in the last Parliament, beginning with the notable events of the session of 1891, and going on to the still more notable events of 1896, when that band of brothers made the remarkable exhibition they did on the floor of this House—these events, I say, were not of a kind calculated to inspire us to have confidence in their virtue, or their patriotism, or their loyalty, to each other, at least, or any other of these virtues which it is desirable that members of a Cabinet should possess.

Now, Sir, for all these reasons—not basing myself alone on the strict legal aspect of the case, although I think, if hon. gentlemen will look carefully into the statute, they will see that my contention is the only one that will make sense of it, and that, if you object to it, then these words "or provided" ought to have been struck out—but not basing myself on that, and basing myself on the plain fact that there was an emergency under which public interests were exposed to great danger, that this emergency had been brought about by no fault of this Government, that this Government were ready and willing to meet Parliament at the earliest possible moment they could, but that this emergency had been brought about by the deliberate failure to do their duty by these hon. gentlemen opposite, when they conducted the affairs of Canada. Sir, under these circumstances, I would not be afraid to appeal to the members of this House; I would not be afraid to appeal to the honest men, and particularly to the business men, of any single constituency in Canada. I believe, Sir, that they will declare, as some of them who have been consulted have already declared, that under the circumstances—not in the least degree to establish this as a precedent, but acknowledging that it is a thing which ought not to have occurred, which we trust will never occur again, but which was forced upon us by these hon. gentlemen opposite—that the action of the Government in the premises was perfectly justifiable.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, it is because this question, which has been brought forward by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is to some extent a legal question, that I venture to ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes this evening. It is with a great deal of deference that I speak in the presence of so many eminent gentlemen of my own profession on both sides of the House, and it is also with a good deal of diffidence that I venture to follow a gentleman of the great ability and experience of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). However, I have formed some conclusions with regard to the question submitted to the House, and I consider it only my duty to the constituents who have sent me here, that I should express to the House, as well as I can, the conclusions which I have so formed. Now, Sir, before dealing with the points which have been made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I may venture to say that it seemed to me that that hon. gentleman found that the defence of the Government on this question required even all the great ability and power in debate which he undoubtedly possesses, and that in dealing with the subject he was hardly so happy as I have observed him on previous occasions when he has addressed the House, during the brief period that I have had the honour to be a member of it. It seemed to me that he was hardly as much pleased with himself and his own efforts as he went along, as he was on some former occasions when he addressed the House; and I think the reason for that is to be found, not in the fact that the hon. gentleman was not making the very best possible defence that could be made from his standpoint, but in the fact that he found that a defence of the action of the Government in this matter required powers which even that hon. gentleman can hardly claim to possess.

Now, before dealing, one by one, with the points which the hon. gentleman has made, I would endeavour to answer one or two queries which he has seen fit to address to the House, particularly to the gentlemen on this side. In the first place, he has asked what it is that we would have had the Government to do under the circumstances of the case. I may tell the hon. gentleman that that is a matter which he should have thought of when he and his friends were obstructing the business of the House during the last session. He has asked us what the Government were to do. I will tell him what I think they should not have done; they should not have taken any step which involved a violation of the constitution of this country. What the hon. gentlemen should have done after bringing about a state of affairs which never before existed in this country, it is not for me to say. It is for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to answer that question; it is sufficient for us to point out that they have done something that they should not have done, namely, they have violated the provision of the statute which limits the power of the Executive with regard to appropriations not sanctioned by Parliament.

Now, I might in reply ask the hon. gentleman a question which perhaps could not be so easily answered by him as the question which he propounded could be answered by us. I would like to ask him, if he were in his place, what he would suggest that the Administration of the present leader of the Opposition could properly have done if they had been returned to power by the electorate of this country at the last election. I am speaking in the hearing of eminent members of my own profession when I say that that Administration would have had exactly the same right to issue these Governor General's warrants as the Administration which now controls the affairs of this country; and I would be willing, I think, to challenge hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to point out to me any words in the statute which has been invoked in this case, or any reasonable construction of it, which would not have enabled the Government of Sir Charles Tupper to have done the very same thing if they had been returned to power. And if, having been returned to power, and the Estimates which they had brought down not having been voted by Parliament, they had ventured to issue these Governor General's warrants, would the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce have taken the practical, common-sense, business-like view which he has endeavoured to impress upon this House this afternoon, and which he has endeavoured to commend to his followers for the purpose of inducing them to vote through this plain violation of the statute? I venture to assert that the hon. gentleman would have taken a very different view of the statute. He would have taken the technical view, as he expresses it, which for eighteen years past he has been taking in this House. During those eighteen years, strange to say, it has never once occurred to that hon. gentleman to take that plain, business-like, common-sense view of this statute which he now thinks it so desirable that this House should take. I do not see how any hon. gentleman, understanding the construction of this statute, can stand in his place in this House and venture to say that the fact that one Government or the other is administering the affairs of this country could for a moment control the construction which should be put upon that statute. If I am right in that, what follows? Then the argument which the hon. gentleman has addressed to this House amounts to this, that the Government of the present leader of the Opposition, if they had been returned to power, could have dealt with the whole affairs of this country for a period of

twelve months by means of Governor General's warrants. That is the logical result of the argument of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I think it is not an argument which can commend itself to the members of the legal profession in this House; because if the Government, after coming down to Parliament with Estimates, and having had those Estimates refused by Parliament, can proceed, by means of Governor General's warrants, to deal with the expenditures for the ordinary services of this country, then, as has been well said by the hon. member for York, parliamentary government in this country has indeed degenerated into a farce.

The hon. gentleman has further said that he admits that some $7,000 covered by one of these warrants was improperly included in that warrant. A more ample justification for the resolution of the hon. member for York could not well be found; and the fact which the hon. Minister mentions, that these moneys have not been expended and will not be expended, is only an argument in favour of the resolution which the hon. member for York has put before the House—an argument showing the necessity for such a resolution, an argument showing that this House should, for that reason, if for no other reason, place upon record its views with regard to the use which should be made of these warrants. Now, Sir, it is well known—it has been said by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce himself when he was in Opposition in this House—that it is of the very a, b, c of parliamentary government that no moneys should be expended by the Government of the country unless with the previous sanction of Parliament. And we know that Parliament has provided a means by which, under certain circumstances, the Executive of the country are empowered to depart from that rule. In departing from that rule, they are not violating the constitution when they act in accordance with the statute; but when once they go beyond the statute, it is clear that they are violating the constitution of the country. It seems to me that a statute of that kind should receive a fairly strict construction. A very eminent authority has taken that view. The Hon. Edward Blake, as far back as 1887, used language which, I venture to think, bears that meaning. It is right that such a statute should receive a strict construction, having regard to our system of government, which is by party. Estimates might be brought down to Parliament, which members supporting the party in power might not feel themselves justified in voting, but if the Executive were to pass beyond the limits of the statute and meet expenditures which they had purposely avoided including in the Estimates, by means of Governor General's warrants after Parliament had risen, their followers would be more likely to support them in such a course than they would have been to vote for the Estimates if brought down in the first instance. For this reason and others, the statute ought to be construed strictly. For the last eighteen years we have heard and have read in the reports of the debates the views of hon. members opposite, including the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), on that point. This is not a matter of light import. Hon. gentlemen on both sides have for many years admitted that it is fraught with the greatest possible danger. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself has admitted as much to-night when he confessed that the Government had taken upon itself a serious responsibility in undertaking to issue those warrants. Of that there can be no doubt, and the only question is whether the Government, in taking the step they did, acted in accord with the statute and the constitution. The defence which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce put forward might be divided into sections. In the first place, he retorted with the argument of tu quoque, but he did so very faintly. He seemed to realize that such an argument does not sound very well in the mouth of a Reformer, he seemed to feel that it did not come with very good grace from gentlemen who have been telling us for the past eighteen years that these Governor General's warrants have been abused, and he did not press that argument very much. I need not, therefore, deal further with it, but content myself with saying that it cannot be seriously considered as an argument at all. Standing in my place, I do not want to be told, as an excuse for a violation of the constitution by this Government, that some one else did the same thing in days gone by. In the next place, the hon. gentleman undertook to argue against the view taken by himself during the past eighteen years, when in Opposition, and by the most eminent men of his own party. He undertook to argue that these words "not foreseen" did not limit the words which follow. He said that there were three classes of cases provided for. In the first place, there was the case of an accident happening to a public works—an extraordinary accident, as he has phrased it in one of his speeches before this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that any extraordinary accident has happened, unless the hon. gentleman would say that the fact of a Liberal Administration having been returned to power is such an extraordinary accident as to permit him to make use of the statute authorizing the issue of Governor General's warrants. That is the only extraordinary accident, at all events, which has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. Then we come to the second part of the statute, which deals with any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament, but which is urgently and immediately required for the public

good ; and the hon. gentleman by some specious logic which, I must confess, I was not able to follow, undertook to ignore the words "not foreseen or provided for," and to dwell almost, if not altogether, upon the words "urgently and immediately required." It does not require a lawyer to know that those words "urgently and immediately required" are qualified by the words contained in the same phrase and coming immediately before them. The expenditure must not only be urgently and immediately required, but must be not foreseen or provided for. It seems to me that no hon. gentleman, be he lawyer or layman, would undertake to controvert that interpretation with any show of reason ; and the only other suggestion, if I understood rightly the language of the hon. gentleman, was the suggestion that the words "not foreseen or provided for," covered two cases—the case not provided for and the case not foreseen. I do not think that any lawyer would so interpret those words. I understand that phrase to mean exactly the same as if it read "unforeseen and unprovided for" ; and if you give the Act any other meaning you will have it result in a construction which could not possibly have been contemplated by Parliament. The result would be, as has been well expressed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), that whether foreseen or not, the mere fact that an expenditure was not provided for would give the Governor in Council power to deal with it by warrant. Why, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has been protesting against such a construction for the past eighteen years, and so have hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, well qualified to speak with authority on a matter of that kind. Speaking on this subject, the hon. gentleman said in 1887 :

> There is but one exception, and that is very well defined in the statute under which these same Governor General's warrants are issued. In cases of public emergency, in cases where unforeseen accidents occur, in cases where things arise which could not easily be foreseen or arranged for by the several departments, then and in such cases, if Parliament be not in session, as the Act states, a Governor General's warrant may issue.

I would like to know if that is consistent with the view which the hon. gentleman has put forward to-night. I would like to know if that corresponds with the view that this word "unforeseen" provides for one case, and that the words "not provided for" govern another case ? So all through that speech of the hon. gentleman from which I have quoted the same idea occurs, that it must be foreseen, and the hon. gentleman went much further in that speech, because he took the ground that although the expenditure was unforeseen, nevertheless if by reasonable prudence it might have been foreseen, then the case did not come within the meaning of the statute. Having taken that high ground in 1887, one may well venture to inquire when it was that he acquired this new view which he has put forward to-night. The hon. gentleman was not alone in the view he took in 1887, because the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries —a lawyer of great eminence in his profession—took exactly the same view, and used even more forcible language. He said :

> Two things that must concur are, first, that the expenditure is unforeseen, and that it is urgently and immediately required.

Nothing could be plainer than this language of the hon. gentleman. And then the hon. gentleman dealt with his own personal knowledge of the facts, and goes on to say :

> I know the facts connected with one or two of those items myself, and I know they cannot be justified. Here is a small item of $3,800 for filling in a station yard at Charlottetown. That was not a matter which was not foreseen, because it is many years since it was reported upon by the engineer in chief as a work that ought to be undertaken by the Government. Nor was there any particular urgency about it.

And yet that hon. gentleman has seen fit to concur in an Order in Council which provides for the expenditure by Governor General's warrants of moneys for purposes that were absolutely foreseen and were attempted to be provided in the last session of Parliament. Now, Sir, Hon. Edward Blake, who spoke in the same debate, took exactly the same view ; and I commend to the attention of the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House and to all hon. gentlemen on the other side some remarks Mr. Blake made on that occasion. He said :

> Why, we all understand that there is nothing more popular than the agreements in declaration of a high standard of morality or a high code of public virtue, and there is nothing more unpopular than the application to particular instances of that high standard of public morality and virtue.

The hon. gentleman seems to have had in view the proceedings of his friends on this occasion when he used that language. Mr. Blake on that occasion also said :

> The law does not entrust the Administration with the power of making expenditures during recess simply because the expenditures may be good in themselves.

That was the argument the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce put forward—that because the expenditures were in the public interest it was right that they should be made without previous sanction of Parliament, even though they did not come within the letter or the spirit of the statute. I venture to quote the remarks of Hon. Edward Blake with regard to that, and I venture to say that the standard set up by Mr. Blake is more worthy of attention and consideration at the hands of gentlemen on both sides of the House than the doctrines the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce saw fit to advocate. Mr. Blake, in concluding his remarks said :

It is a power to be used for the good of the state in order that, in case some unavoidable, some unforeseen, some extraordinary accident or other emergency occurs, the commonwealth may not suffer damage by the fact of the Government not having the power to spend necessary moneys at the moment.

And the gentleman who then represented Bothwell, the Hon. David Mills, also used language, which is of considerable importance. In the same debate and dealing with the same question, he said :

Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen need only look at these appropriations to see that they are not such as were contemplated by the law—not such as the law was intended to meet. They are not of the class that the Act put upon the Statute-book was intended to enable the Government to deal with. These are ordinary appropriations for ordinary purposes.

"Ordinary appropriations for ordinary purposes," according to the judgment of Mr. Mills, a gentleman who was well qualified to speak on the subject, are not within the meaning or letter of the statute. It is stated in the public press that it is the intention of the present Administration to elevate the hon. gentleman who used that language, to a very high judicial position in this country ; and it would be a remarkable thing if that hon. gentleman, acting judicially, should have occasion to pronounce in the spirit of his speech on that occasion upon the view with which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has seen fit to put forward to-night. "Ordinary appropriations" he says, are not within the letter or meaning of this statute, and "ordinary appropriations" are the appropriations for which the Government of this country has seen fit to issue these Governor General's warrants. Now, so much for what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and if I thought fit to weary the House with it, I could quote language of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to the same effect—namely, that no expenditure comes within the letter or spirit of this statute unless it is an expenditure that was not foreseen at the time the Estimates were brought down. Now what are the defences, when you come to analyse them, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has seen fit to put forward to-night. First, there was the tu quoque argument, upon which, as I have said, he did not much depend. Then there was the argument that three cases are provided by the statute instead of two, and I have answered him in regard to that out of his own mouth and out of the mouths of very eminent gentlemen on the same side of the House. I do not say that the statements of these hon. gentlemen are conclusive, but I do say that their arguments commend themselves to the reason and intelligence of any man who desires to approach the question before the House to-day in a judicial spirit ; I say they are right arguments and proper arguments, and I say that the construction put upon this statute by these hon. gentlemen, being the right construction, cannot and does not support the issue of these Governor General's warrants under the circumstances which have been detailed to the House to-day. Now the next point that the hon. gentleman made was that these moneys had been expended properly in the public interest and for public purposes. It seems to me that that is not an argument at all. If the moneys had not been expended for public purposes ; if they had not been properly expended—I use the expression "properly expended" in the sense of being expended for the services of the country—why, the hon. gentleman would be guilty of malfeasance in office. These hon. gentlemen are trustees for the public ; they have no right, even when the moneys have been voted by Parliament, to use them for other than public purposes. The question is not whether the moneys have been applied to public purposes, but whether under the statute, they are improperly taken for public purposes. That is the question before the House, and the hon. gentleman did not meet a single point advanced by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) when he undertook to tell the House that the Government were justified because the moneys were not used corruptly. If they had been used corruptly, the hon. gentleman would be in the dock. Surely it has nothing to do with it, when we are construing the statute, whether these moneys have been properly expended ; but it has everything to do with it whether they have been expended with parliamentary sanction. Now, the hon. gentleman, when he used that argument, forgot, I think, to consider the conclusion to which such an argument would drive him. If such an argument is advanced in favour of the position advanced by the hon. gentleman to-day, then the expenditure for every month during the year ending July 1st, 1897, could be dealt with in the same way. The expenditure for every month during that year would be for public purposes : the expenditure for every month during that year, we must assume, would be appropriated honestly and honourably. The argument the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce makes with regard to that would apply to every month up to the first day of July, 1897, or until Parliament should be called again ; and, for my part, I do not see that it would be any greater violation of the constitution to defer calling Parliament together before the expiration of the period fixed by the statute, than to pursue the course which the hon. gentlemen, in the administration of this country, have seen fit to pursue with regard to Governor General's warrants. In either case there would be gross, and unwarrantable, and unjustifiable violation of a statutory provision regulating the Government of the country.

Now, the next point the hon. gentleman made, when you come to put aside the splen-

did declamation of which that hon. gentleman is so perfect a master, is that he had consulted business men with regard to this matter; and it would appear from the hon. gentleman's language that, in dealing with this matter, His Excellency has not been acting upon the advice of his Ministers, but has been acting, rather, upon the advice of certain business men whose names are not confided to the House, and who have advised the advisers of His Excellency that this was a proper course to pursue. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that perhaps the best course would be to get one of these business men to fill the position of Minister of Justice in this country, in order that we may have the benefit of his advice and guidance on all occasions, and that we may be able to have those business men with us in Parliament, instead of having thrust upon us the advice of those with whose capacity to give advice this House is not familiar. The hon. gentleman says that he acted upon the advice of business men and dealt with the matter in a business-like way. I venture to think that a more extraordinary argument in favour of a more extraordinary procedure was never put forward in this or any other Parliament, in this or any other country. Now, I cannot at this moment recall any other argument which the hon. gentleman has put forward for the purpose of sustaining the position of the Government with regard to this matter. I say argument, because the hon. gentleman, master as he is of parliamentary debate, master as he is of declamation, did make a very plausible speech in this House; but I submit that when you come to analyse it, you cannot find anything in it in the way of argument beyond what I have stated to this House, and if there is anything further in the hon. gentleman's remarks in the way of argument, I would be glad to have it pointed out by some other hon. gentleman on the Government side.

Now, the hon. gentleman did not make any further argument, but he did address himself to his followers with an ill-disguised appeal to them to vote this matter through, whether it is according to the constitution or not. I think, Sir, that is a dangerous thing for a gentleman in the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce to do. I think it does not augur well for the parliamentary institutions of this country, or for parliamentary government in this country, for an hon. gentleman in that position to turn to his supporters and say to them, in thinly-disguised language: We have evaded this statute, we have gone beyond this statute, but we look to you to vote it through. That is not the spirit in which parliamentary government ought to be conducted in this country, and I hope that is not the spirit in which parliamentary government will, in future, be conducted in this country; but certainly it is not the spirit in which a Government which calls itself a Reform Government, ought to seek to carry on the Government of this country. Now, Sir, I have ventured to put before the House, in as few words as I could, what my views are with regard to this matter. I can only say, in conclusion, that I do not think the hon. gentlemen have begun well. They have begun, however, exactly where they left off in 1878. Almost the very last official act of the Mackenzie Government, in 1878, was to do exactly the same thing; and almost the very last words the Minister of Trade and Commerce uttered in Parliament, were words in which he admitted, compelled so to admit by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, that he had gone beyond the limits of this very same statute; and I can refer hon. gentlemen, if they desire, to the page and to the line of "Hansard" where he made that admission.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Give it to us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The late Sir John A. Macdonald dealt with this matter exactly in the same way, in 1878, as the hon. member for York has dealt with it to-day; and after he had arraigned the Government on the same lines and for the same reasons as they have been arraigned to-day, Mr. Cartwright arose and said:

> While admitting generally the correctness of the principle contended for by the hon. gentleman, he pointed out that there were cases of emergency in which all governments must depart from the rule laid down in the statutes.

"Must depart from the rule laid down in the statutes." For the next eighteen years the hon. gentleman, on all occasions and with all the eloquence at his command, urged that the Government should not depart from the rule laid down by the statutes, but, when he resumes power, in 1896, he resumes it exactly in the same line and exactly upon the same principle as he laid it down in 1878. It is a bad omen for this country that such should be the case, because a precedent of this kind is apt to be extended under circumstances which render it even more dangerous than it is at present. It may be, as hon. gentlemen have said, that this money has been applied properly for public purposes; it may be that, although they have gone beyond both the letter and the spirit of the statute, there is no actual misfeasance. It may be that they have not violated their duty as trustees, but if a precedent like this is to be put before Parliament, although the hon. gentlemen disclaim that it should be used as a precedent, how do we know what may be the circumstances under which it shall be used hereafter? It has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen now on the other side of the House, that this is one of the great dangers of the misuse of such a power—and I venture to think there is a great deal in that argument, and that hon. gentlemen urging that position urged it properly, and I can only commend to my hon. friends opposite the ar-

guments which were used on that point by their now leaders, when in Opposition. I feel sure that if they approach this subject in a judicial spirit, if they give the force to these arguments to which they are entitled, and if they look at this statute in the way in which it should be regarded, they cannot fail, voting according to their conscience, to vote for the resolution which the member for York has offered.

Mr. LISTER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech which my hon. friend has just addressed to the House, and with a little feeling of amusement, too. The hon. gentleman was bold enough to say that this Government commences its career where the Government of 1878 left off. If my information is correct, that hon. gentleman was a supporter of the Government of 1878; if my information is correct, that hon. gentleman, who so violently assailed the conduct of the present Administration, was a supporter of the Liberal party in the year 1882, and he continued to be a supporter of that same party until a few years ago. There is nothing like a pervert for bitterness. He seems to think that it is his particular duty to abuse and vilify his old companions in politics in order, forsooth, that he may prove to his new friends, who doubt his allegiance, that he is true. I always look with some suspicion on gentlemen who thus assail their old party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Look around.

Mr. LISTER. I see several of such opposite. I see the ex-Minister of Finance, who came into this House as an independent Liberal; he was a Liberal before he was elected, an independent Liberal when he was elected, and a Tory when there was an opportunity to go on the Treasury benches. Sir, the argument of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Borden) was a long, laboured, technical argument, such an argument as he would address to the judges of the Supreme Court of the province of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And they would give judgment after he had sat down.

Mr. LISTER. It proves to me how insignificant the question before the House really is. When I remember all those long years that hon. gentlemen opposite were on the Treasury benches and how every day they were swallowing political camels and to-day are squirming at a political gnat, it makes one believe that those hon. gentlemen are hardly sincere in their opposition to or in their attack on the Government for obtaining those warrants. The hon. member for Halifax soberly told the House that the present Government should have settled the question last session. It was not the duty of the present Government to consider the question last session, it was the duty of the Government then in power to have considered it; but although Parliament was called together early in the year, those hon. gentlemen who are so particular to-day about the constitution being observed allowed the session almost to pass before they proceeded with the Estimates, and before they attempted to make provision to meet the necessary public expenditures. They went on with that work, which they knew it was impossible for them to get through, and if there is any responsibility resting upon the shoulders of any party, that responsibility must be borne by the present Opposition. The hon. member said that the Government which I have the honour to support has violated the constitution, has violated the statute law of this country. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that one of the most distinguished jurists of Canada, if not the most distinguished, has declared and admitted that what has been done was within the power of the Government under the statute law.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LISTER. Oliver Mowat's opinion, I venture to say, without wishing to depreciate any opinion expressed by the leader of the Opposition, is of the highest value, and hon. gentlemen who now constitute the Opposition have good reason to know that the opinion of Oliver Mowat on questions such as this is not to be disregarded. He has told the people of the country as a lawyer and a jurist that the power which the Government has exercised is within their rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LISTER. Yes. If the ex-Minister of Finance had only been as anxious about the observance of the constitution in all the years he occupied the position of Minister of Finance as he is to-day, the speeches delivered by him and his colleagues would not have been necessary. As to the Governor General's warrants, those hon. gentlemen issued them not once or twice, but by the half a dozen, by wholesale every year. Parliamentary government in this country had become almost a farce when the people in their might turned out of power and discredited the Government and the party so that it will not get back into power until it has purged itself. The hon. member for Halifax has declared that the position taken by the ex-Minister of Finance is one that cannot be controverted. I venture to place against it the opinion of Oliver Mowat, who holds that the position hon. gentlemen opposite have taken is not a correct one. The hon. gentleman says that the money could not have been expended without the sanction of Parliament. We are all reasonably familiar with that proposition, and it was scarcely necessary to inform the House of that fact; but it was to get over that difficulty in the cases men-

tioned in the statute that the statute was passed, and the question comes up now whether the case now under consideration is one coming within the meaning of section 32, subsection D. We have had a speech from the ex-Minister of Finance, one which I suppose he will call the speech of his life : it was a speech delivered from a long brief which went back into English history for a period of 200 years to prove something with which the House is fully familiar. He addressed arguments to the House with all the eloquence and power he possesses, to prove that the Government in issuing Governor General's warrants acted illegally. And when we come to consider that there is no principle involved—for we all agree upon the principle—and that there is not one Canadian cent of the current coin involved—because it is not suggested by any hon. gentleman but that every dollar of the money raised by these warrants has been properly applied in liquidation of the liabilities of this Dominion, we see that it is an infinitesimal question. There is no dishonesty charged. There is no loss of money. There is nothing charged, except that these warrants were issued, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, without the authority of law, but as we say, with the full authority of law. They ask hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to vote against the Government because of the statements they make that these payments were without authority of law, when the Minister of Justice of this Dominion has given his deliberate opinion that the Government of the day was justified and legally authorized to ask that these warrants should be issued for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the country. What were the circumstances of the case, and in what an absurd position do these circumstances not place hon. gentlemen opposite. They called Parliament together on the 2nd of January last. They knew that Parliament would die a natural death on the 25th of April, and they knew that the public service of the country had to be provided for. They knew, moreover, that if that provision was not made by the 25th of April there was no power here to make provision for it. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was delicate in his language concerning these hon. gentlemen opposite. They called Parliament together for the purpose, among other things, of voting supplies, but instead of going on with the work of Parliament they were engaged in the most disgraceful intrigue that ever disgraced this country or any other British colony, or Britain itself. Instead of proceeding with the work they called Parliament for, they were engaged in an attempt to supplant the old leader of the Government by another man from across the ocean. For two long weeks there was no Government in this country, and yet these are the men who talk about the violation of the constitution. They called us together when that conspiracy was ripe. They thought the public would know nothing about it, but fortunately for Canada, the old man who was at the head of the Government had not such a weak back as they thought he had. For two weeks these men were out of office ; for two weeks the leader of the then Government was trying to form a new Adminstration, and thus, to the discredit of the Government and to the disgrace of Canada the valuable time of Parliament was lost. These are the men who have temerity enough, shall I say indecency enough, to come before Parliament and assail the Government of the country for trying to provide for the public services, which they neglected to provide for themselves. Our party while in Opposition were generous enough to give them supplies for the 1st of July, 1896. They say to us to-day : This is all your fault ; you should have given us a year's supply. Sir, it would be an unfortunate day for Canada if we had done that. We know them well, and knowing them we do not trust them. What, give them a year's supplies ! Sir, if we had done that the verdict of the country would have been ignored and set aside. Defeated at the polls, these men upon the Treasury benches, and the treasury of Canada under their hands, would have appealed to the courts and by hook or by crook they would have set aside sufficient elections, and then as in 1891, they would have bought up the constituencies of Canada. Trust them : no Sir. We know better than to trust them. We knew that we dare not trust them with more money than would carry them on to the 1st of July. We believed then that the country was sick and tired of the crew who had been governing it for eighteen years. We believed then, as afterwards turned out, that we would defeat them when we got before a free people, and when their acts of maladministration were know to the country. What we believed was verified by the verdict of the country, and they were ignominously defeated. They have been placed on the Opposition benches, and let us all earnestly pray that long may they remain there. The people of Canada were tired of the Tory party. Their policy of buying the people up by trotting out the old bundle of straw labelled the National Policy and asking them to vote for that, had played its last game. The appeal to race and prejudice in Manitoba and Quebec had also played its last game. Was the treasury of this country to be looted by the leader of the Opposition going to Manitoba and the Territories and promising them untold wealth if they would return supporters of his : and then going to Prince Edward Island and trying to buy one hundred thousand honest people by promising seven branch railways? No, Sir, the country was astounded ; the country feared them, and the people of Canada have turned them out of power to remain there for many years to come. The

elections of the 23rd of June declared that the Liberal Government was to govern Canada for five years at least. When the Liberals came into power, and when they found no provision for carrying on the public service, what was to be done? Parliament had been called for the 16th of July by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the meantime the leader of the Liberal party was called upon to form a new Administration. These men opposite now say that Parliament should have been convened before the members of the Government had gone to their constituencies and got their approval. How was it possible to ask Parliament for supplies until almost the present time? As was said by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), the public service of Canada had to be carried on, and in order to carry it on, it was necessary that funds should be provided for the purpose. I ask them, how could funds be provided? Were the people around the buildings here to go unpaid; were the officials throughout the country to go unpaid; was the public service of Canada to stand still, until the Government came to Parliament and asked Parliament to give them a vote, when they had the authority of the statute itself? My hon. friend may put as technical a construction on that statute as he thinks proper. While the statute may bear the construction which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) has put upon it, it is equally clear that a warrant may issue when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good. That section of the Act is capable of that broader interpretation, and that is the interpretation which the Minister of Justice has declared is in his opinion the law.

But, Sir, what are we arguing about? If there is a doubt as to the meaning of the statute, has any wrong been done? Is anybody injured? Does it make any difference, in view of the fact of a condition of affairs existing unparalleled in this country or in any other, a condition of affairs that will never recur, a condition of affairs that rendered it absolutely necessary that the Government of the country should raise funds for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the Government? Does it make any difference, when it is not charged that one farthing of that expenditure was corrupt—when it is admitted that it was absolutely necessary in the public interest? Does it make any difference whether you give the statute the narrow or the broad construction? Because the money has been honestly borrowed, it has been honestly expended, and the Government of the country, in calling Parliament together as soon as it was possible for them to do so assumed the full responsibility; and they are here to-day to answer for their action, and to say to their followers that in their judgment they were within the law, that it was a case without parallel, that it was a case wherein it was necessary that the Government of the day should make that provision, and that they did it in the public interest? The argument against it, therefore, is of no particular consequence. Hon. gentlemen opposite are arguing upon a naked principle, with nothing involved. They are arguing upon a question to which there are two sides, and about which much can be said for and against. But I am sure that every hon. gentleman here who wants to look at this thing fairly, and upon its merits, without the spirit of party, and who does not feel impelled to vote for his party right or wrong, will be found to-night voting against the amendment of the ex-Minister of Finance. It is simply absurd, and it shows how anxious hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are to get up a discussion of some kind or other. If they had consulted their own party interests, I believe they would not be found to-day moving such an amendment—four or five pages long, with nothing in it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did they leave any money when they went out?

Mr. LISTER. The box, I believe, was empty. The position I take is this: the necessities of the Government were such that they were obliged to get the money, or let the public service of Canada stand still, they had the authority of the law to borrow the money and to expend it, and it was expended in the public interest. It is not suggested that it was not necessary or that there was any improper expenditure. I repeat that the argument of hon. gentlemen on the other side is simply the argument of lawyers, who clothe themselves with technicalities, and they want to make the members of this House believe that there is something greater and graver in this matter than appears upon the service. All that there is in this little question is that these hon. gentlemen made no provision for carrying on the affairs of this country, and when the Liberal party came into power they were compelled to borrow money, and they borrowed it in the only way they could, under the authority of that statute, fairly interpreted. That being the case, the money being properly expended, the Government assuming the responsibility, the Minister of Justice, one of the most eminent lawyers in this country, advising that the Government had such a power, what is there in this question? What can there be in it? Why waste the time of Parliament, called here for a particular purpose? Hon. gentlemen, by motions such as this, seem determined to waste the time of this Parliament in useless discussions. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that every hon. gentleman who has given this question any consideration, be he Conservative or Reformer, unless he is bound by party spirit, will be found voting against the motion of the hon. ex-Minister of

Finance in amendment to the motion of the hon. Minister of Finance. Sir, the people of the country, I am satisfied, will give these hon. gentlemen no credit for the factious opposition which they are offering to the new Administration, which has thus far acted in the best interests of Canada. I appeal to my hon. friends, I appeal to every honourable man in this House, to look at this matter fairly and squarely, and to say that in this motion the hon. ex-Minister of Finance has not exercised that shrewdness and sagacity which usually characterizes him, but that the whole thing is a weak piece of business, not deserving of the support of any intelligent member of this House.

Mr. CRAIG. I shall not detain the House very long, but desire to say a few words on this question. I was rather surprised to note the difference of tone between the speech made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lister). The Minister of Trade and Commerce admitted that this was an important question, worthy the serious consideration of the House, and of the fullest discussion that can be given it. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), however, thinks it is a question of no importance at all. He charges the Opposition with wasting the time of the country and with not knowing what we are doing. He charges us with talking nonsense, but I must say that, listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman, I concluded that he must have imagined he was addressing an audience from the stump. Why, he even found fault with the admirable speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden)—a speech which commanded the attention of every other member of this House, a speech which may be rightly characterized as an argument, and that is a description which I am sure could not be applied to the speech of the hon. member for West Lambton. Sir, the hon. member for Halifax did just what the hon. member for West Lambton said should be done in treating this question. He treated it, not as a party, but as a legal question. He discussed the statute, its meaning and its limitation. Did the hon. member for West Lambton so discuss it? Why, he commenced by ridiculing the hon. member for Halifax. He talked about him as a pervert, and he said that perverts were always noted for their zeal. Well, I do not intend to allude to any converts on that side of the House, because I hold that any hon. member has the perfect right to change his opinions on political questions, and it is no reproach to any man in this House that some years ago he held different political opinions from those he holds to-day. So that I think that the remarks with reference to the hon. member for Halifax which the hon. member for West Lambton made were uncalled for. They showed simply that the hon. member for West Lambton felt himself unable to refute the argument, and therefore resorted to ridicule instead of serious discussion. But, I am happy to say, such an attempt at ridicule fell extremely flat, and had not the slightest effect on the House or on the hon. member for Halifax, who is too well known as a lawyer, and who enjoys too high a reputation in his profession, to be at all affected by anything which the hon. gentleman could say against him. I was rather amused with the remark made by the hon. member for West Lambton, that this Government had the advantage of the favourable opinion of the highest authority in this country, when I found out that this authority was a member of the Government which had done this very thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no man in this House respects more highly than I do the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat). I had the pleausre of being with him in the Ontario legislature. I learned to respect him there and I respect him still, but I do not hold that his opinion on this question is equal to that of a disinterested outside lawyer, because he is one of the parties interested. While I am satisfied that he thinks he is right, that does not prove he is right, and I do not know that it will justify to the country the issuance of these warrants. I was very sorry to notice that while the hon. member for West Lambton said that this question should be treated apart from all reference to party, as I think it should be, and as I intend to treat it, he discussed it himself solely from that point of view, and went on to talk of the course of the late Government during last session and the course of the party supporting it, and said that the country was both sick and tired of that Government and party. I do not think that such remarks could be described as treating this question without reference to party, but that, on the contrary, the hon. gentleman introduced a party spirit entirely into this debate. Instead of treating this question from a legal point of view, as one would expect a gentleman of his legal attainments to do, he confined his remarks to making appeals to party feeling. The country, he said, was sick and tired of the late Government and its supporters. I would ask the hon. gentleman how he came to that conclusion. I do not think the province of Ontario acted as if it were sick and tired of the Conservative Government and party. While I am not going to discuss all the reasons why we find ourselves on this side of the House, there are reasons which might be given, apart from the actions of the Government generally during last session, and many past sessions. I believe that if it had not been for one unfortunate question which came before the country, and agitated the people, the Conservative party would still be in office. If the country was sick and tired, it was not of the Conservative party, but of a question which had been thrust on the late Government, and which that

Government tried to handle, but failed to handle to the satisfaction of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What do you think of the question yourself?

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman ought to ask a question a little more to the point, because everybody knows what I thought of the question and what I think of it to-day. Then the hon. member for West Lambton said that the Conservative party had put before the country something labelled "National Policy," which had been able to accomplish great wonders. No doubt it did, but the trouble is the National Policy was lost sight of during the last election in the agitation resulting from that other question, or we might have a different tale to tell to-day. I would, however, warn the hon. member for West Lambton not to say too much about the National Policy, because he does not know what the policy of his own party may be yet, and he may find that he has made a great mistake if he ridicules that policy and then discovers that his own party has not altered it so very much as he may have led the people to imagine they would. I do not know what he may yet have to say about coal oil. It is true that that has not much to do with the question that we are now discussing, but it is just as relevant and as germane to it as the remarks the hon. gentleman made about the National Policy. I do not propose to answer the legal argument, because I think that was answered before the hon. gentleman spoke. The hon. gentleman certainly failed to answer the arguments adduced by the hon. member for Halifax, which, to my mind, were very strong indeed. One reason given for the issue of these Governor General's warrants is that the late Government acted in such a manner as to prevent Parliament being called in time. Well, a very convincing answer was given to that, when it was pointed out that the late Government asked very reasonably for three months' estimates, so that the public service might not suffer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon gentleman says "hear, hear." I am satisfied of this, that if hon. gentlemen opposite had had any idea that they would have been returned to power, they would have consented. I do not think they had the remotest hope of being elected, or they would not have objected as much as they did to the three months' estimates being passed. The request that three months' supplies should be voted last session was a most reasonable one. We knew that a certain time must elapse before the Government and Parliament could be called together, but the Opposition were unwilling even to grant that moderate request of the late Government, and, owing to their obstructive tactics, the present Government found themselves in the predicament of having no funds, when they came into office. Another reason given for the issue of these warrants is that there was urgency and great need for the money. Now, I would just make this remark—and here I speak not as a lawyer, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, but as a business man—he said there was very great and urgent need for the money. I say this: I may admit that there was need for the first warrant, and that the necessity for the money would excuse the issue of it; but what is the excuse for issuing a warrant on the 18th of August, the very day before the meeting of Parliament? I do not think that the necessity for money could have been so urgent that it could not be put off until Parliament had been asked to sanction the expenditure. But though the necessity for the money might excuse the issue of Governor General's warrants, yet it does not justify the issue of those warrants. Why, if there was no necessity for money, there would be no control at all over the Executive. If they did not need money, they would not need to call Parliament at all. And so, if we justify the issue of warrants on the ground that the money is needed, we give an excuse for not calling Parliament together. The need for money, instead of being a reason for issuing Governor General's warrants, is the very strongest argument against it. I noticed that the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not speak in a very combative manner in discussing this question: as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) said, he did not seem to be at his best. I was struck with one remark he made. He expressed the hope that the necessity for this would not occur again; that is to say, he did not want to make this a precedent. I am not treating this as a party question, and have no wish to do so, but I think it is right, as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce himself admitted, that the attention of the country should be called to this matter. If the Government can justify themselves to the country, so much the better for them. I have no doubt they will justify their action to their own supporters or most of them. But the question is: Can they justify themselves to the country; are the people satisfied that they should, while in Opposition, strongly object to the issue of Governor General's warrants, and criticise them every time they were used, and then, when they get into power, to do the very thing which previously they had condemned? If the country approves of that, the Government are all right. But it is a most important question, which concerns the people and concerns our parliamentary institutions. It may be said—it was said by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister): What is the danger; the money is spent for the public benefit? We are an honest Government; we are not like the gentlemen recently in power. The country should not trust them with Governor General's warrants, but you may trust us to take all the Governor General's war-

rants we want; you may be sure the money will be rightly spent, because we are an honest Government. It may be very well for them to say this, and to tell us that there is no danger; but I say there is danger in every violation of the constitution, even though it is a small violation, because bad precedents are always dangerous. But even supposing that the present Government is an honest Government and one in which the people have confidence, it is possible that some day there may be a Government in power that is not quite so honest, and that Government will cite the action of its predecessor in issuing Governor General's warrants as justification for doing the same. It is our duty to protest. The resolution before us says that, under the circumstances which have been recited,

This House is of opinion that the issue of said warrants was in contravention of the well understood principles of parliamentary control.

I maintain that, while there might have been some excuse for the first Governor General's warrant, there was no excuse for the second. So I am prepared to vote for the amendment, which condemns the issue of these Governor General's warrants as an abuse of the powers vested in the Governor General.

Mr. LOUNT. Mr. Speaker, before voting upon this question, I desire to state to you, to the House and to the country the reasons which governs me in coming to the conclusion I have come to with regard to it. It has been very properly stated that this is largely a question for lawyers. I concede that, because it is, to some extent, a constitutional question and one to which great importance should be attached and close attention paid. I have listened, I must confess, with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. member for York (Mr Foster). I always listen with pleasure and attention to his advocacy of a cause. Even though I may not agree with him in the conclusions he arrives at, still, he presents his case in a logical, clear, and sometimes very correct aspect. I cannot say I agree always with his statements of fact, nor do I always follow his conclusions in law. I was led to believe from his line of argument that he might almost be said to be a lawyer, even though he did not have a legal education. His fine-spun sophistries and close technicalities indicated that he followed on the line of legal argument, though legal argument may not always agree with legal conclusions. The hon. gentleman gave us—and I was delighted to hear it, for it reminds us of the history of the past—he gave us what he described in his own eloquent language the safeguards and protections that have been thrown around parliamentary government, and warned this side of the House against the danger of the invasion of these principles. Does the hon. gentleman remember that it is from this side of the House and from this party in the past that responsible government first came, and that with responsible government there has been the effort of the Liberal party to surround it with all these safeguards? History repeats itself again and again in showing the Reform party as the defenders and protectors of parliamentary government; and I will not say, though perhaps I might say it with perfect safety, that history does not say the same thing for the Conservative party. Now, I recognize that, and recognize also that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), in his close reasoning and in his premises which he advanced for the conclusion he arrived at, stated that there was but one conclusion to come to, and that was that the Administration had been wrong in, acting as they had done with regard to the matter under discussion.

He may be right, I am not prepared to say he is wrong. It is a debatable question, and it is for this House to say whether, in consideration of its being a debatable question, this Government was not thoroughly justified in the course it took in regard to the warrants. Now in reasoning upon that line I was somewhat amazed at finding those hon. gentlemen so active and energetic in looking back to the past utterances of the leaders of the Reform party. They cited to us with unction, they cited to us with infinite pleasure, they cited to us as if it should close the debate, that we should accept as being conclusive, that the Hon. Edward Blake and the Hon. Mr. Mills had in the past given their opinions in this House on the same line as the hon. gentlemen are proceeding to take to-night. I think it is a safe conclusion to draw that, although the hon. gentlemen opposite now accept and approve of the opinions of those distinguished gentlemen, when they were uttered those same hon. gentlemen opposite dissented from them. At that time hon. gentlemen on the other side took a position with regard to the grant of warrants of this character somewhat similar to the position taken by this Government to-day. The opinions of those eminent gentlemen I have mentioned have been produced, and read in extenso, and cheered by every hon. gentleman opposite as if the doctrines were incapable of dispute, and I say it redounds to the credit of the Reform party that those principles which were enunciated then, are principles which, if you examine them closely, are being enunciated by the Reform party on this side of the House to-night. Hon. gentlemen may endeavour to make a distinction, but they forget that there were differences of fact and differences of condition which entirely change the bearing of the opinions that were offered by the hon. gentlemen whom they cite. Now, Sir, I am a new member in this House, wholly inexperienced in the manner of debate. I have endeavoured to listen with care to the dis-

cussion as conducted by the other side, believing that I could get wisdom, that I could get assistance, that I could learn something from those hon. gentlemen. I have learned something, but I have learned this more particularly, that one is not safe to trust his judgment at least to the statements of fact enunciated from the other side. I have examined this Act with some desire to come, as I hope, to an honest conclusion as to what the law is, and I admit frankly that the effort to come to that conclusion is not entirely satisfactory. The law is not as clear as one would like. We are told by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that necessity does not justify the action, and to fortify himself in that statement, he harks back again, as other hon. gentlemen on that side have harked back, to opinions which, on other occasions, when it suited their purpose, they have seen fit to minimize and discount. They are willing to-night to accept the opinions of the Hon. Edward Blake, they are willing to-night to accept the opinion of the Hon. Mr. Mills, but I have read in parliamentary debates how often hon. gentlemen opposite have derided, and laughed at, and endeavoured to minimize the opinions of those two gentlemen. When the occasion suits them they can accept their opinions, and when the occasion suits them otherwise, they are quite competent to dissent from those opinions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, what conclusion can be drawn from hon. gentlemen who play fast and loose; who take when it suits them, and discard when it suits them, the same opinions and the same reasons. Surely, as a new member of this House, I cannot look with much confidence upon their arguments and upon their conclusions. Now, as I have already remarked, I admit that this Act is surrounded with some difficulty. The hon. member for York says that necessity does not justify the action of the Government. Has that hon. gentleman never heard the old saying that necessity knows no law?

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOUNT. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." I believe that the hon. gentleman is necessity itself—not that I mean to say he absolutely knows no law, but that he is capable of expounding some extraordinary doctrines with regard to law, which would rather indicate to me at least that necessity has had a great share in the wisdom which is given to him with regard to the knowledge of law. Just to glance for a few moments at the legal position, this Act, strictly and literally read, says that Governor General's warrants may issue when occasions arise for the expenditure of public money, not foreseen or provided for by Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite desire to import into the language, not the word "or" but the word "and," and doing so they are able to raise an argument in support of the amendment to the resolution. When the Act is thus read, the action of the Government is clearly and obviously within their province. If hon. gentlemen opposite say this was an expenditure which was foreseen—and perhaps they may be right in that, on which point I shall have a few words to say later on—it is not denied these moneys were not provided for. If not provided for, then under the terms of the Act the Government were justified in presenting the warrants. So that according to the conclusion I am able to arrive at with respect to the literal construction of the Act, the Government were perfectly justified in their action, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite concede it, for I have not heard them dissent from that proposition, I have not heard any hon. gentleman express an opinion which goes the length of saying that if this money was really unprovided for, then the Government is in any sense to blame. This being the literal reading of the Act, what has to be done before the Government can be condemned? You must change the language of the statute and put one word for another. I admit, as a lawyer, that judges when interpreting Acts of Parliament endeavour to find the meaning and if an Act is not capable of construction, it is the duty as well as the privilege of the bench to interpret it and to give a reasonable and sensibe meaning. This being so, on what ground do hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to say that it should be read "and" instead of "of." I understand hon. gentlemen to say that the Act is not capable of proper construction if it is read as it is worded at present. But I take this position, and it is a position so far as my influence can affect hon. members behind the Government, that where there is any doubt, and I submit there is strong doubt whether "and" should be imported into the Act, and the word "or" removed, hon. gentlemen are perfectly safe in supporting the Government, they having taken their course not hastily or ill-advisedly, but with the greatest precaution and prudence. What greater precaution could have been taken, what better course could have been pursued than has been followed? To whom should this Government apply for an opinion in regard to these warrants? Should they take the opinion of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), with his legal mind; should they fall back on the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who has displayed, I admit, marvellous ingenuity in the course of the debates which have taken place in this House in making white appear black and black white; should they have taken the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden)? I have heard an old saying, which I will not repeat, about going to Halifax.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. LOUNT. What is troubling the hon. member? Is he in agony, is he in any serious physical condition? If so, I will wait until he gets rid of the difficulty, and then proceed. I was saying, however, that it was necessary to take an opinion. That opinion was taken, and I venture to say it was the highest opinion in this land, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. For eighteen years hon. gentlemen have been learning the extent and magnitude of the profundity of such opinions. The Privy Council in England has admitted the wisdom of such opinions, and in all the battles which have been fought between this House, led by the late Premier and by those who preceded him, and by Sir John A. Macdonald, who was, I admit, an eminent authority, a man of high dignity, of great judgment and influence, a man who led his party with honour and credit to the men who sat behind him, where it was an honour to sit—that hon. gentleman, perhaps the best statesman those hon. gentlemen had to follow—I say this in humble deference to the hon. gentlemen before me—gave his opinion on many constitutional questions. Those opinions were given on occasions when differences arose between the Dominion and the province of Ontario. I need not repeat to the hon. gentlemen the several cases which must be fresh in their memory, because a wounded man or a wounded intelligence long suffers under the wound. Those wounds are fresh and almost green in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, and there never was an occasion when a difference arose between the opinion of the late Attorney General of Ontario and the Minister of Justice of the Dominion that the opinion of the late Attorney General of Ontario, now Minister of Justice of this Dominion, was not always sustained. He was sustained not alone by the judges of this Dominion, but by the highest Parliament in the world, he was sustained by the Privy Council of England, to which all men bow and recognize as the highest authority to which to appeal. Now we have an opinion coming from the Minister of Justice, an opinion which it was proper for the Government to seek in its hour of trial and difficulty, and therefore the opinion of the Minister of Justice of the land, whose opinions upon constitutional law were always safe to follow is the opinion upon which we stand, it is the opinion which I trust and believe, and if ever it should be tested, it would be found like his other opinions, constitutionally right, and the opinion of the other side would be found constitutionally wrong. The Minister of Justice has given his opinion, and I refer to it for this reason. Where the Act is strictly read he holds that it justifies the action of the Government.

Where the Act is in some state of doubt, as it possibly might be, then we have an opinion that we can rely upon, and an opinion which until it is disturbed will be accepted authoritatively, I believe, by every hon. member on this side of the House, and by a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as well. When the vote comes to be taken I believe this House will show that it has faith and confidence in that opinion. As I have said, Sir, that opinion was taken almost at a moment's notice; practically at a moment's notice, and why? It was I think the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) who declaimed against the Government because when they came into power, they did not proceed at once to call Parliament, and then get an appropriation for this money. Sir, any one who has watched the tactics of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), here for nearly three weeks past, any one who knows his ingenuity of debate and the skill he possesses—and the skill too of that old Nestor beside him (Sir Charles Tupper)—must know, that no such vote would have been allowed to pass, and that there would have been in this Chamber, day after day, and almost week after week, an effort to prevent the passage of that vote under parliamentary practice, and which money was urgently required for works of necessity. Knowing that, is it to be wondered at that under the circumstances; the Government coming into office after the 11th of July, Parliament being called by hon. gentlemen opposite for the 16th, and these hon. gentlemen clinging to office from the 23rd of June to the 11th of July and almost up to the hour that the clock struck for them to get down and out; is it to be wondered that the Government were put in such a position that they were of necessity bound to obtain these warrants. Why did not the late Government make provision for this necessary appropriation?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You would not allow us.

Mr. LOUNT. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as a supposed state of facts, but I venture to predict, that my idea of it is the more correct one. It is this: there lingered in the breasts of hon. gentlemen opposite a delusive hope that a chapter of accidents might keep them in power, that some possible chain of events, recounts or some other devices of that kind, might keep these gentlemen in office. And so, with this small unction to their souls they did not proceed to do what they ought to have done. In what position did these hon. gentlemen opposite leave the country at that time? Was it a position that statesmen ought to be proud of? Was it a position which they could justify before the country? Was it a position which was other than a disgrace to them? Our railway and canal system had to be kept in operation; men who were entitled day by day to get their hard-earned wage, men who under various forms of contract were entitled to receive their money, were demanding their money, but no provision had been made to pay them. So, Sir,

the Government when they came into office had to provide for this necessity. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that there should have been an inborn wisdom in the Government, that they should have had a common knowledge of all the sums of money which had to be paid, and the various channels and sources into which it had to be paid. Well, Sir, these hon. gentlemen are perhaps giving larger credit to this Government than they are entitled to. I admit that our Government, as will be seen by their conduct in the future, is entitled to a very large credit for judgment, and for discretion, and for honour, which perhaps has not been displayed to the same degree by hon. members on the other side of the House. Now, what was the condition of things? As soon as this Government could become possessed of the facts they proceeded to complete the act, which is now charged against them to be wrong. They obtained the Governor General's warrant. It is alleged that they should not have obtained that warrant, the very day before Parliament met. I may be somewhat misguided in my judgment, wanting parliamentary experience as I do, but I believe that any one who tries to look upon the matter in a spirit of fairness as I do, must come to the conclusion that the Government delayed as long as they reasonably could to obtain information as to the various sources to which this money ought to go, and then they immediately asked for a warrant which was absolutely necessary to pay an indebtedness that was past due, an indebtedness the payment of which ought to have been provided for by the late Government, and an indebtedness which this Government were bound in honour to pay as speedily as possible. It is charged that they should not have done so before the meeting of Parliament. I need not remark, Sir, that such a decision might have baffled all the efforts of the Government to pay these debts, because the Opposition would probably have taken to themselves great credit—as they are apparently taking to themselves now for their three weeks of almost factious opposition—they would no doubt have taken to themselves great credit for having prevented the Government from doing what they were bound to do in honour, and which the late Government now out of power, hesitated and delayed and neglected to do. I venture, Sir, to interpret the Act literally and the conclusion which I arrive at is that literally the Government is justified. I have endeavoured to show the reasons why I shall support the Government on this question. If I had no better reason, if I could offer no better excuse to the country, if I desired to perfectly fortify myself before my constituents for the vote I intend to give, I need only tell them that the opinion of the present Minister of Justice was the opinion which was offered as a justification for the action of the Government, and I have heard many a good Conservative say—for there are good Conservatives here and there—that the opinion of the Minister of Justice is upon constitutional questions the best opinion there is in the land. Therefore, with that best opinion and with the confidence that the country will support it, I to-night feel it my duty, and a pleasure as well, to support the Government on this question, and to oppose the amendment of the hon. member for York.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, just a word before the debate closes. It seems to me that there is not much of good or bad in the action of the Government in obtaining warrants from the Governor General for the purpose of paying the current stated expenses of the country pending the meeting of Parliament. It has to be borne in mind, I think, that the moneys for which these warrants were obtained were for services on which, not only salaries for officials, but wages for workingmen were due, and moneys were payable, and I think it would have been to the discredit of this country if these bills had not been paid. Further, there is no pretense that the sums that were raised by these Governor General's warrants were applied on accounts other than those which everybody admits had to be paid. I, for my part, do not consider that this Government has in this instance given us an example of the abuse of that power. Some hon. gentlemen might say that the Government might not have called Parliament together, but might have gone on for any length of time paying its way by Governor General's warrants. Well, if the Government wanted to put its head into the halter, it might have so acted. But I think it acted just as the late Government would have acted if it had been placed in the same situation. It strikes me as a business man—and I come from a city where there are large mercantile interests, and I know the feelings of the constituency I represent—that the circumstances justified the action of the Government, and I do not think that outside of extreme politicians, the people at large will find fault with either the Government for advising the issue of these warrants, or with the Governor General for following the advice of his Ministers.

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add one word or two to what has been said in this debate in regard to the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), which has been so highly lauded by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount). In the return of correspondence which has been brought down, we find the following letter :—

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, 14th July, 1896.

Sir Oliver Mowat,
Department of Justice,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir Oliver,—It is suggested to me that unless the civil employees are paid their regular

salaries, the public service will be subjected to very serious inconveniences. The inconveniences would more particularly arise in the case of that class of employees who are wage earners on railways, canals and other public works.

I would ask you to look into the question and give me your opinion as to whether a special warrant can be issued to provide for the payment of those servants of the Government.

Believe me, &c.,
WILFRED LAURIER.

To that letter the hon. Minister of Justice makes the following reply :—

Office of the Minister of Justice,
Ottawa, 14th July, 1896.

The Honourable
Wilfred Laurier, M.P., P.C.,
Premier and President of the Council,
Ottawa.

My dear Premier,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date informing me that it is suggested to you that unless the civil employees are paid their regular salaries the public service will be subject to very serious inconveniences, and that these inconveniences would more particularly arise in the case of that class of employees who are wage earners on railways, canals and other public works. You ask my opinion as to whether a special warrant can be issued to provide for the payment of these employees.

By R.S.C., chapter 29, section 32 (b), it is provided that if when Parliament is not in session any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no Parliamentary provision and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required, which shall be placed by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to a special account, against which cheques may be issued from time to time, in the usual form, as they are required.

I think that the payment of the employees mentioned in your letter is "urgently and immediately required" for the public good, within the meaning of the said enactment, and that, under the circumstances which have occurred, and the consequent present condition of public affairs, the Governor in Council may properly, on the reports mentioned order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General, for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.

Yours sincerely,
O. MOWAT.

What I wanted to call the attention of the House to is this, which I believe to be the gist and kernel of this whole matter, that in the opinion which the Minister of Justice offered to the Prime Minister, the only reason assigned by him in justification of the issue of a warrant was that it was for the payment of employees and civil servants. Now, with all due deference to the eminent jurist, Sir Oliver Mowat, and with all deference to the admiration in which he is held by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, I beg humbly to submit to this House that the reasons assigned by the Minister of Justice are not sound. I have risen, Sir, for the very purpose of attempting to make that proposition good, and the best authority I can find upon the subject is one that is on all fours with the case now in hand. I find in Todd's "Government in the British Colonies," at page 437, a case which strikes me to be exactly the same as the one now under consideration, and to meet entirely the reasons assigned by the Minister of Justice as a justification for the issuing of those warrants :

A few months afterwards, Governor Belmore again addressed the colonial secretary on this subject, alleging that the legislative council of the colony had taken umbrage at certain unauthorized expenditure which had been avowedly incurred by government, without an Act of appropriation ; and that the council had protested against the proceedings as being "derogatory to the privileges of parliament, and subversive of the constitution."

The governor explained that, in this instance, the payment had been merely of certain official salaries, in anticipation of the Appropriation Act, the passing of which had been inadvertently delayed by a parliamentary adjournment ; and that there had been no intentional infringement of the privileges of the legislative council.

The colonial secretary (Earl Granville) in a despatch, dated June 16th, 1896, pointed out that any such proceeding was at variance with the instructions contained in the foregoing despatch from the Duke of Buckingham, and observed that a temporary inconvenience to certain civil servants could not be regarded as "an unforeseen emergency" or as a case of expediency that would justify violation of law. He added that, "except in case of absolute and immediate necessity (such, for example, as the preservation of life), no expenditure of public money should be incurred without sanction of law"

Mr. LOUNT. Will the hon. gentleman say whether there is an Act in that country similar to the one here ?

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not think that the interruption of the hon. member for Centre Toronto is at all pertinent. Here is a case in which certain reasons are assigned by the Ministers to the Colonial Secretary as their justification for these warrants. And Earl Granville—than whom there could be no higher authority—replied that such reasons were no justification for the issue of the warrants. The words used by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) are not found in the statute. It is an inference from the words of the statute that he founds his opinion upon, and he gives as his reason particularly why this warrant should issue, that great inconvenience would arise to the civil service employees of the Government, which is the very reason assigned by Lord Granville as not being sufficient for a violation of the law. I merely rose for the purpose of pointing this out. I believe, and sincerely believe, or otherwise I should not have taken my feet

on this question, that no greater misfortune can happen this country than to have such precedents as this established, and particularly by gentlemen who, for eighteen years, have been professing a doctrine exactly opposed to the one they now preach. The Liberal-Reform party make the boast—and perhaps there is some justification for it—that the Liberal party is the father of responsible government, that it has fought for the liberties of the people, that it adopted and engrafted into the spirit of the constitution and the laws of our country the right of Parliament, and Parliament alone, to vote moneys. I understand that that doctrine is one which was fought out through many long years; I understand that, like every other branch of British liberty, it is one that has slowly broadened down from precedent to precedent; and I am astonished that hon. gentlemen opposite—the Reform party, the Liberal party—who have been taking the very opposite ground during all these years on this question, should now, as their very first act on coming into power, attempt to demolish the doctrine which they have preached for so many years past

Mr. FLINT. When I find a party which has for eighteen years ruled this Dominion and interpreted all doubtful questions of law in favour of the views which suited them best, a party which very recently went to the country with great boasts as to the results that would follow their appeal, when I find that party, with its great historical record and boasts of what it has done and is capable of doing, depending to-night for its victory or defeat upon a little word in a statute—because it must be conceded by all who have followed the course of this debate, that if the word "or" cannot be changed by a legal interpretation into "and," the whole fabric of the case which they have built up, and on which they have founded so much perfervid oratory, has fallen completely to the ground. I cannot help regretting that any political party in this country should depend on an argument of this kind for sustaining their case. As my hon. friend behind me has said, it certainly is open to argument as to the strict manner in which a court of law would interpret this statute. If, for instance, it could be brought before the Supreme Court of Canada, on a motion to quash the Governor General's warrant, there might be ground for an elaborate argument as to the strict legality of the warrant under which the Government drew this money for the payment of the civil service of the country. I contend that this is a very small ground upon which hon. gentlemen opposite can appeal to the support of the electorate. In the face of the doubt, in the face of the legal opinion given by the Minister of Justice, in the face of the necessity and grave urgency of the circumstances, in the face of the evident intention of the Act under discussion, I contend that, even if this ground were held tenable by a court of law, it would not be supported by the great electorate, when considering it in the light of business and common sense. This subject has been approached from the legal and constitutional standpoint. In my view, it would be better, as public men, dealing with vast financial interests, as men bound, in their legislative capacity, to look to the interests of the civil service and public works of the country, that we should consider this question from the point of view of the actual circumstances of the case. What were the circumstances? Those hard-worked employees of the Government in the civil service, on our Government railways, along our public canals, were in urgent need of the wages they had honestly earned. The previous Government had been displaced by the electorate, and a new Government had but recently been formed, and found these thousands of employees in immediate necessity of the payment of the wages due them. I ask the hon. gentleman if a liberal and generous interpretation of any doubtful clause or sentence of the statute should not, under the circumstances, be given, in order to meet the exigencies of the case? Suppose a strict legal interpretation of the clause would show that the Government was possibly in error, I contend that this high court of Parliament, that the representatives of the people here, would be morally and equitably bound to overrule a strict legal interpretation in favour of a generous interpretation and in favour of meeting the obligations of the country to its employees. And upon that ground alone, apart from any legal quibble that might be raised, either sincerely or otherwise, I would vote with gladness against the amendment of the member for York and in support of the Administration of the day. I will not read the clause of the statute, because it is very familiar to this House and to the country. It was either the second or the third act placed upon the statute-book of Canada. It has no precise parallel in the statute-book of any colonial possession of Great Britain, so far as I have been able to discover; it has no precise parallel in the statute-book of any of the provinces of the Dominion. In those provinces where this Act or any counterpart of it is not found, we find no disastrous consequences arising though the administration of the day is required to advance from the public treasury sufficient money for the public requirements before the meeting of the legislature. But the Act was a wise one. The question is how it should be interpreted and complied with by the high court of Parliament so as to defend the rights of the people and also to meet the requirements of the public service. Among the cardinal principles upon which all acts of legislation should be interpreted, that is foremost which looks at the intention. And I demand from any hon. gentleman who reads this Act if the evident intention of the Act was not to provide for cases

of this kind. Precedents cannot be quoted because there never was a precise precedent for the situation in which the Government found itself shortly after the 11th day of July last. As no precedent could be quoted, for none existed, a precedent had to be made; and if ever it should occur in the history of this country that such a combination of circumstances arose as that which existed when a new administration was formed public obligations to the extent of many hundreds of thousands being due to the servants of the country that were not provided for by Parliament, though they might have been foreseen, I believe the Liberal party in this House, whether in opposition or on this side, would support any administration, which would take the interpretation of the Act and follow the course of the present Administration. Another principle by which all acts should be construed by us, as practical statesmen, is the general policy of the Act—the intention and general policy. Can it be conceived that the Parliament which passed this enactment would for one instant have refused or declined to provide for such a case as occurred, when, through the dissolution of a Parliament by lapse of time no appropriations whatever were made for the ensuing year and no Parliament could possibly meet and no time was allowed for the appropriation to be passed for payment for services of this kind—could it be conceived that it would be the policy of any legislators or statesmen that there should be no machinery provided by which the daily obligation of the Government to the civil servants and employees on public works should be raised by some means. The policy as well as the intention of the Act, apart from the strict legal interpretation of its verbiage would lead ninety-nine men out of a hundred of the electorate of this country to sustain the action of the Government in this regard. But how has the Act been interpreted in the past by the Administration that has preceded this? If hon. gentlemen opposite complain that a new departure has been taken by the Liberal party in this House, I think we have the right to retort that the interpretation, the usage and custom which hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, pursued, and by the light of which we have a right to interpret this Act so far as the practical administration of it is concerned is precisely that of the present Administration. Unfortunately, I have not been able to procure all the returns of sums expended under Governor General's warrants during the last fifteen years, because large numbers of them have not been published in the sessional papers. But on glancing over a return moved for some years ago by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, one is surprised to notice the vast sums of money that the Conservative Administration of those years raised by Governor General's warrants to meet the obligations of the country. And though, in many cases, the propriety of these warrants was questioned, and although it was manifest that Parliament, owing to the appropriation and character of the service to which they were applied, did not act strictly within the meaning of the Act, yet none of those who criticised this method of obtaining the warrants has quarrelled with the large votes of gentlemen supporting hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. I find that the previous Administration, when in power appropriated very insignificant sums by this method, whether it was that they were very careful to obtain from Parliament all that was necessary for the services of each year, or whether a disinclination to use this method of obtaining money for the public service, they appropriated very insignificent sums in this way. Consequently the observation made by my hon. friend from Halifax that the Liberal party from 1873 to 1878 had also used Governor General's warrants freely was entirely without point. Because, I would call attention to the fact that of all the sums raised from 1873 to 1878, the whole amount was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $200,000. In 1873-74 no appropriation was made. In 1874-75, the appropriations by Governor General's warrants amounted to less than $8,000. In the following year the largest appropriation made in this way was, $144,000. In the following year the amount was about $8,000, and in the last year that Administration held power the appropriations through Governor General's warrants—no doubt for proper purposes and under strict interpretation of the Act—was something under $64,000. So we find that during that administration, insignificant sums were appropriated in this way, so that the remark of my hon. friend from Halifax was entirely without point, as he had not looked into the facts. But when the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite came in in 1879, then began the use of Governor General's warrants entirely without precedent in this country and entirely against the spirit of the Act. In 1879, the amount appropriated in this way was $597,396.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To what item does the hon. gentleman take exception to in 1879. Has he examined them?

Mr. FLINT. I will call attention to them later on.

In 1880-81 hon. gentlemen opposite raised and expended by means of Governor General's warrants, $532,656; in 1881-82 they raised $746,413; in 1882-83 they raised $463,010; in 1883-84-85 they raised $698,049, and in 1885-86 they raised $3,190,243. I have not the returns from 1886 to 1891, but it is within the recollection of hon. gentlemen present who have glanced over these returns, and who have heard the discussions in this House with regard to Governor General's warrants, that these sums were very large, aggregating probably, for the same number of years, as large an amount as those I

have quoted. I do not contend that in every one of these instances the law was violated, nor even that the law was violated in a majority of these instances; but I do contend that a strict interpretation of the law would leave these hon. gentlemen without excuse in many instances which are quoted here. A notorious instance, running through the whole term of office of those hon. gentlemen, are the cases in which appropriations for public services have expired before the meeting of Parliament. Of course I am not alluding to cases of accident or emergency, which no one questions in this debate. Large majorities of these instances were those in which the appropriations were lapsed; but they were defended upon the ground that the appropriation had been made by Parliament for a certain public work, but the appropriation had lapsed, and therefore, morally and equitably speaking, if not in the strictly legal sense, the Government was chargeable with the fund, and they were authorized by the spirit of the Act to raise the amount by Governor General's warrants. Now, I would ask my hon. friend: What is the distinction between a lapsed appropriation, the power to use which has completely expired, and in connection with which the public service has been performed, and the appropriation under consideration to-day? I contend that it is only by torturing the words, it is only by torturing the line of argument, that any distinction can be made between an obligation of the country for a public work, the appropriation for which has lapsed, and the obligation of the country for the payment of the civil servants and the employees upon our public works. In one case Government has provided funds after the appropriation has lapsed, in the other case Parliament has not provided that particular fund, but the facts as far as the Audit Office is concerned, and so far as the legal methods of raising money to meet the obligations of the Government are concerned, are precisely the same. Although millions may be lying in the banks collected from the revenue sources of the country, although the obligation of the Government to the people has accrued, yet no cheque can be passed through the Audit Office in order to meet the obligation. The present case, as regards the moral and equitable obligations of the Government, is on all fours with those where the service has been performed, the money collected from the people is lying in the banks; but between the obligation and the liability of the state, and those who are to receive pay for work done, lies the Audit Office, through which no cheque can pass. The only method of meeting these obligations to carry on the public works of the country, and to prevent a wide area of distress by the stoppage of many public works, and consequent widespread disaster—the only method of preventing this is through a Governor General's warrant. Hon. gentlemen opposite have successfully defended Governor General's warrants on the ground that the appropriation had lapsed, and I believe that the same ground can be taken under the present circumstances where the obligation has accrued, where the money is lying in the treasury, but where Parliament has not met, and the appropriation cannot be made for many weeks; the Government is then perfectly justified in calling this machinery into action in order to avoid these great public disasters. A great deal has been said about the responsibility of the present Administration for the state of affairs which brought about the necessity for the issue of the Governor General's warrants, but I think the argument used by the hon. gentlemen opposite has completely collapsed. The responsibility does not rest upon this side of the House for the emergency which arose. The Government of the day is always responsible for carrying on the public affairs of the country, for making due provision for meeting the liability of the treasury towards the servants of the state. Had the Government of the day pursued a wise and statesmanlike course, had they met Parliament when they promised, had they not dallied with a political question, had they not endeavoured to create political capital out of another political question, had they promptly brought down the Estimates before Parliament in the beginning of 1896, there can be no doubt that these Estimates would have been passed, or at any rate, sufficient Estimates would have been given the Government to carry on the affairs of the country up to the end of June, 1896. But instead of that what spectacle did we witness? Scarcely had the Speech from the Throne been delivered when a riot broke out in the ranks of the Government, when one set of Ministers flew at the throat of another set of Ministers, when a conspiracy was brought to a head against the Prime Minister of the country, and the time of Parliament was wasted in settling these domestic quarrels between the hon. gentlemen who had charge of the Treasury benches, and Parliament was waiting for something to do. Then we found the time of Parliament taken up with a political Bill, brought in to give hon. gentlemen opposite some issue upon which they might go before the people with the hope of carrying the electorate in their favour. They knew that the National Policy had tumbled to pieces, that its unmitigated failure was patent to all the people, and that unless some new issue was raised, unless some new agitation was started which would distract the minds of the people from the commercial condition of the country, from the disastrous condition in which the National Policy had left it, they dared not go to the country at all. But time was the essence of the contract. Parliament was about to expire, and so a desperate effort was made

to press forward the Remedial Bill with the design of arousing certain prejudices throughout the country by favour of which they hoped to be returned to power. The hon. gentlemen opposite failed in the attempt. The people had not forgotten the disastrous results of the National Policy, and although these efforts to distract their attention may have succeeded in some directions, yet, taking the country as a whole, the people remembered the failure of the financial and fiscal policy of the Administration, and hon. gentlemen opposite were defeated.

It was entirely owing to the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to postpone the hour of going before the electors, and raising issues which had not been raised before, that they delayed to forward the Estimates for 1896, that they placed Parliament in the position that the Estimates could not be put through, and they are responsible and must be held to blame for the position in which the country was placed at the close of the elections of 1896. My hon. friends came into office with this extraordinary position confronting them ; the employees of the Government, the labouring men on the public works of the country, the officers of state were without their pay. I ask hon. gentlemen, what would have been the denunciations from the Opposition benches if the leader of the Government had met the House without having made provision for the payment of public servants and for the carrying on of public works ? Every Conservative paper would have rung with denunciations of the Government for their weakness in not taking advantage of the Act ; they would have depicted the distress on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, along the lines of the canals, and among the civil servants, who require all their pay promptly ; every newspaper and orator supporting the Opposition would have hurled base denunciations at the head of the Government and his colleagues for not having applied the Act for the purpose for which it was manifestly intended. I can imagine the manner in which the House would have been entertained by hon. gentlemen if those wages were still in arrear, the indignation with which the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) would have denounced the First Minister for his weakness and lack of business sagacity, for lack of sympathy for the workingmen and civil servants, if the Government had not met their obligations ; and although the obligations could not have been paid immediately, yet day after day would have been occupied in denouncing the course of the Administration for not having met those claims in a proper spirit. I will quote a few remarks made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), when holding the position of Finance Minister. He was at the time defending the use of the Governor General's warrants under certain circumstances, and I think he took a very reasonable ground, a ground which can be applied to the act of the Administration now under consideration. Certain expenditures had been made upon the Intercolonial Railway, which had not been provided for by Parliament. This expenditure must have been foreseen, but through some error in calculation or mistake in details the amount was omitted from the Estimates submitted to the House, and was subsequently met by a Governor General's warrant for the sum of $150,000. This was in 1891, and the Finance Minister defended the action of the Government in securing the money by means of a Governor General's warrant, in the following terms :—

> I have no doubt that when the power was given, although the wording of the statute is badly drawn, the spirit and intention of the Act was to provide only for those expenditures which came to be considered as absolutely necessary and urgent, so far urgent as to make it a matter of public service and utility that the expenditure should be made.
>
> It is true, as my hon. friend has said, that with reference to the item he has specially mentioned, it ought to have been foreseen and ought to have been provided for by Parliament.
>
> Whether from error or any other reason an insufficient appropriation has been made by Parliament, whenever the Government comes face to face with the lack of money sufficient to carry on the service, and the alternative is between the service stopping or going on, the Government has no other course to pursue than to keep up the traffic and keep up the business, in this great branch of the public service for the benefit of the people of this country.

I return these words to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I ask them if ever there was an occasion in the history of this country when the alternative was so clearly presented between stopping the service and continuing the service and when action was more urgent to provide money than in the case now under consideration. Hon. members looking at the matter from a business standpoint, or from a broad statesmanlike standpoint, considering the interests of the people engaged in the public service, considering the interest of the public credit and considering that good faith should subsist between the Government and those it employs, would stultify themselves if they did not support the Government in negativing the motion moved by the hon. member for York.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would appeal to the leader of the Government that, as we sat to a pretty late hour last night and it is now one-quarter past eleven, and I shall have to trouble the House for some time, he should agree to an adjournment of the debate. I should like it very much myself, and I think it would not be against the interest of the hon. gentleman that the debate should be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry that I cannot see my way to oblige the hon. gentleman. I regret he will have to speak for a considerable time, but

let the hon. gentleman proceed and we will all be happy to hear him, even if it is until the early hours of the morning.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The members of the Government have had rather an easy time in this debate, which deals with a subject that seems rather serious, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has admitted, but which has been dealt with by hon. gentlemen opposite in a very light manner. It seems we are not to have the benefit of the views of the Ministers, and the back benches have been given permission on this occasion to speak from their various standpoints, and the result is a conglomeration of very diverse opinions, all tending in the direction of a justification of the action of the Government, none of them, however, following very closely either the lines of the opinion of the Minister of Justice or the position taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. But before entering into reasons that appear to me pertinent to the question I will refer to some of the positions that have been taken by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House. In the first place the Minister of Trade and Commerce took practically a very wide ground for his justification, namely, the circumstances of the case. Therefore, there could be no definite rule laid down by Parliament to guide the Government or to hold the Government in connection with so important a matter as this, but that in each case the particular circumstances were the guide. He avoided as far as he could any rule, except one, which for the first time in this Parliament he has ventured to put before the House. It is not to be found in the statute, but he called it his third ground as a justification for the issue of the special warrants by His Excellency. As nearly as I could take his words down, his ground was that special warrants might issue for expenses not provided for but urgently required for the public weal. However, the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Lount) dealt rather severely with that argument, and I shall have very little to say about it, except to call his attention to the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was good enough to make in advance the admission "that necessity knows no law." He treated with certain contempt the members of the legal profession, and any legal interpretation which might be put upon this check and safeguard that Parliament in its wisdom has seen fit to place upon the statute-book. The hon. gentleman as well as some of his friends, have asked: would we starve the services, would we stop the post office and the Intercolonial Railway, and would we bring about such untoward circumstances as such a stoppage would involve. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is begging the question. All circumstances of that kind must have been, and of course were in the mind of Parliament, when Parliament in its wisdom decided that the hands of the Exchequer should be tied and their resources limited according to the law of the land. No matter what the difficulties may be, these difficulties must have been foreseen by Parliament, and the only way to avoid those untoward circumstances is to call the representatives of the people as quickly as possible, lay the case before them, and urgent action would be taken if the circumstances justified it. That responsibility is a responsibility of Parliament. It is not a responsibility of Government, and the strongest circumstances will not warrant in my judgment, and according to the precedents that I have carefully examined—any action the Government have seen fit to take in this case. These precedents go to show that where in good faith the Government have stepped outside the law—as some of the legal gentlemen supporting the Government admit may have been the case in the present instance—the first thing the Government should do is to come before Parliament and confess their action, and in that spirit ask at the hands of Parliament for a Bill of indemnity. That has been the course followed in so many cases in the House in England, that it has been abandoned for a very long time, and extraordinary safeguards and provisions have been framed, to prevent the Exchequer for any purpose whatever, obtaining public money without the direct sanction of Parliament for the expenditure of money. I wish to call attention to another argument of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) which I think no gentleman of the legal profession on either side of the House will support. He pleaded that they have followed the open, and manly, and honest course, and that even if they have violated the law, and even if they have flown in the teeth of the statute, they were good enough to put all the facts before us and they were good enough not to steal or pilfer any of the money they obtained by virtue of these warrants. That is an argument that has not been seriously pressed by gentlemen on the other side, and I mention it only to show how weak it is. The hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Lount), a distinguished member of the legal profession was perhaps wise—seeing the doubts that disturbed him on the general point—in passing over the most extraordinary admission made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and made after the justification of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick); for mark you, the Solicitor General has said that the action of the Government was right according to law. Hon. gentlemen opposite also say that the Minister of Justice has taken the same position. But, the Minister of Trade and Commerce admitted to-day that part of the moneys included in these warrants should not have been included, and that so far as

these warrants relate to the expenditure for September they have no justification. The hon. gentleman asked us to accept his frank admission as an extenuation for that offence. The hon. gentleman must go further. If the expenditure for September is not warranted, what justification is there for one dollar of the expenditure that is to be made under those warrants from the 19th of this month, the day the Parliament opened, until the first day of September. The case is not only made out against the Government, but already at this stage of the debate, the only member of the Government who has favoured us with his views has supported in large part the position we have taken. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) went into the political phase of the question, and he asked whether the late Opposition, the present Government, would not have been fools to let us have six months' estimates at the last session of Parliament. That reminds me that it does seem the very height of audacity for these hon. gentlemen to ask us: would we have starved the civil service, would we have stopped the public works. Why did not these arguments occur to them, when, by obstruction unparalleled last session, they absolutely refused to provide the ways and means for keeping the serivces going, and even for paying the civil servants. They tell us again, that we had no right in that last session of a moribund Parliament; just preceding a dissolution, to ask for a three or a six months' vote of credit. Sir, I take issue with the hon. gentleman. I say that no member of this House, by any reference to constitutional procedure, or the practice of the English House of Commons, can support that most extraordinary position. The actual fact is, that the reverse is the rule, and that from the time of Pitt there never has been a Parliament in England that would think of refusing a vote of credit, or the necessary vote to carry the Government over the period of dissolution, until the new government had been organized and were able to meet Parliament again. I shall refer to that at a later stage: but I mention it as the last point that could be considered in any sense a point in the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Now, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) is a very handy member for the Ministerialists, and I make that admission frankly. If a case is bad, whether he is on the Opposition or on the Ministerial side of this House, I am in the judgment of his fellow-members whether he has not always shown an aptness and a readiness to rush in and say what is necessary to be said; and when the case is particularly bad, the hon. gentleman is particularly personal. So, on this question, which has disturbed and worried other members of his own profession in this House, but which he treats so lightly, he opened up with a personal attack. I thought it was rather unkind on his part to refer to the bitterness of converts, and the temper of those who leave one party to join another.

Mr. LISTER. Unless there is a good cause for it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And I did not think it particularly courageous considering that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was not in his seat, that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) had left the Chamber, and that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) himself was absent. I think if he would repeat that language in their presence, he would hear from each one of them and all of them.

Mr. LISTER. They had good cause for leaving.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman did not seem ready to take into consideration causes or reasons. It was the fact of the change of opinion that struck him as an excuse for making a personal attack which I am almost ashamed to refer to, for it had not the effect the hon. gentleman intended it to have.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the duty of the Government in power last session; he said it was their duty to have had this question considered. I call his attention again to what I have already observed in connection with the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that that Government did all that a Government possibly could do to discharge its duty. All these awkward and inconvenient circumstances were wholly out of the contemplation of the statute, as I shall show, and are not only due to the action of hon. gentlemen opposite during that session, but to their unprecedented action in extending the meeting of Parliament, which had been properly and regularly called for an early day after the last general election.

The hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount), who followed, placed great store on the opinion of the Minister of Justice; and they will forgive me for saying that I was surprised to hear, coming from members of a learned profession, an argument that, forsooth, because a Minister of Justice such as the present Minister of Justice undoubtedly is, an able man and an ornament to his profession, gave an opinion on a question of law, the Parliament of his country were to accept it and not question it in any particular. That position was taken, but I shall show later on that hon. gentlemen cannot obtain from the opinion of the Minister of Justice, all that comfort which they have thought themselves warranted in taking to themselves. I shall show that the Minister of Justice has taken good care to avoid putting his name to any opinion in justification of a course which the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself admitted to be illegal in part.

The hon. gentleman alleged that the whole difficulty arose from the late Government clinging on to office when an appeal to the courts in connection with the elections would have destroyed the Reform victory. That is an admission which I accept, as probably correct, that if the elections on the 23rd of June had been carefully sifted in the election courts, hon. gentlemen opposite might not be sitting where they are.

The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) spoke of necessity, doubt, and the opinion of the Minister of Justice ; and, in the midst of all these conflicting ideas, he rushes at once to the argument that, after all, as the result of the Government's action was good, he is not going to question it, and that the evident intention of the Act was to provide for cases of this kind.

Now, I will put a question to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to hon. gentlemen who disagree with the view that I hold. I will put a question to them which I think will illustrate the fallacious position which they take with regard to this whole question. I have summed up the views of three hon. gentlemen who have spoken. Now, I put it to them : If the present Opposition prevented, as the late Opposition did, the supplies now before this House being granted, and they, finding that we would not give them one dollar of money necessary for public works, for the operation of railways and canals and for the civil list, advised His Excellency to prorogue Parliament, and Parliament was prorogued, do these hon. gentlemen contend that the Government would be warranted, under the section of the Audit Act under consideration, in issuing a special warrant for those services for which the Opposition refused to vote the supplies ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Is the hon. gentleman arguing on the legality of the warrant or on the propriety of its exercise ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the legality.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he is arguing as to the propriety, I can understand his argument ; if he is arguing as to the legality, I cannot see the connection.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not object to the interjection, but I ask the hon. gentleman now to do me the courtesy to answer my question. Would he think it legal under those circumstances for a special warrant to issue for the items of the Supply Bill, or any of them, which this Opposition had prevented passing ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the facts the hon. gentleman suggests affect the legality one way or the other. They affect the propriety.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no right to press the hon. gentleman to answer my question. I put a question which is clear and distinct, and he may answer it or not as he likes. The question is apposite, and it illustrates the present position admirably. Suppose you ask us to vote money for these various public services, and we obstruct ; month after month passes, as many as you like, and His Excellency is advised to prorogue Parliament, and Parliament is prorogued ; after that occurs, is the hon. gentleman of opinion that it is within the meaning of this section 32 of the Audit Act, and legal, for the Governor General to issue a special warrant for any of the items in those Estimates, which had not been passed by this House ? The hon. gentleman declines to answer that, as is his right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not decline. I confess I have not followed the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry my hon. friends do not understand me. If the hon. gentleman is arguing as to the legal power under the statute to issue the warrant, then I say the question of obstruction or non-obstruction does not enter into the argument at all. If he is arguing as to the prudence or imprudence of the issue of the warrant, I can understand his argument.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman has no objection, I will take his answer on another ground. Would it be justifiable under those circumstances to obtain the issue of a warrant for all those services ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will not give the hon. gentleman a speech now, but may afterwards.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Again, we have the Government in that happy condition that they do not know their own mind. But if the hon. gentleman hesitates to give an off-hand and direct answer to that, how can he pretend that these hon. gentleman have the slightest confidence in the strength or correctness of their present position ? For, after all, is not that the precise position in which they stood in July? There were Estimates and supplies that Parliament had refused to vote, and those hon. gentlemen came into office and found these services not provided for, because Parliament had refused to sanction the expenditure of one dollar to meet them, and they pretend that they were warranted, whether on equitable or legal grounds or on grounds of necessity, in advising that a special warrant of His Excellency the Governor General do issue. I ask the hon. gentleman if the Government have sufficient confidence in their judgment to instruct the House

that they are prepared to do it again, and that they have thus found a happy solution for any obstruction that may be practised in Parliament, and the hon. gentleman is dumb. He is going to take his own time to deal with that in his own way, and a direct answer I cannot have the pleasure of receiving at present.

The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) spoke first of necessity and doubt and then of the difficult position being settled by this opinion of the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat). That was enough for him, and after that he went on to speak in the most confident manner, wholly free from doubt and difficulty, of the evident intention of the Act. The hon. gentleman wanted to know what the distinction was in the case of lapsed balances. I can give him one or two. In the first place there is the practice supported and endorsed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, on the one side, and the Government on the other. In the one case, the balance of money appropriated and sanctioned by Parliament, and in the case under consideration the use of money which Parliament absolutely refused to grant. That seems to me a distinction that cannot fail to strike one.

I heard the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in his exceedingly able speech, which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Lount) declared was a powerful presentation of the case, say that he would avoid going fully into certain matters connected with procedure in these cases of constitutional practice, because these things were familiar to most hon. gentlemen in this House. I must ask to be excused for not giving that credit to hon. gentlemen's intelligence that the hon. member for York did, for this reason. The hon. gentleman who followed the hon. member for York showed clearly that all have not looked in to the practice of Parliament, nor into the various methods that have been adopted by Parliament, both in the old country and in this, to prevent being perpetrated the very thing that has been done in connection with these special warrants. In the first place, take that question raised by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. He, forsooth, glories in the fact that his party were able to prevent the late Government from obtaining any vote, even for the limited period of six months, or the regular Estimates for the following year. I say that the authorities show that the responsibility of the Opposition for their course last session was a very serious and heavy one, and that the terminating of Parliament under such circumstances is a constitutional irregularity. The duty upon the House of Commons, under our system, undoubtedly is never to leave the Administration of the day without the necessary supplies for the carrying on of Government. After looking into the precedents, I find that the invariable practice in England, for nearly a hundred years, is that when the Opposition is not prepared to give the outgoing Government that has run its term, full charge of the year's supply, it gives them enough to tide over the period of the general election and the period during which any new Government may be going through the process of formation, and a departure from that is called by the text writers a "constitutional irregularity." Further, I want to call your particular attention to this important fact that since 1783 there has never been a dissolution of an English Parliament without supplies, either annual or quarterly, for the purposes I have named.

The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) referred to the history of the efforts of Parliament to take completely within its hands control of public expenditure, and to see to it that the Executive of the country simply made payments out of public money for specific and named purposes by an Appropriation Bill. The hon. gentleman went very briefly into that, but the invariable practice since the time of William III. in England has been not to spend a dollar except under the express provisions of the Appropriation Act. The clause that has given rise to this discussion, the clause of this statute that has been brought to your attention, Sir, to-day, has been frequently called a most peculiar provision. It was not intended to give great scope to the Executive. It is not to be found in the English system. There is not in England a case where the Executive can spend money that has not been appropriated by Parliament. You may have in your mind the case of the army and navy and the government of a great Empire and the contingencies unforeseen and unprovided for nearly every session, but Parliament has considered all that in the Government of the mother country and Parliament there has declared that notwithstanding all that, there shall not be taken one farthing for any of these expenditures if the Appropriation Act—not a general statute or Audit Act such as we have here—does not make provision for these very purposes. And they take civil contingencies and the army and navy contingencies, and after having put in a list of the principal items that they can foresee, they put in a liberal amount for unforeseen or unprovided expenditure in connection with those important services, and the money is taken from no other sources and no other way. And hon. gentlemen who have used arguments as to necessity, will, I am sure, if they do me the honour to follow me in the examination of one or two authorities find that no such argument obtains in England or under the system which is the system of England and the system of Canada in connection with the parliamentary control of public money. And they will find that even in the most extraordinary case, the case I shall mention later on, the Crown could not act, the Crown of England could not act, without summoning Parliament.

and dared not take such a step as the Governor General was advised to take in this case. What led to this provision being placed in our statutes? Up to 1864, in Old Canada, there had been abuses, there had been expenditure without parliamentary sanction, and the public mind was stirred in regard to these growing irregularities in connection with the expenditure of public money. Let me give the section that was introduced for the first time, and was afterwards repeated in the statutes of Canada in 1867, because I think hon gentlemen who follow the debate carefully will see the advantage of having that part of the history before them. The section upon which our present Act is based, appears in the statutes of Canada, 1864, chapter 6, section 8:

It shall be the duty of the auditor to see that no warrant issues for the payment of public money without the direct authority of Parliament; and also to report to the Governor in Council through the Minister of Finance, any case in which any sub-accountant has expended money out of the proceeds of any Accountable Warrant, for any purpose for which there is no legislative authority, or beyond the amount for which there is such authority; provided always that in the event of any unforeseen accident happening to any public work or building which requires any immediate outlay for the repairs thereof, if there shall be no amount appropriated by Parliament which is available for such repairs, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council, upon the report of the commissioner of public works to that effect, to order such expenditure to be made and to be thereafter submitted to Parliament, and such Order in Council shall be authority sufficient to the auditor to permit the issue of a warrant or warrants to the amount so ordered to be expended; but it shall be the duty of the auditor to cause copies of all such Orders in Council, and of such warrants issued upon the authority thereof, to be laid before Parliament on the first day of the then next session.

Sir Alexander Galt, then Mr. Galt, introduced the Audit Act, of which this that I have read is a section. The provisions were intended to prevent, as far as they could, any officer daring to be the authority—and in England the penalties attached to such an act are tremendous—for the withdrawal of a dollar from the public treasury without the sanction of Parliament. And it is interesting to know how important this question had become even then, for Mr. Holton asked to have it made a penitentiary offence for any officer under whose signature a warrant issued, unless he had the sanction of Parliament for the signature, in order to provide against the possibility of abuse. Now, hon. gentlemen who have followed the debate will remember, without my repeating it, the language of the statute, as it stands at present, but, on reflection, I will trouble the House, as I have read the Act of 1864, with reading the Act as it now stands, practically first introduced in the Act relating to the collection of revenue in 1864. This will give us, as far as I can find it, the history of this piece of legislation:

If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared and be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount, estimated.

Now, I ask the House to indulge me, for I think it is of considerable importance, while I refer to a very interesting memorandum, or part of a memorandum, prepared by Lord Monteagle, in 1854, when he was, I think, Controller in England, upon this question as to the basis for that provision and as to the necessary provisions by the legislature to preserve to Parliament its full and absolute control and direction in the expenditure of public money. I do this because our own legislation largely follows the English legislation in this regard. And I think those gentlemen who follow the reading of this interesting and instructive report, will agree with me that the subject is of far greater importance than some of the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the discussion, seemed to believe. For I am within the judgment of the House, when I say that they have mainly attempted to justify the expenditure on the ground of necessity. In this memorandum of the Select Committee on Public Moneys of 1854, the English Controller goes on to say:

It is thus provided by law how the votes of Parliament, the pleasure of the Crown, the authority of the Treasury, and the final order of the Exchequer, should be invariably carried into effect.

And here I want to call particular attention to one of the differences between the two Audit Acts In England there is one warrant that lets loose the money appropriated by Parliament. This is a most important fact, and its importance will be seen later more clearly—that where the Crown is concerned in connection with the expenditure of money voted by Parliament, without the direct approval of the Crown not a dollar of money appropriated by Act of Parliament can be expended. In England there is only one warrant, while we have two—the Governor General's warrant letting loose, so to speak, the money voted by Parliament, and that placing it at the disposal of the various departments of the Government. Here we have that special warrant that does not find its justification in the general Appropriation Act. In England there is one Appropriaion Act applying to these matters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And no provision for a special warrant?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. I have endeavoured to show that in England, so jealous is Parliament of its authority that it would not for one moment think of allowing the Executive of that country to have an unlimited right of expenditure. It is to show that if they contemplate an emergency, they contemplate a contingency of any kind, they limit the amount that the Executive may spend with regard to it. We have gone further. I see the force of the hon. gentleman's interruption. I will meet that; I do not wish to deal with this question in a narrow way. The force of the hon. gentleman's interruption is, no doubt, to call attention to the fact that we have, wisely or unwisely, gone further, and vested in the Government a greater discretion here than they have vested in the Government in England. That may be, but it does not strengthen the position taken in the resolution now upon the Table, as I shall show before I go into its history, in order to point out, if possible, all the care taken by Parliament, not only in England, but in recent years in our own country, to keep within its own hands the control of the expenditure of every dollar of public money:

It is thus provided by law how the votes of Parliament, the pleasure of the Crown, the authority of the Treasury, and the final order of the Exchequer, should be invariably carried into effect; and that no sum should be issued or applied to any purpose not warranted by law or exceeding the amounts specifically voted.

No question of necessity, no question of state interest, but the question of law.

It was to enforce these great principles and to guard against any possible and undue appropriation that the office of the Exchequer would establish.

And so on. Now, later down he refers to the report of two Royal Commissions issued in England under the Governments of the Duke of Wellington and Earl Grey, and from these reports there are certain extracts given. The commissioners say:

We are decidedly of opinion that the most efficient restraint on the Crown and on its Ministers should be provided and maintained. It becomes our duty to suggest means for obtaining full security that no appropriation of the funds received should take place under any circumstances, however urgent, without such sanction as shall be a real guarantee to the public for the legality of the appropriation.

I call particular attention to that sentence from the report of a distinguished Royal Commission in England, which went into these questions. You see how they plead that the law shall be adhered to in the expenditure of public money, and no opinion of a cabinet, no opinion of any executive, no matter what the circumstances might be, should have any force or effect, if behind that opinion and supporting it in every particular, there was not the principle of law. Then again, he says:

This principle was strictly carried out, and special penalties were imposed on any officers of the Exchequer who should make issues at variance with the statutable appropriation. The same penal clauses were inserted in the 6 and 7 Will. III., c. 7. The impeachment of Sir E. Seymour comprehended a charge, for that he, being treasurer of the navy, did, contrary to law and to the duty of his office, lend £90,000 raised and appropriated for building ships, to the support of the army, contrary to the Act.

The gravity of the departure from these provisions is apparent where a member of the Government in England was actually impeachd for taking money appropriated for the purposes of the navy and applying part of it for the purposes of the army. Again, in this interesting memorandum, he goes on to say:

The assertion and legislative adoption of the great constitutional doctrine of enforcing a strict Parliamentary appropriation, originated with Lord Somers, who is said to have been directed by the House of Commons to prepare the proper clause, which became, and has since continued to be, the constitutional law of England. Now, was this principle less carefully enforced in subsequent times. In 1711, a resolution was passed by the House of Commons to the following effect:—"The applying of any sum of unappropriated money or surplusages, of grants, to uses not voted or addressed for in Parliament, hath been a misapplication of the public money." In the year 1754, by resolution, and in the 7 Geo. II., c. 12. s. 12, in the Appropriatian Act, a more relaxed system was temporarily introduced. But this was done in a time of exigency, and so justified only. Against a similar course, which had been taken in 1727, much opposition had been given in the House of Lords; and a protest appears in the Journals, signed by many Peers, including the name of the then Earl of Aberdeen. These exceptional cases confirm the general rule, and had a parliamentary justification; and therefore there is no reason to question the authority of the author, who states distinctly that "the uniform practice, begun at the revolution and continued for near a century, is that the money granted by the House of Commons for the current service of the year, should, by a special appropriation, either in the Act for levying the aids, or in some other Act of the same session, be applied only to the services for which they were voted."

Again, in 1784, when it was anticipated that public moneys might, after the dissolution, be applied to purposes not sanctioned by Parliamentary appropriation, the highest constitutional authorities then existing induced the House of Commons, on the 12th January, to pass the following resolution:—"For any person at the Treasury Exchequer, or Bank of England, or employed in the payment of public moneys, to pay any moneys for services voted in the present session of Parliament, after Parliament hath been prorogued or dissolved, before the passing of an Act of Parliament appropriating the services, will be a high crime and misdemeanour, a daring breach of public trust, derogatory to the fundamental principles of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution of the country."

There is the opinion never receded from in England, that even after a vote of Parliament, to expend one farthing, if no Appropriation Act has been passed, would be, as they put it, "a high crime and misdemeanour—a daring breach of public trust, derogatory to the fundamental principles of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution of the country." He then goes on :,

Though such was the admitted constitution of England, abuses were not wholly checked, even in later times when abuses were, it might be thought, less likely to prevail. But in order at once to adhere to the principles of Parliamentary appropriation, and yet to meet unforeseen exigencies in the public service, two very considerable votes had for many years been customarily taken, which were freed from the restraints of any very special application, and left much more at the discretion of the Treasury subject to the responsibility of a subsequent Parliamentary account of the expenditure. The one was the vote for Army Extraordinaries ; the other, the vote for Civil Contingencies.

Just the question. A later passage—and it is the last reference to this report I shall make—is as follows :—

The stringency of the system thus enforced by law, more especially after the cessation of the vote for Army Extraordinaries, was felt to be so great that by the 9 and 10 Vict., c. 116, the following clause was introduced into the Appropriation Act to give somewhat more of discretionary power to the Treasury. This clause has since been re-enacted annually. The words and import of the enactment are remarkable, and deserve the utmost attention from the Government. They are as follows :—"After the appropriation of Ways and Means to the several services voted, the Act proceeds——"

They are given a latitude only within the amount of the Act. The Act provides a check upon the treasury, so that not a dollar of that vote can be used unless it appears indispensably necessary, and that the sum granted be not exceeded. The section is rather long, but I have given the point of it, and will not read the whole of it. I do not think that the House will find those references unimportant in connection with a serious consideration of this subject, admitted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to be so important. I, therefore, do not apologize for taking up so much time in calling attention to it. Some gentlemen have referred to the canons of construction. I am sorry I did not hear the whole of the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) upon this subject, and I do not know whether he went into that subject exhaustively. But there are several canons that I have not heard referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think they are directly in point. In the first place, in regard to the rule of interpretation laid down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, we have coupled with the admission that he has a poor opinion of the legal view of this case and of the opinions of commercial men; therefore, I shall not deal with it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

But in connection with the rule that the language of the statute, whatever it may be, may be modified by the courts to meet the intention of the legislature, when it is manifestly a contradiction of the purpose designed, there are cases of reading "or" for "and" and "and" for "or," and this ruling has been given again and again by the courts. One case is in connection with an Act providing that property should be taken for the purpose of maintaining sick or maimed soldiers. The court ruled that "sick and maimed" meant "sick or maimed," and that any other intention would destroy the obvious intention of the Act.

Mr. BRITTON. How many cases are the converse of that ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The only case I have down is one in which "and" is construed "or." But I need not labour the point to which I have referred to show that by the same rule that is followed in order to give the obvious meaning of the Act, can change "or" into "and" you can also change "and" into "or." The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has kindly placed in my hands "Maxwell on the Statutes," in which there is a reference to the case to which I desire to advert. It is as follows :—

The 1 Jac. 1, c. 15, which made it an act of bankruptcy for a trader to leave his dwelling-house "to the intent, or whereby his creditors might be defeated or delayed," if construed literally, would have exposed to bankruptcy every trader who left his home even for an hour, if a creditor called during his absence for payment. This absurd consequence was avoided, and the real intention of the legislature beyond reasonable doubt effected, by reading "or" as "and" ; so that an absence from home was an act of bankruptcy only when coupled with the design of delaying or defeating creditors.

But there is another rule in interpreting statutes. Suppose a certain interpretation has been given to a statute by the courts, whether of final resort or not, and the matter is still subject to appeal, every member of the legal profession is aware that if the legislature, with an outstanding interpretation of a statute, re-enacts the clause as before, that decision of the court becomes law, and that interpretation is the final interpretation given to the meaning of the statute. We have by parity of reasoning the fact that men like Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Blake gave the construction that the resolution moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) gives to this section to-day, that after that time there was a revision of our statute, and until this particular case occurred no hon. member on either side of the House controverted the position we are agreed on taking upon the present occasion. Abuses might follow an interpretation that would leave out a portion of the statute, and by simply finding that circumstances were pressing, that they were circumstances of a necessity if you like, and that no ap-

propriation had been made by Parliament, a special warrant might be used. There is no limit to the expense and abuse that might follow, and all the struggles in connection with parliamentary reform at home and in this country, whether by Liberals or Conservatives, would go for naught. I have a strong case to show that the arguments indulged in to-day will not weigh with the country. I appeal to the practice in England. When George III. was incapacitated and was for a time unable to govern, this extraordinary state of affairs arose. There had been a parliamentary session held; there had been an Appropriation Act passed; but that Act had received the royal sanction. Every item for the expense of government was in the Supply Bill and to let that loose, if I may use the term which I think is a somewhat apt one, and to enable the various departments to spend the money on the appropriations, the royal sign manual was required, as the signature of the Governor General is required to warrant in Canada. The Lords of the Treasury took this view—and if there ever was a case of necessity this was one—that they would take the responsibility and go down to Parliament and pass a Bill of indemnity, and tell those officers that under the circumstances, the conditions of the King, it was absolutely necessary money should be had and expended and the services of the country maintained, and they ordered the proper officials to prepare papers that would be complete without the signature of the King, and thus secure money to be placed to the credits of the departments. But those officers took advice. They were liable to severe pains and penalties for issuing warrants without the sanction of law, and it was held that the case was not such as would warrant them in running the risk, even by authority of the government. Parliament was convened. An appropriation Act had been passed; yet Parliament was convened in that year to sanction by solemn resolution the substitution of some signature for that of the King under the circumstances. This was an extraordinary case which goes to show how carefully the Parliament of England guards against abuse. There was a long debate, and it was especially over a resolution asking that this special course should be adopted in connection with the Army and Navy service when no royal sign manual could be obtained. This case which is the strongest case, came before Parliament in 1811. There was a long debate in regard to any departure being made from the very important rules that were adopted to prevent the possibility of abuse. The Chancellor of the Exchequer explained that it was his intention to move that authority be given to make certain applications of money, under circumstances which he detailed, the distressing circumstances in which the nation was placed. He said: "He considered a committee of the whole House competent to meet such an emergency;" and he proceeded to move:

> That it is the opinion of this committee, that it is necessary, in the exigencies of the present conjuncture, that until due provision shall be made for supplying the defect in the royal authority, such sums as have been appropriated for the services of the Navy and Army, by the Act of last session of Parliament, and other Acts for enabling His Majesty to raise three millions, should be issued, in conformity with said Acts accordingly; and that it is expedient that the Lords Commissioner of His Majesty's Treasury should be required to issue their warrants to the Auditor of the Exchequer, for the payment of such sums as the exigency may render necessary; and that the said auditors and officers of the Exchequer are authorized and commanded to pay obedience to the warrant in this behalf, and to pay such sums as appear necessary, according to the warrants of any three or more of the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, which they may issue from time to time.

I think that will dispose of the argument based on the ground of necessity, because I have referred to this which is the most extraordinary case in Parliament of this nature, and the proceedings show the great care taken in England to prevent any abuse. Notwithstanding the convening Parliament for that special purpose, I find in May's Constitutional History, that:

> A protest was entered by in the Lord's journal, signed by twenty-one Peers, including six Royal Dukes, which affirmed that the principle of the resolution would justify the assumption of all the executive powers of the Crown during any suspension of the personal exercise of the royal authority; and that this unconstitutional measure might have been avoided without injury to the public service, by an address to the Prince of Wales.

The hon. gentleman from Kent (Mr. McInerney) put a very strong and a very pertinent case before the House, and I will venture to add a few observations in connection with that case, because there is much to learn from it. It is a case in which we have the opinion of the British Government, by their instructions to the Governor of a colony, in which we find them saying, that it is against constitutional practice to pay official salaries that have not been appropriated by Parliament, and because the Governor joined with the Government of the day in perpetrating that illegal act, and being a party to that abuse of the constitution, he was recalled and summoned to England as being unfit for his duty. That was done even though the Governor had in his support the advice of some of what were called the law advisers of the Crown in that colony. Notwithstanding all that, Mr. Cardwell in his despatch at that time instructs the Governor that a heavy responsibility lay upon him, and that he could not under any circumstances sanction an illegal act that had been submitted to him by his advisers. I propose to make a further reference to that case. As the hon. member for

Kent (Mr. McInerney) said, that case had to do with the very phase that has been urged before us, namely, the question of the payment of official salaries. In this case there had been an Appropriation Bill, mark you, Mr. Speaker, and the Estimates had been passed by the Lower House, but it had not received the sanction of the Upper House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Parliament was sitting.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so. In that respect there was no similarity, but as the member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) answered the member for Toronto (Mr. Lount), the point to which this case relates is not as to the construction of the section of the Act before us, but as to the value of the argument that these amounts were due and a great wrong would be done if they were not paid. There is no question that these amounts would be paid at some time. There was no attempt to be dishonest, but nevertheless the Governor lost his position because in the face of the law he was a party to this illegal act. Sir C. Darling sets forth these facts in his justification, but I will give you later on what Mr. Cardwell had to say about it. The Governor says :

> But apart from these considerations I would state that there is no process of law by which the civil servants of the lower ranks and minor creditors in the rural districts whose claims constituted on every account the most distressing and therefore most pressing demands upon the Government, could possibly recover, without great delay, the wages and payments which they had always been in the habit of receiving monthly and upon which they depended for the daily subsistence of themselves and their families. In this most important respect, therefore, there was no law practically available, and the emergency was, I thought at the time, and, with all deference and respect for your opinion, cannot do otherwise than still think, one which if its nature were rightly understood and its probable consequences fully appreciated, did according to the view expressed in your despatch constitute an "excuse" and "justification" for the proceeding of "borrowing from a private bank large sums of money on behalf of the public."

In a despatch of the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, at that time Secretary of State for the Colonies, this is what he says :

> No such emergency did exist. If payments were legally due from the Crown to public officers for salaries or to any other person on any account, it was open to such persons to recover what was so due to them in the ordinary course of law. It was for one or other branch of the legislature to yield or for both to compromise their differences. It was not for you to give a victory to one or the other party by a proceeding unwarranted either by your commission or by the laws of the colony.

There were several other points involved in connection with the conduct of the Governor, and Mr. Cardwell continued :

> In paying salaries without sanction of law, you have departed from the principle of conduct announced by yourself and approved by me—the principle of rigid adherence to the law. I deeply regret this. The Queen's representative is justified in deferring very largely to his constitutional advisers in matters of authority on all or any of those manifestly unlawful proceedings by which one political party or one member of the body politic, is occasionally tempted to endeavour to establish its preponderance over another. I am quite sure that all honest and intelligent colonists will concur with me in thinking that the powers of the Crown ought never to be used to authorize or facilitate any act which is required for an immediate political purpose, but is forbidden by law.

And again in another despatch Mr. Cardwell says in reply to the argument of Sir C. Darling :

> It is for you to inquire, not whether the result of any step which you may be invited to take, will operate in favour of this body or of that, of one political party or another, but whether it is in itself legitimate. If it be clearly contrary to law, you will refuse compliance ; and will inform your Ministers that while in all lawful matters you are desirous of being guided by their advice, you have a higher and paramount duty, which is to observe the existing law of the colony.

When we find that the Governor is taken in hand in that sharp manner, that he is recalled for sanctioning the payment of salaries that had been voted, mark you, Mr. Speaker, by the Lower House, but did not receive the sanction of law by the concurrence of the Upper House ; I think we have made out a very strong case indeed in order to support the resolution that is in your hands, and to prevent the recurrence of such an abuse by any Executive, whether the present or their successors, at any time in the future. The very fact of voting down this resolution will be dangerous in itself. The very defeat of this resolution would give the Government a warrant they have not now, for perpetrating an expenditure wholly illegal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The whole point is the illegality. The hon. gentleman has not touched that yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman found me touching it so closely that he did not answer the question I put to him across the House. I admit that when the hon. gentleman would not give me that satisfaction, it seemed for a time unnecessary to deal with anything but the constitutional part of the question. Now, as to the law. The hon. gentleman could not have been listening to me, or he could not have made the statement he has made. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that I gave some authorities, and I think they touched the case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To that extent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And that extent was sufficient for me, because I think the authorities showed that under certain circumstances the language of the Act should be read as we construe it; and I submit that the opinion of such men as Mr. Blake and Sir John Macdonald is in line with the opinion of the leading legal minds in this Parliament.

But we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that they have the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat in endorsation of their conduct. I deny it. If they have such an opinion, it is not laid on the Table of the House. If they have such an opinion, why is it not produced? If they refer to this document, I will show you that it contains no such opinion. I remember when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries occupied a long time in this House in descanting on the impropriety of any Minister of Justice giving an unreasoned opinion. Let us see what opinion we have from the Minister of Justice in this case. We have a private and unofficial statement from the Minister of Justice to the Prime Minister. That is all we have, and it refers to only one of a host of cases covered by these several warrants. The Prime Minister, in his letter, says:

> My dear Sir Oliver,—It is suggested to me that unless the civil employees are paid their regular salaries, the public service will be subjected to very serious inconveniences. These inconveniences would more particularly arise in the case of that class of employees who are wage-earners on railways, canals and other public works.

And Sir Oliver Mowat, in reply, recites this note of the Prime Minister, and says:

> You ask my opinion as to whether a special warrant can be issued for the payment of these employees.

Now, the warrants were issued. Is there any member on the Treasury benches who will tell me that the warrants were confined to the cases of civil employees or wage-earners on railways, canals or other public works? If any one ventured to say that, I shall show that the Prime Minister having received this informal statement from the Minister of Justice, the Ministers of the various departments began to put in motion machinery by which they got in advance a large portion of their general Estimates—Estimates wholly apart and outside of these particular and urgent cases referred to by the Minister of Justice. Let us see what they were. By a special warrant of His Excellency, the Department of Agriculture got $27,446 to pay the salaries of the various employees, permanent and temporary, of the inside and outside service for the month of July. That is the nearest that comes within the meaning of Sir Oliver Mowat's letter. The next is for the payment of temporary officers, clerks and messengers. Then there is a schedule, in which we find provided for in the same way the Civil Government salaries, Civil Government contingencies, arts, agriculture and statistics, quarantine, Manitoba census in the Department of Agriculture; permanent and extra employees' salaries for the month of July in the Auditor General's office. In the Finance Department we have Civil Government salaries, superintendent of insurance, charges of management, Civil Government contingencies. Contingencies is a term certainly not referred to in Sir Oliver Mowat's letter, and certainly I do not believe that either he or the Solicitor General could be got to give an opinion to any of their colleagues that departmental contingencies could be considered as an item which on either of these occasions would have justified the issue of a special warrant. In the Geological Survey, we have the salaries of the temporary staff. Then, we have travelling expenses and contingencies of the Indian Department, medical attendance, industrial schools, farmers and labourers, instructors for Sioux, agents, clerks and interpreters, millers and helpers. In the Interior Department we have the same thing—contingencies and salaries and all the various heads of the great votes, restricting them in nothing. In the Justice Department we have police, penitentiary pay-lists, administration of justice—a very broad term, and not included in the letter of either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice; also the contingencies of that department. We have some large items for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, such as ocean and river service, lighthouse and coast service, scientific institutions, steamboat inspection, and fisheries—items running from $10.000 to $14,000; as well as contingencies and salaries. And so through the different departments. But then we come to another case, on which there is no opinion of the Minister of Justice:

> That a special warrant of His Excellenecy the Governor General do issue for the sum of $1,500, being the amount estimated as necessary to repair the Government's snag boat "Samson," in order that she may be put into commission.

And in this case it does not appear from this minute that this was after the Minister of Public Works had reported that the case was urgent. It is simply:

> The Minister of Finance certifying that there is no Parliamentary provision for the said expenditure.

That was the ground on which the Ministers went when they sent in these Estimates, but not the ground of the statement of the Minister of Justice. So, we have the warrant authorizing the payment of "pensions, superannuation allowances, contingencies and other expenditures required to be made by the several departments during the said month of August, 1896." Parliament met on the 19th, but these expenditures were provided for the whole of that month, and these purposes are not the purposes contemplated in the opinion of the Minister of Jus-

tice. So that hon. gentlemen have not even that comfort in this debate; they have not the opinion of the Minister of Justice in their support, but they have the admission of the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to the illegality of part of the issue, and they have the expression of his profound regret that such a mistake occurred.

Now, I want to call attention to another provision of the statute, which has been treated as a dead letter; and I want to know if either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General will say that this section is blotted out by section 32, subsection "b" of the Audit Act. I call attention to section 13 of the same Act, where Parliament in its wisdom has enacted that no officer engaged in the collection of revenue shall be paid his salary until it is voted by Parliament. The language of that section is important:

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, determine what officers or persons it is necessary to employ, in collecting, managing or accounting for the revenue, and in carrying into effect the laws thereunto relating, or for preventing any violation of such laws; and may assign their names, officer and such salaries, or pay for their labour or responsibility in the execution of the duties of their respective offices and employment, as to the Governor in Council seems reasonable and necessary, and may appoint the times and manner in which the same shall be paid; but no such officer so appointed shall receive a higher annual salary than is allowed in his case by any Act of the Parliament of Canada respecting the civil service generally then in force, nor shall any such salary be paid until voted by Parliament.

You have therefore a flagrant violation of this Act, and it is the same Act which contains this other section. The two sections are in no sense inconsistent. No one could contend reasonably that section 32 in any respect does away with this section, whereby it is provided that not a man engaged in the collection of the revenue of this country shall be paid one farthing of his salary until it is voted by Parliament. The reason for this extraordinary protection is that there shall be ample opportunity for discussion by Parliament before these officers are allowed to engage in these responsible duties. The law says that not a dollar shall be paid until Parliament votes it, but this Executive comes into power, violates all constitutional practice and precedent by further proroguing Parliament summoned to meet after dissolution and general election, and having thus further prorogued Parliament, which had been called for the despatch of business, they say, forsooth, that as there is no Parliament sitting and we cannot obtain provision from it, and as the previous Parliament refused to give us a dollar for these services, we will obtain from the Minister of Justice a casual and off-hand opinion as to civil employees and wage-earners on railways and canals, and having obtained that, we will submit our regular Estimates, taking periodical amounts for each department, and advise His Excellency to issue this special warrant, and we will govern this country at our own will and pleasure, wholly regardless of the principle of parliamentary control.

The hon. gentleman, a little while ago, stated that I had not dealt with the legal aspect of this case. I am sorry the hon. gentleman considers that I have avoided that aspect, because I have endeavoured to make it clear to the House that I not only had that aspect in view, but that side by side with it I would consider the constitutional procedure in the mother country with reference to similar subjects; and I have endeavoured to point out, by the references I have given at some length as fairly as I could, the manner in which Canada has attempted to follow the mother country in seeing that the peoples' representatives have complete control over the expenditure of public money. And I have endeavoured to show that in all cases in which the Executive of this country was permitted —there being no similar case in England— to spend money not included in the Appropriation Act, such authority was to be found in the Audit Act, section 32, subsection "b." The language of that section has been given the House on several occasions and the invariable interpretation of it has been in line with the views that have been expressed on this side time and time again. Hon. gentlemen opposite are committed to those views. The construction for which I have contended needs no laboured argument and no further reference to the authorities I have given; but it is significant that while some of these hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to shelter themselves behind the opinions expressed by members of Parliament on some other occasion, they take good care to avoid the statement that in their opinion as lawyers, you can read this Act so that, to quote the language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), "whenever expenses are not provided for, but urgently required in the public weal, a special warrant may issue." No other member of the Home Government has given that interpretation. It would be, I think, a startling proposition to intelligent men in this country, for it involves a great deal more than the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce dealt with to-day, and gives rise to considerations that he did not touch in any particular, because whenever the advisers of His Excellency think that the public weal urgently requires an expenditure which is not to be found in the Appropriation Act or which Parliament had refused to provide, then a body of fifteen or seventeen gentlemen could obtain a warrant from the Governor General, spend the money and come down to Parliament and claim that they acted on the construction of the Act as expressed by a Minister of the Crown and endorsed by Parliament. It is a grave

position for the Government to take; and whether we have argued the case forcibly or otherwise, it is a significant commentary on the course of the Government that in this most important topic affecting Parliament, members of the Government remain silent on the legal and constitutional view of the case. The debate has proceeded for some hours, and I have had to follow gentlemen who agreed with me. I have not had the advantage of hearing the opinion of the Solicitor General. I have read his opinion given, not exhaustively, but in a debate on other subjects. He has not taken part in this discussion; and the Minister of Trade and Commerce has admitted that he did not approach the question from the standpoint of a lawyer; but the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice will agree with me and every other member of the profession that this question can be considered only from the standpoint of law. If the construction they have put upon the statute is sound in law, there is no gound for a resolution such as the one we have put. If theirs be the construction, it is wholly useless to ask Parliament to meet, and no necessity to vote the supplies. All that the Government need do is to advise His Excellency to prorogue the House, and after prorogation issue further warrants to carry on the business of the country. If hon. gentlemen were unable to obtain the supplies they now ask and Parliament were prorogued, they would be face to face with the very circumstances that existed in July last, and all the arguments they have used to-day, if there is anything in them, would carry them along another year without any vote from the independent representatives of the people. That is an extraordinary position for the Canadian Government and the Canadian Parliament to find itself in, in the year 1896. One hon. gentleman at the back of the Treasury benches dared to refer to the glories of Liberal leaders who had fought for responsible government. But he did not dare, though he had doubts about propriety in regard to one of the most important features in connection with party rule, although he had doubts as to the legality of the position of the Government, to give the slightest symptom that he had inherited anything of the spirit of those great reformers and those parliamentary guides. So there are gentlemen giving their allegiance to the Government, giving their reasons in a halting fashion and not basing them upon the exact language of the statute. And on the other hand, we have these opinions not only of eminent lawyers on our side of the House, but on the Opposition side of the House. It is easy to see that a leading member of the Bar, as the member for one of the Torontos is, who spoke in this debate, has hesitated to say as a member of his profession, that the Government's construction was right, and all he was willing to do was to express doubt and to give the Government the benefit of that doubt. Well, I say if that hon. gentleman be not a political partisan, or not politically blinded, but is here to represent and protect the interests of the public and to guard the privileges of Parliament, he should give the benefit of the doubt to the resolution which is before you. What is the resolution? I will read it. I propose to read it because the hon. gentlemen who listened to it, gentlemen who follow the facts, will, I think, have the arguments that have been delivered on the right of the Speaker to-day will have great difficulty in voting against the resolution or against the propsition which it sets forth. I fancy that I could with no great difficulty find in resolutions of hon. gentlemen opposite almost the very words of the conclusion of this resolution. And are we to be told that there is to be one rule and one construction of our constitution and of the Audit Act when hon. gentlemen opposite are in opposition and another rule and another construction when they are members of the Government, and that as soon as they change their opinion so also will their supporters change theirs. This resolution says:

The Sixth Session of the Seventh Parliament met on January 2nd, 1896, and on the 27th day of the same month the Government submitted His Excellency's Message transmitting the Estimates for the year 1896-7, which were forthwith referred to the Committee of Supply.

That these Estimates provided appropriations for the foreseen and necessary salaries and contingencies of the several departments of Government and for the maintenance and construction of public works and for other services.

That on the 28th of January the House was asked to go into Committee of the Whole for granting supply, and to consider first the appropriations for departmental salaries and contingencies.

That neither then, nor on the several occasions thereafter when the House was asked to grant supply did the Opposition agree thereto.

That appeals were made by the Government setting forth the urgent necessity for making provision for the ordinary and regular expenditures for the approaching fiscal year, or in view of the impending dissolution and of the fact that the new Parliament could not possibly assemble before July 1st and would probably meet shortly thereafter, for a part thereof.

That despite these representations and although the circumstances were well known and there was ample time at the disposal of the House, supplies for the year 1896-7 were refused and Parliament rose on the 23rd day of April without these supplies being granted.

That Parliament was dissolved and a new Parliament was summoned to meet for the despatch of business upon the 16th day of July, 1896.

That the Government resigned office on the 10th day of July, 1896, and the Honourable Wilfred Laurier was called upon by His Excellency to form an Administration, which he undertook to do.

That thereafter, Parliament was on the 13th day of July, 1896, prorogued to meet for the

despatch of business on the 19th day of August, 1896.

That by chapter 29, 49 Victoria, R.S.C., the Governor General in Council is empowered to issue special warrants authorizing the payment of money not previously voted by Parliament under the following circumstances only, to wit :—

'If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repairs thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.'

That on the 16th day of June, 1896—the date when Parliament had been summoned to meet for the despatch of business—His Excellency was advised to issue his warrant for the expenditure of $1,067,576 for departmental salaries and contingencies, and on August 18th—one day before the actual meeting of Parliament—was again advised to issue his warrant for $935,561 for similar expenditures, and that these warrants did issue and the sums named were accordingly placed at the disposal of the department.

That these amounts were not called for by any accident to any public work or building, nor were they required for any expenditures which had not been foreseen, and which could not have been provided for, but were used to pay ordinary salaries and contingencies, for which Parliament had been asked to provide, and which had been refused by the House of Commons.

That, under these circumstances, this House is of the opinion that the issue of the said warrants was in contravention of the well understood principles of parliamentary control, an abuse of the powers vested in the Governor General in Council by the said Act, and a usurpation fraught with danger to public liberty and constitutional government.

I have read that resolution for a purpose. I humbly submit that it was useful not so much to give my own opinion, which is a very strong one as to the construction of that statute, but I did think it necessary, when hon. gentlemen indulge so much and particularly a leading member of this House, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, indulge so much in these arguments as to necessity, common-sense, and what business men of the community might think, that it was well to bring the House back to a feature of the most important struggle that has gone on in the old Parliament and in the Parliaments of this country and the various legislatures of the Dominion of Canada. And to give at length, as I venture to do, the opinions of experts, the opinions of high parliamentary authorities in England, showing not only the practice that obtains there, but the reasons for tieing the hands of the executive and preventing them exercising the discretion that the Minister of Trade and Commerce thinks the executive ought to possess and ought to be able to exercise. No man can follow those precedents, no man can follow those authorities, no man can have done me the honour to have followed me closely in my speech, and fairly contend that every sentence before the conclusion of the resolution that has been placed in your hands, is not entitled to the support of both sides of this House. Before I sit down, I would like to ask the Government what purpose they have that prevents them accepting this resolution ? It would not be the first time that a proposition clearly in line with parliamentary practice and parliamentary precedents, and in line with the safeguards in regard to parliamentary control, was accepted by the Government, when moved from this side of the House ; and if they will not accept it, surely some hon. member on the Treasury benches will give us the reasons, the high reasons of state, why they cannot subscribe to this doctrine, so as to prevent, not only themselves, but future Governments from committing the same error again. For they do not propose to remain in power a very great length of time : the only gentleman in this House who seems to be confident on that score, is the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who has not been able, personally, to get into power at all ; but he has predicted a long lease. But hon. gentlemen know that some day the fates will agree against them, be their luck ever so good for a while. They must consider the position in which, not only the present Executive stands, but in which the Executive for many years to come, will be placed, by voting down such an amendment as has been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker. So I hope that hon. gentlemen will do one of two things : either accept this amendment, and then go into Supply, on another occasion, or favour us with reasons not yet given to his House for their course in objecting to the principles contained in that resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—LABOUR DAY.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before I move the adjournment of the House, I beg to call its attention for a moment to the fact that Monday is a legal holiday, and I have heard expressions from all quarters, both from the right and from the left, that the House should not sit on that day. Of course, we have sat on some occasions on legal holidays ; for instance, we have sat on one or two occasions on Dominion Day, though that is not a precedent which I would like to justify, but it was done under pressure

of business and when we were nearing the close of the session. We have not yet approached to that desired stage, though on our side we are desirous of reaching a close as speedily as possible. But as Monday is Labour Day, and a legal holiday instituted in honour of labour, I suppose I will meet the wishes of all members in the House, if I move, as I do now, that when we adjourn on Friday, which is to-day, the House stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 10) to confirm an agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Gibson.)

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted by Her Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1897, the sum of $446,500, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of Canada.

I suggest that this resolution, which covers an item in regard to militia already voted, may be passed through its stages without any delay.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to pass the resolution through one of its stages, and that will not delay it any inconvenient time.

Resolution considered in Committee and agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance when we may expect the Supplementary Estimates. The main object of the session appears to be to pass Supply, and as it is manifestly going it blind to have only part of the Estimates down—for the Finance Minister has told us that Supplementary Estimates are still to be brought down—I think it very necessary that they should be on hand as soon as possible.

The FINANCE MINISTER (Mr. Fielding). We have been making such slow progress with the main Estimates that I hardly thought it necessary to deal with the Supplementaries. They will, however, receive very early consideration, but I am unable to give the hon. gentleman a definite answer to-day as to when they will be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. The object which we both desire of shortening the session, will be helped forward if the Supplementaries are brought down at an early day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Are you not boasting ?

SUPPLY—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding : That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply ; and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I could offer no excuse for presuming upon the indulgence of this House had it not been for the tender and somewhat affectionate invitation extended to the young members—that is young in their parliamentary years—and to the independent members, to weigh calmly and fairly and dispassionately, the arguments that have been addressed from the other side of the Chamber. I can say with absolute sincerity that I had no intention until yesterday of taking part in this debate, for in my opinion the matter does not very profoundly agitate the public mind, and in so far as any vindication of the course of the Government is concerned, it demands very little argument at our hands with respect to any impression which is likely to be created upon the mind of the public at large. If I had had any intention from the first of taking part in this debate, I would have made it my duty to pay very much more attention to the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) than, I am sorry to say, I did, owing to the late hour of the evening at which it was delivered. I would possibly have been able to deal with his argument, as I shall not do now—the House perhaps has occasion to rejoice at that—and I might also have been able to follow his highly interesting disquisition in which he developed the record of the great parliamentary struggle which is perhaps the central feature in the history of parliamentary institutions in the motherland, a struggle as the result of which the Commons of Eng-

land obtained control over the public money and prevented the Crown from assuming the control which it had on too many occasions usurped. However, any serious discussion on that branch of constitutional law has become somewhat obsolete in these days. It has become of somewhat secondary importance, because the usurpations which rendered it necessary that the House of Commons should assert its right, assert its powers, and vindicate its position, have since then entirely ceased. Those usurpations which were the cause of the great struggle between the Crown and the Commons no longer take place, and it would be only a person of almost insane imagination who could suppose that there was any danger of that description threatening us in these days, to render such a discussion of any real practical value. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is very fond of propounding conundrums, and he did propound some to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I was anxious to know whether he was as eager to answer questions as he was to ask them, and when my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who made a very clear and a very lucid presentation of the legal merits of the case, asked him some very pertinent questions. I did not think the member for Pictou candidly or clearly answered them. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) presented the possibility of the supposititious case, of Parliament sitting all through up to the end of its term, and up to the end of the fiscal year, having been prevented by some unforeseen occurrence from taking an appropriation for the current year. Assuming that Parliament was unable to do so, and assuming a sudden and unexpected dissolution and reconstruction of Government, and possibly an entire change of the complexion of Parliament, and further assuming that there was a necessary expenditure for two or three months which was absolutely unprovided for; my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) asked whether in a condition of things like that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) would say that it was absolutely impossible to make any provision for the ordinary expenditures of Government, simply because they were foreseen, at the time Parliament was sitting, although they had not been provided for. I do not think that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) gave a very clear or a very lucid answer to that question. Hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted for us a great many precedents, but let me remind them that the value of a precedent altogether depends upon the similarity of the case to which it is applied. We were on the 14th of July last living under a condition of things in Canada which was absolutely without precedent. We were then passing through a crisis, the conditions precedent to which were altogether unique in their character. It is hardly worth while, when you are seeking what you shall do in a particular emergency, to cite precedents and to appeal to precedents which have relation to a condition of things altogether dissimilar from the conditions with which you are for the moment face to face. A great statesman whose name my historical knowledge does not enable me to recall with absolute certainty uttered a memorable aphorism in a time of revolutionary excitement and revolutionary disorder and irregularity, to the sticklers for constitutional law, and sticklers for parliamentary propriety, who insisted that they should go only on precedent, when he said: There is no use asking for precedents when you have a condition of things which is without precedent. When a man gets lost in the woods there is not much use in his protesting that he will walk nowhere but upon the King's highway. When he is in the woods the best thing for him to do is to find the shortest way out to the highway. The present Government were not in the woods it is true, but this country itself had been led into the thickest kind of a wood under the guidance of the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). It was really an unprecedented condition. We were, figuratively speaking, in the woods, both financially and constitutionally, and had been led into that condition under the unskilful guidance of that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). I say that, under such circumstances, the only thing for the present leader of the Government to do was to find the shortest and clearest path out to the Queen's highway. That course the Prime Minister of Canada adopted. I am quite prepared to assert the propriety of his conduct in so doing. Even suppose his act had not strict legal sanction, if it were necessary to prevent the disastrous condition of things which was so graphically portrayed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and also by my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), it was the duty of the First Minister to avoid these difficulties and dangers. This House does not and this Government does not need any arguments in vindication of such a principle as that, even assuming the course pursued by the Government to be without strict legal warrant. But apart from that line of defence altogether, I am prepared to argue, rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, skilfully or unskilfully, as this House may judge, that the Government was also strictly and legally right in the course it adopted; and as one member of the House I am prepared to take the responsibility of voting that the action of the Government has been strictly legal and regular and proper, and in accordance with the statute under which they proceeded. And, Sir, in dealing with the legal aspects of the subject, let me refer to the remarks of my honourable and very highly esteemed colleague who sits on the other side of the House (Mr. Borden, of Halifax).

There is no hon. gentleman in this House for whose legal judgment I have greater respect; and, had he addressed to this House a legal argument on this subject, such as he would address to the Supreme Court of his province or to the Supreme Court of this Dominion, I am sure I would have listened to it with the profoundest interest. In opening his speech he promised us that kind of an argument. He said that it was because this was a legal question that he entered into the discussion of it. But I am sure that before he had been on his feet three minutes by the clock, he left the legal aspect of the question, and launched out upon the wild and shoreless ocean of political controversy and partisan recrimination. He attempted to state the question which was really the only question at issue, namely, the question what this Government, or any government in the position of this Government, should have done in the circumstances in which it found itself on the 14th of July of this present year; and he amazed me by saying, in answer to that question, that he would not undertake to say what the Government should have done under those circumstances. Well, if my learned friend had no suggestion to make, if he had no light to throw on that crucial and burning question, the only question in the case in which the people of this country take the slightest interest, then it seems to me he had nothing whatever to contribute to the solution of the real issue now before this House. He absolutely dodged that question; he failed to give any answer to it; but he thought that it was a sufficient reply to ask: "Why did you hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House not think of that as a question likely to arise when you obstructed the Estimates in the session which began on the 2nd of January of the present year?" Now, that is not a legal argument at all. That is a political argument, and as such it is a very fair and legitimate argument to use, but it has been fairly and reasonably answered over and over again. I maintain that it is entirely distinct from any legal argument that could be addressed to this House. Jane Welsh Carlyle used to say that it was the mixing of things that was the great bad; and it is an absolute absurdity, when undertaking to discuss this question as a legal question, to import into it those political controversies to which my hon. friend turned his attention before he had been speaking five minutes. The test of the hon. gentleman's reply, as a legal argument, is this. Suppose that some hon. gentlemen had been elected to this House and had been entrusted with the administration of affairs of this country, who were in no way connected with the so-called obstruction of which he complains; granted that it was ever so bad and improper; waiving every consideration as to the character of that obstruction; I say, supposing that we had sitting in the seats of power at the present moment a government altogether irresponsible for it, having had no connection with it, would my hon. friend's legal argument, such as he made, then have had any relevancy to the issue now before us? He tells us, and he tells us truly, that the answer to the legal question can never be allowed to depend on the accident of which political party is in power. I accede to that proposition absolutely and entirely. He says that it is an accident that the Liberal party is in power in this country. Grant for the sake of argument that it is an accident. Suppose the accident had turned out otherwise, and that another party which had no connection whatever with the so-called obstruction of the late Opposition had come into power—which is among the possibilities, with which we must deal when testing a legal argument; suppose, for example, that those good and honest men, the Patrons of Industry, had had the good fortune to sweep the constituencies of this whole Dominion and to secure a majority of the votes in this House, and had been in a position to dictate who should rule this country for the next five years; suppose that from the 23rd of June, when the elections took place, down to the 16th of July, when this question arose, the kaleidoscopic changes in the administration had been as great, as numerous, as startling, and almost as shocking, as they were in an equivalent period before the 23rd of June; suppose that as a result of those changes, we had in power a Government led by a man fully pledged to the Patrons of Industry, and depending upon them for his support as a political leader; and suppose the leader of such a Government had on the 16th day of July advised the issue of these warrants; how would my hon. friend have retaliated upon him? He could not have charged him with having been guilty of obstruction and having brought about the condition of things which existed when these warrants were issued. He would have been obliged to deal with the question solely as a legal one, without any of the political recriminations that he threw across the floor in the course of his speech. The legal question would then have been precisely the same as it is now, and would have had to be answered by precisely the same considerations with which it has to be answered now. So that the legal proposition which my hon. friend undertook to discuss ought to be divorced from any political questions arising out of the transactions of the previous Parliament, with which hon. gentlemen opposite have mixed it, only to obscure the real issue pending before the House at this hour.

Now let me come to the discussion of that legal question myself. I know that the discussion of a legal question is apt to be a very dry and dull and uninteresting affair to this or any other assembly, and I know that we lawyers have almost to apologize for our existence and our attempts to enlighten our friends on such questions; and

I do, before commencing, enter a most humble and abject apology for undertaking to discuss the legal question before this House, which some hon. gentlemen have studiously avoided. However, it is necessary that I should do so, in order to analyse to some extent the words of the statute under consideration, which it seems to me have been somewhat misconstrued. I am inclined to accede to the argument of my hon. friends opposite that this statute does require two conditions precedent to the issue of such a warrant as is provided for. I am inclined to accede to the argument, which was very strongly and clearly stated by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) that, under the provisions of subsection "b" of section 32 of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, you must have a case which is not only not provided for, but which is also not foreseen. I am inclined to accept that as being a fair interpretation of the statute, but my hon. friends will have to admit that it is not its literal meaning. In order to come to the conclusion they adopt, they must depart from the mere letter of the statute and put on it an interpretation which is not severely and exactly grammatical. They have to give the word "or" a meaning which is not usual to it, and convert it into the word "and." They have to do some violence to the statute, though in so doing, I freely admit the probability that they arrive at the true construction of the statute. But if my hon. friends are so generous in their treatment of the conjunction, will they not be equally generous with us when we discuss the adjective and the substantive? If they are going to ask for concessions from us when they are tithing the mint, anise and cummin, will they not permit a similar course when it comes to the consideration of the weightier matters of the law? My proposition is this, that you can take either the literal or the sensible construction of the statute. If you take the literal construction, it is quite sufficient to invoke the words of the statute in order to justify the issue of the warrants in question. All that is required is that the expenditure be unprovided for, even though it be not unforeseen. I do not assent to that as the proper construction of the statute. I think it is a literal but not a sensible construction. On the other hand, if you are going to depart from the mere literal interpretation and give the statute a sensible construction, according to its true intention, you must conclude that the expenditure in question was an unforeseen expenditure. It was foreseen in a dry, barren, literal and grammatical sense of the word. It was an expenditure which everybody could have foreseen in February or January last, but it was an expenditure as to which no human being could possibly have foreseen the circumstances which led to its not having been provided for. In that sense of the term, which is, to my mind, a fair and just sense of the term, it was really an unforeseen expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend aware that before the Supply Bill was passed, the statement was made from the Government side of the House that the new Parliament would be called together, not before, but on or about the middle of July, so that from that time forward the House knew the whole circumstances—knew that no Parliament could meet before the 15th of July, and yet this second warrant was issued on the 18th of August?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We could have met on the 5th of July easily.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am aware of that statement having been made; but the hon. gentleman in his speech, as I heard him distinctly, admitted that Parliament might have met, and could have met, on the 2nd of July.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not possible for me to be certain that I heard the hon. member correctly, but the same statement, if I caught it correctly, is made in the resolution tabled by the hon. gentleman, "that Parliament would probably meet shortly after the 2nd of July." In any case, I cannot concede that it was positively and absolutely certain that this House could not have met before the 16th July. On the contrary, I think it might have met considerably before the 16th July. Even if I were disposed to concede the whole point, as claimed by the hon. ex-Finance Minister, that this House could not meet before the 16th July, it is admitted that it could not have been foreseen that the House would not be able, at all events, to sit on the 16th of July and take steps to provide for the public necessities in the ordinary way, instead of applying for Governor General's warrant on that date. I do not, however, press that point very strenuously. My argument is, that this statute is applicable whenever the expenditure is wholly of an unforeseen character, in the literal sense of the term, or when, being of a kind that could have been foreseen, the circumstances that prevented its being provided for could not have been foreseen. I take it that the statute applies whenever the circumstances are such that it could not have been foreseen that the expenditure would not, and could not, be provided for when required. If that be a fair reading of the statute, I should like to know if anybody could have foreseen that this Parliament could not meet in time to provide for this expenditure. Was it an absolutely foreseen circumstance that the elections could not have been held before the 23rd June? Was it absolutely necessary that two months should elapse before the late Government was in a position to appeal to the electorate? Was it absolute-

ly foreseen, assuming that the elections were to take place on the 23rd of June, that the late Government, after the verdict of the country had been rendered against them, would cling to their offices until the 10th of July, wholly without justification, in view of the peculiar condition of the public affairs of the country? Could it have been foreseen that the proceedings which led to the formation of the present Government would occupy further time in necessary appeals to the constituencies, which made it essential in the best interests of the country that Parliament should not come together until the 19th of August, although it had been called to meet on the 16th of July? Without any hesitation whatever, I say that in respect of these three particulars that I have mentioned, the expenditure was not, and could not have been, foreseen.

Let me go one step further, and say that, even if, as a matter of the technical reading of the statute, you cannot read it in the sense I do, the condition of things which actually had arisen brings the case within the equity of the statute. If you have one condition of things expressly provided for in the statute by express terms, and then you have another analogous condition of things which is not provided for by the express terms of the statute, and if you are able to draw the inference that, if the mind of the legislature had been directed to that analogous condition of things which is not expressly provided for in the statute, it would have taken pains to provide for it exactly as it did expressly provide for the other condition, then you are at liberty to hold that the statute, by this enlarged construction does include the analogous condition as well as the one which is covered by its express terms. Whichever way you put the matter then I contend that this was an unforeseen expenditure in the true and fair sense that the circumstances which led to its being unprovided for were unforeseen. If the legislature which passed the Audit Act—I think it was in 1878—had anticipated the very condition of things which we saw in this country on the 14th January, 1896, they would certainly have made express provision to meet that contingency—even if you do not hold that it is already covered by the express terms of the Act—whichever way you take it, the expenditure is amply and abundantly and legally justified by the terms of the statute. If you are going to read it literally, you, of course, arrive at the same conclusion by a far easier course; but if you are going to read it sensibly, equitably and according to the fair intention of the statute, and with reasonable regard to the condition of things that it was meant to cover, I say it is proper and reasonable to read it in the way I have read it.

There is only one point more that I would urge, and that is with reference to the citation which was made by the hon. member for Kent, N.B., (Mr. McInerney) from Todd's book on Parliamentary Government in the Colonies. I am not going to say that the hon. gentleman used in any unfair way the book he then had in his hand, but I do say that if he had taken the pains to read a little more to himself, he probably would not have read any of it to the House; and if he had read a little more to the House he would have thrown a light on the discussion which would not have been welcomed by the other side. He read the passage referring to the particular circumstances of the case in which the Colonial Secretary, Earl Granville, had written a despatch pointing out that the action of the Colonial government which he was then dealing with had been at variance with instructions which had been given. I am not going to weary the House by going into a statement of the facts of the case referred to, because I know how wearisome and tedious this argument must be. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) called attention to an expression to which it was very proper for him to call attention and which was a very forcible expression in the connection in which he read it. But he failed to read these words from the despatch of Lord Granville:

> Except in cases of absolute and immediate necessity (such, for example, as the preservation of life), no expenditure of public money should be incurred without sanction of law.

That is an expression of opinion with which nobody quarrels. But here is a qualification that is of the utmost importance:

> Uuless it may be presumed, not only that both branches of the legislature will hold that it is unobjectionable——

That is this case exactly——

> —but also that they will approve of the expenditure being made in anticipation of their consent.

Now, I want to know if that does not absolutely and comprehensively cover the case before us to-day? Is not this expenditure one that comes within this rule? Is it not an expenditure as to which it is fair and reasonable and natural to presume—as to which the presumption is practically irresistible—not only that both branches of the legislature will hold it to be unobjectionable, but also that they will approve of the expenditure having been made in anticipation of their consent. If I were making a wager—and it would be unparliamentary and improper to do so—I would give heavy odds that both branches of the legislature will hold it to be unobjectionable and will support the Government in making it without waiting for the formal consent of Parliament. Why, it must be so. If you go back to the question I referred to at the outset of these remarks and consider what would have happened—as the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has asked, as the people have been asking and have answered without hesitation or qualification,—what would have happened if, on the 16th of July last the Government had not taken the

perfectly fair, somewhat heroic, perhaps, but perfectly fair and reasonable and proper course of providing, as they did, for the public service. Was the ship of state to come to a standstill because it had a new commander? Were the crew to starve and languish; was no sail to be set, and no headway made? Was it all to be like the craft in the rhyme "Ancient Mariner":

As idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean?

To return from metaphor to facts, were the canal labourers and employees to be discharged? Were the railway officials to go out of business, and were we to have a strike almost as large as that inaugurated by Mr. Debs in the American republic? Was the Government to fail in the discharge of its duties as common carriers on its railways? Were the lighthouses to be unprovided for and the lights to be allowed to go out? All this must have happened and would have happened, together with a great deal of pecuniary distress and domestic unhappiness if the Government had not made the provision that it did make on the 16th July for the absolutely necessary expenditures for the public service. And yet gentlemen opposite say, if they say anything, that this is exactly what the Government ought to have done.

And the argument is put thus: If this sort of thing can be done, if these Governor General's warrants can be issued, and if the Government can go on from the 16th July to the 16th August, why not to the 16th September, to October, November, and so on through the rest of the year, never calling Parliament together at all and finding supplies by means of Governor General's warrants? That is a kind of argument that does stagger some people, but I have heard it so often, that, to me, the edge has become a little dulled. Why, if we stop to think of all the things that could be legally and constitutionally done, some of us who are as timid and as apprehensive as the ex-Minister of Finance seems to be would hardly be able to sleep in our beds. Bagehot, in the introduction to the last edition of his work on the English Constitution says, that some people would be very greatly surprised if they knew the kind of things that the Queen could do. She could disband the army and dismiss all the officers from the general commanding downward. She could dismiss all the sailors; she could sell all the ships of war and all the naval stores; she could make peace by the sacrifice of Cornwall; she could make every citizen a peer; she could dismiss all the civil servants. Perhaps it might solve the question we were discussing the other day if Her Majesty would come over to this side of the water and exercise a little of this power—and she could pardon all offenders, which would be a sweet consolation to the front benches on the other side of the House. Why don't any of these terrible things ever happen to us? Merely because of the saving common sense, the saving constitutional sense, which prevents the abuse of powers which it is absolutely necessary some person should possess in order to forward the public interests of the whole country. I think that saving common sense is in the breasts of the people of this country. We may argue about this thing all night, we may spend late hours, and burn the midnight oil; we may weary ourselves to death over this matter; but I can give my word of honour to hon. gentlemen opposite that there is not in the breast of a single farmer, or a single fisherman, or a single miner, or a single person outside this Chamber, in all this broad Dominion, the least concerned over this matter; there is not a particle of agitation over this question, there is not a particle of public apprehension. On the contrary, there is an absolute consensus of opinion upon the propriety of the step that was taken by the Government as being an absolutely necessary and proper step to be taken, in the conditions in which they found themselves; and for that reason I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I am prepared to vote against the amendment offered by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

Mr. CHAUVIN. Before submitting to this House in my own language some few arguments on this question, I desire to submit one argument in English, because, I think, it is a strong one. I am not prepared to blame the Government for the first warrant. I do not think they are very guilty for issuing the first warrant. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) in the opinion that this question is not a very important one. On that point I think that a better authority than the fisherman or the farmer whose opinion is quoted by the hon. gentleman is the letter of the Governor General himself. The Governor General himself thought that the question was of sufficient importance to warrant him in obtaining the advice of the Minister of Justice, even before he issued the first warrant. I have that letter in French, but it is needless to translate it into English. The letter is written by the Prime Minister to Sir Oliver Mowat, the Minister of Justice, asking his opinion about the propriety of issuing the first warrant. Well, that means that the Prime Minister thought the question was important enough to justify him in obtaining the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon the right of the Governor General to issue that first warrant. That is my answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman from Halifax that this was not an important question. But, Sir, from my point of view, I do not think the Government is very much to blame for issuing the first warrant; if anybody is to blame it is the Liberal party, because during the last session of Parliament they frustrated the

wishes of the majority of this House by preventing this House from granting the subsidies necessary to carry on the public service. But that offence has been condoned by the electors. I do not mean to say that the verdict of June 23rd is an approval of the obstructive tactics resorted to by the Liberal party; but I say that the election is over now, and as a consequence of it, a new Government is in power. Now, Sir, I wish to be fair and just towards the new Government. This Government has among its members some gentlemen who were not members of the last Parliament, and were not responsible for the obstruction of which the Liberal party was guilty. When the new Government came into power they were confronted with a condition of things which had to be met, and in consequence of that condition of things I admit that the first warrant, in a certain sense, and under reserve of the arguments that I am about to present in French, was legitimate. But I am not prepared to admit that the second warrant issued on the eve of the opening of Parliament, was also legitimate, though some hon. members pretend that it is legal. Well, I do not contend even that the second warrant was neither legitimate nor legal. Hon. gentlemen before me have spoken about interpreting the statute in a liberal spirit. Well, I pretend that it is putting a most liberal interpretation upon the statute to say that the second warrant was legitimate and legal. Now, the second warrant was issued on the eve of the opening of Parliament, even on the day previous to the opening of Parliament. Perhaps, as has been contended by some hon. gentlemen, that action was according to the letter of the statute, which says that when Paliament is not in session a warrant may issue under certain circumstances. But I think the Government was not sincere in that action, because exactly on the day previous to the opening of the session they issued the second warrant, and I pretend that if that is according to the letter of the statute, it is certainly against a liberal interpretation of the statute. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if I rise in my place, it is not that I intend to participate at any length in this debate, but it is with a view to placing in bold relief before the House a principle, that of the supreme power of the people, the principle of responsible government, which is the object of this debate. That principle, Sir, every one admits, is that which secures to the representatives of the people in Parliament the absolute control of the public money. Where is the man, Sir, who is not conversant with our historic political struggles to obtain representative government in this country? And, Sir, I may say that one of the salient features of our system of responsible government, gained after such a long struggle, is, as hon. gentlemen all know, the principle that the representatives of the people hold within their power the supply for the administration of the services of the country. Previous to responsible government having been gained, the expenditure of the people's money was controlled by the governor and by a legislative council, who were not even responsible to the people. And, Sir, it is not without a feeling of legitimate pride that I tell the House that, throughout those long years of struggle which culminated in the securing of responsible government, and in the gaining by the representatives of the people in Parliament of the undoubted and absolute control of public money, my fellow-countrymen, the French Canadians, fought to the fore. It is on record, Sir, that French Canadians stood to their guns and joined hands with the few English-speaking citizens who were opposed to the rule of English oligarchy in this country; and it was also from the ranks of the French Canadian people that sprang up those men whose fame is imperishable, who led the combatants to victory, and succeeded in giving Canada political freedom. To these men, Sir, we are indebted for the well-understood practice of free parliamentary institutions, which we now enjoy under the ægis of Great Britain.

Now, Sir, as I said in my opening remarks to the House, I hold that the Liberal party alone is responsible for the state of things prevailing here since the 1st July, 1896. On the Liberal party alone, I say, rests that responsibility, because I do not want, out of a mere desire of finding fault with them, hold the Government of the day responsible for the obstruction which occurred in this House last session of Parliament. The Government of the day is largely composed of new men who were not members of the late Parliament, and cannot, therefore, be held responsible—unless they be held jointly responsible as a party—for the obstruction which took place at the last session of Parliament. To that obstruction alone, I hold, is to be attributed the condition of things which prevailed when the new Government came into power. Indeed, Sir, the dying days of last Parliament witnessed an unprecedented fact in our parliamentary records: that of a majority of this House rendered powerless and coerced by an insignificant minority in Parliament. That majority was ready to pass the Supply asked for by the Executive for the administration of the services of the country, but the minority which, as such, was not enjoying the confidence of the majority in the country, succeeded in overriding the will of Parliament, as voiced by the majority, and in obstructing the passage of the supply asked for by the Executive to defray the expenditures of the services of the country, at least until the 1st July last. Now, Sir, the people, later on, have pronounced their verdict, and I shall not undertake to say that by that verdict they did endorse the policy of obstruction of which the present state of things is the direct out-

come ; and the more so, as that topic was but seldom referred to before the people during the last election. Our opponents did not undertake to deal with that question on the hustings, being fully alive to the fact that the course they had pursued in Parliament was far from being creditable to them. The electors pronounced themselves on other issues, and particularly on a vital question which, as the hon. First Minister is well aware, was the primary cause of his being returned to power, owing to the vote of the province of Quebec, through which he holds the balance of power which constitutes his majority in this House. By reason of the policy of obstruction carried out by the Liberal party at the last session the Government of the day, when they came into power, were confronted with an extraordinary and critical condition of affairs. So critical, indeed, was the position that His Excellency the Governor General himself thought fit, in order to relieve his anxiety, to ask the opinion of the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), previous to acquiescing in the demand of the hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier) who had asked to be authorized to appropriate a certain sum of money for the administration of the services of the country. I shall not vote censure on the Government of the day for issuing the first warrant, provided they show clearly to the House that they could not call Parliament together at the appointed date. If the hon. gentlemen opposite clearly and conclusively show us, resting their case on English precedents, that the Government could not call Parliament to meet for the prosecution of business on 16th July, then I say—and then only I shall not vote censure on the Government for its issuing the first warrant. But should the Government be unable to make that point, and to show good grounds for their delay in calling Parliament together on the day appointed, then I say it shall be my duty to vote censure on them for issuing both warrants. It must be borne in mind that the first warrant was issued on the eve of the day fixed for the meeting of Parliament, the 16th July, and that the second warrant was issued on the very day preceding the opening of Parliament, called together by the Government of the day.

I do not feel I can endorse the opinion of some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are willing to exonerate the Government from blame for issuing the first warrant, but feel that they cannot endorse their action with regard to the issue of the second warrant. For my part, Sir, I hold that the Government's action is free from blame only in so far as they can justify it and clearly show to the House that they could not meet Parliament on the 16th July. I maintain that, so far as the issue of the second warrant is concerned, I cannot but censure the action taken by the Government of the day, by reason of their having issued it on the eve of the opening of Parliament, which, to my mind, is altogether indefensible.

There is a second ground on which an attempt is made at justifying the course pursued by the Government in issuing those warrants, and, if I mistake not, it is this : that there was an urgent and immediate necessity for the Government to procure the money wherewith to meet the expenditure of the services of the country, and that, as often remarked, they have made a good use of the money thus appropriated. Supposing the necessity of the case justified the issue of those Governor General's warrants, in order to provide for the requirements of the services of the country, I say this was but another reason why the Government should have made every effort to call Parliament together on the 16th July. Were the Government able to show that they could not open Parliament on that date, I say that would vindicate their action in issuing the first warrant. Admittedly, the Government alone are to be held responsible for the delay in calling Parliament together. The Government would have met with no more opposition from this side of the House, in getting a vote of money from Parliament, than they did experience this week in having an appropriation granted for the annual drill of the militia. No sooner had the Finance Minister asked for the vote in question than it was assented to by the House, which goes to show that the Opposition does not mean to resort to a policy of obstruction. Some hon. gentlemen opposite, I rgret to say, have tried to make political capital out of the fact that we, on this side of the House, as they pretended, were unwilling to give the Government a vote of money in favour of those hard-worked employees in the civil service and of those heads of families who were in urgent need of the wages they had honestly earned. Such an imputation, I venture to say, is nothing more or less than a libel on the House and on the Opposition. We, on this side, are willing to grant all just and reasonable demands on the part of the Government, and we are just as ready to concur in any vote asked in behalf of the employees in the civil service as we were to vote the appropriation for the militia. The Government would have found the Opposition quite ready to vote the sums required for the services of the country, had they seen fit to ask for them ; and in so doing, they would have avoided creating a precedent fraught with danger, and one throwing the door open to intolerable abuses of power ; they would have, at the same time, shown less indifference to the rights of the representatives of the people, and better respected the essential prerogatives of ministerial responsibility, and the principles of parliamentary control over the expenditure of public money.

The hon. gentlemen opposite also tell us that the Government are not open to blame in connection with the issue of those war-

rants, and why ? Because, it is contended, they have made a proper and legitimate use of the sums of money appropriated under the two warrants signed by the Governor General. I cannot, for my part, endorse such a statement. Granting that the Government have made a proper use of those warrants, I say that they could not misuse them, because those sums of money were entirely affected to the payment of the services of the country, and could not be applied to any other purpose. But, Sir, I arraign the hon. gentlemen, not only for having appropriated the people's money without the sanction of Parliament, but I arraign them also on another ground: Because they have asked for more money than was required to provide for the services of the country; and, if I mistake not, they have still on hand a pretty considerable balance of the sums taken by Governor General's warrants; a fact which goes to justify our fears and impresses upon us the necessity of insisting upon a more severe control over public expenditure under the present Administration. Why, Sir, shall it be said that we are going back to the days of English oligarchy ? Now, I ask the Prime Minister, how it happens that, while claiming to be the political heir of Papineau and Lafontaine, those champions of responsible government, he should, instead of joining hands with this side of the House, side with those who impugn the great principle we are advocating?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). (Translation.) Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman laughs; and he also laughed last evening when told by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that it was his duty to vote with us on this question. Were the hon. gentleman willing to remain faithful to the traditions of those great men who so highly prized the principles of parliamentary control over public money, it is with us he should side——

An hon. MEMBER. Order, order.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.)——instead of joining hands with those who have nullified the prerogatives of this House and the inalienable privileges of the people's representatives. A most sacred mandate was given by our constituents, that of watching over the good administration of the people's money. And we would no longer have any business here, should the doctrine prevail that the procurement of a Governor General's warrant is all that is required to authorize the executive to put their hands into the public treasury and thus provide for the requirements of the services of the country! Were we to tolerate such an usurpation of power, we would be unworthy of the position we occupy here, and prove recreant to our oath of office. I should deem myself unworthy of the mandate my constituents have given me were I not to champion the cardinal prerogative of this House, by speaking and voting in favour of parliamentary control over public expenditure.

For these reasons, Sir, I shall not hesitate to vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate every one knows that it is almost impossible to introduce new arguments; however, I should like to add a few words to what has been already said on this side of the House in connection with the question now brought to our notice on the amendment moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). We all recognize that the circumstances under which Governor General's warrants were obtained were very extraordinary, and such as are not likely to occur again. We all know also that there is no precedent to be found, nothing at all that could have guided the Administration in the course they were compelled to advise under, and we are now called upon under these circumstances on the motion of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), not to express an opinion on the subject, but to vote censure upon the Government of the day. The hon. member opened his address to the House this afternoon by imploring hon. members to consider this matter not from a party standpoint but to look upon it as independent members of the House, and arrive at the conclusion which under the circumstances we felt ourselves justified in reaching. I accept the hon. gentleman's invitation in that sense, and I propose in the vote which I will give to justify at all events to myself, the vote, and to feel that in giving that vote I am voicing my constituents upon the grounds and for the reasons which I will very briefly state.

In my view this question naturally divides itself into two branches: first, the question of policy, and second, the question of law, and if those questions are considered and dealt with, as I think they should be, separately, there will be very little difficulty, if there be legal power, in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion on the question of policy. I am not concerned, Sir, in fact I do not know why this House should concern itself, with the action of the last Parliament. We have no mandate here to condemn the last Parliament. I suppose if the proceedings of that Parliament were now submitted to members of this House they would not receive the approbation of a majorty of the members, and they would not be considered from the same point of view as that taken by members of the late House. But we are not concerned with that matter. In the resolution and speech of the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion much stress is laid on the action of the last Parliament,

and a good deal of the argument and much of the weight of the censure which the hon. gentleman thinks the Administration responsible for is because of the action of those hon. gentlemen, some of whom were in the last Parliament and some were not. So far as I am concerned as a member of the late Parliament, there is nothing in the least degree in anything I did of which to be ashamed in regard to what is called the granting of supplies. I always thought it was a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of the late Administration to have the presumption to come down some time at the end of January, and not to ask for a vote on account or a vote for a month or two, but to ask Estimates for the present current year. I say that hon. gentlemen did not ask for a portion of this year's Estimates, but they coolly took it for granted on the eve of dissolution that members of the House at that session would be prepared to entrust the then Administration, which was about to appeal to the country, with supplies, not for a portion of the year, but for the whole year. That was what was done. The hon. gentleman has stated in his resolution that from time to time appeals were made to grant a portion of that sum. I question that as a matter of fact. I was here at the time. The ex-Finance Minister can refer me if I am wrong, to the page of "Hansard" in which it is recorded, but I never heard an appeal made to the House for a vote on account or for anything less than a grant of supplies for a whole year. So that the statement on which the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has based his resolution, if my recollection is to be depended upon, is not accurate, and certainly it is most misleading and most unfair.

Mr. FOSTER. It is accurate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I can only say that I never heard of it. Passing that by, because after all it really has not anything to do with the question, there can be no estoppel, to use a phrase familiar to lawyers, on the part of hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches as regards what the House did last session. The present Government were called upon to administer the affairs of the country on 13th July. They came into office on that day, and they found within a few days large sums of money were due and payable as wages to employees in the civil service, and they could not wish that the credit of the country be dishonoured. That was their position. What were they to do? Something had to be done, as I think every fair-minded man in this House will admit. They could not repeat the humiliation and disgrace with which we were more or less overwhelmed during last session, when the Government were unable to pay the charwomen, and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had to move the adjournment of the House in order to draw attention to the fact that the Government had so far forgotten their duty as not to make provision to pay members of this humble class of the community. If something must be done, then the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who addressed the House in a speech this afternoon, which reflected much credit on him and the city from which he comes, very properly asked, what alternative course had been suggested by the hon. gentlemen opposite? Let me see what was possible and what was open. There was no possibility under the law as it stands now to draw without authority a Governor General's warrant, or exercise the authority of Parliament. Before the Audit Act was passed, the Government might have assumed the responsibility of making drafts on the public exchequer, and afterwards have asked Parliament to endorse their action. Possibly that might have been done a year or so ago before; but it was not possible under the Audit Act, because the Auditor General would not sanction the advance. That possibility, then, must be excluded. What might have been done? Advances could have been obtained from the banks upon the responsibility of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches; but that would have been violating the spirit of the constitution just as much as if men had drawn public money, because it involves an obligation which the country is called upon ultimately to implement, and is just as wrong and contrary to the spirit of the constitution as it is to spend money without the authority of Parliament. So, Sir, the only possible alternative suggested is that Parliament might be permitted to meet on 16th July. Let us look at that point as practical business men. On 16th July, if Parliament had met, those seats on the Treasury benches would have been vacant, for every hon. gentleman who accepted office thereby vacated his seat. Who would have had to conduct the business of the House? What would have been the practical results accomplished? Undoubtedly a Message could have been sent down by His Excellency and placed in the hands of the Whip of the party, and he might have done the best he could to engineer the Bill through the House; but a fortnight has been occupied already in considering the business of Parliament and we are not yet through the Militia Estimates; and I should like to know under the circumstances I have endeavoured to suppose and picture what would have been the consequences with the Treasury benches vacant and with the Opposition in their present mood and temper. Then there was just that choice given to the Opposition, and no word of complaint as to the expenditure of a single dollar—and I attach to this very great importance—there was no word of complaint as to any salary paid. It is admitted by every hon. member in this House, that this money had to be paid, and had to be paid no matter what Administra-

tion was in power. It comes to the purest technical reasoning to complain and to ask that the House should censure the Administration because they resorted to a course which practically was the only one open to them, if the law permitted that course to be taken. Had indeed, Sir, these Governor's warrants been, as some of the warrants which I have had to sustain in days gone by, for unforeseen expenditure which it took all one's credulity to imagine could be classified in that category, had there been a scent of a job in the matter, then, Sir, I, for my part, would have been very much inclined to have supported the motion, and very much disinclined to say a word against it. But where it comes to be an admitted fact that this money was required, that this money was necessary, that this money had to be found in some way to prevent this country being discredited, and there was only the alternative of calling Parliament together at the very greatest possible inconvenience, with the very strong certainty that then the House would have had to adjourn from day to day and from week to week, until the members of the Government were re-elected; then, for my part, I am quite satisfied to accept the responsibility for this procedure, so far as the matter of policy is concerned.

Now, Sir, when we come to look at the legal aspect of the question—I am not going to weary the House by any long speech, and, if I might venture to say so, I think perhaps the reproach of long speeches, to which this House has become subject, is not being improved in the present session. Certainly I have never yet heard longer harangues on matters which are altogether in a nutshell, which require no historic statement, which require no disquisition, than we have had to listen to from gentlemen on the Opposition side.

Mr. FOSTER. What about your Manitoba schools speech of last year?

Mr. McCARTHY. I allude to the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution (Mr. Foster), and to the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who addressed us with great ability, great industry and great learning on the matter last night, but which, I think, was as foreign to the subject as a discussion on the Silver Bill would have been. No person doubts the authority of Parliament and the control of Parliament over supplies. We alone, I believe, of all the English-speaking communities that have self-government, have given to the Executive this power of obtaining money by means of Governor's warrants. So far as my research has gone, there is no such authority in England, and, so far as I know, there is no such authority in any of the other colonies. Our case is one in which we have thought fit to delegate to the Executive, under exigencies mentioned in the Act of Parliament, the power to get money which the people had not thought fit to vote. But no person doubts the general proposition, and, therefore, the authoritative statement as to how, and why, and when this change was made and this strictness was imposed by the Commons in England, appears to me very far afield. But, Sir, when, as I say, we come to deal with the question of law, I confess, without the slightest hesitation, that I had always read the Act of Parliament as hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side, and as some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side, have interpreted it to the House. I had always supposed that the Act of Parliament permitted, and only permitted, the exercise of the power to obtain money by virtue of Governor General's warrants under the particular circumstances mentioned in the statute, or when that particular circumstance did not exist—namely, with regard to the construction or injury of public buildings—then, when the circumstances were unforeseen as well as unprovided for. I am bound to say that much, Sir. But what did the Administration do, and what are we, in this House, confronted with? We find the First Minister meeting this difficulty on the very day after his entrance into office, because his letter to Sir Oliver Mowat is on the 14th of July, and he appeals to Sir Oliver in these terms:

> It is suggested to me that unless the civil employees are paid their regular salaries, the public service will be subjected to very serious inconveniences. These inconveniences would more particularly arise in the case of that class of employees who are wage-earners on railways, canals and other public works.
>
> I would ask you to look into the question and to give me your opinion as to whether a special warrant can be issued to provide for the payment of those servants of the Government.

Now, Sir, that appeal was made to the Law Officer of the Crown, and the appeal was answered by the Law Officer of the Crown in an opinion given without question and without doubt:

> I think the payment of the employees mentioned in your letter is "urgently and immediately required" for the public good, within the meaning of the said enactment, and that under the circumstances which have occurred and the consequent present condition of public affairs, the Governor in Council may properly on the report mentioned, order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.

So we have from the Minister of Justice—and I do not know what other legal authority the Government could have relied upon—we have an emphatic opinion given, that, under this Act of Parliament, there was authority to the Governor to sign this warrant. And who is Sir Oliver Mowat? Now, Sir, I do not propose to yield my own view even to Sir Oliver Mowat. But I am bound to say that I would be a pretty hardy man to stand up as a lawyer in this House, and

venture to assert that the opinion of the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), who is certainly one of the most distinguished jurists in this country, who in all constitutional questions, or rather, in the great majority of them, in the contests that have taken place, has been found to be right against able men and against able opinion—I say it would be a foolhardy thing for any lawyer, no matter what his standing be, to say that Sir Oliver Mowat's opinion is wrong. And, when I look at the Act of Parliament, I find—as indeed is admitted—that Sir Oliver Mowat has interpreted the Act according to its literal meaning. There can be no question about that. The words literally mean just exactly what Sir Oliver Mowat says they mean. The Act of Parliament, curiously enough, has been so worded, and has been so revised and consolidated, with this word "or" in, whereas, according to the general understanding, it meant "and." Again, Sir, it is difficult to tell any lawyer or to tell any judge that he is wrong, when he places upon a statute its plain and literal interpretation and its meaning according to its grammatical sense. I do not at all mean to say that we will not find authorities in the books; nay, many of them, when "or" is to be read for "and," when "may" is to be read for "must," and "must" for "may." But, Sir, what I am bound to is this, that, in the face of the legal opinion of the Minister of Justice, where I am satisfied that the act was right, if the act was lawful and legal, I am not bound here—whatever my own view may be as a lawyer—and I do not feel that I can take the responsibility of censuring the Government for acting on the opinion of their Minister of Justice. Let me add one word to that, and it is this, and I have no doubt it is what has guided Sir Oliver Mowat.

In the old days, when Parliament was perhaps not as particular in the phraseology of its Acts as it is to-day, and when the judges took to themselves greater authority and power than perhaps we would tolerate at present, it was not an uncommon thing for judges to interpret Acts of Parliament in a sense very different from the plain meaning of the terms of those enactments. But the current of modern decisions is the other way. The current of modern decisions is that as Parliament meets yearly, and Parliament can easily remedy its own mistakes, it is not for the judiciary to say, when Parliament says one thing plainly, that Parliament meant another thing. If it were interesting to the House, as it is not, to quote law books, I could give the opinion of the Lord Chancellor of England to that effect, expressed in a recent case; and that adds to the doubts and difficulties which I have about criticising the advice given by the Minister of Justice to the Cabinet.

These appear to me to be the two questions involved in this motion. But I should add that the hon. gentleman who framed this motion—and it is certainly long enough to be an ordinary speech—has not ventured to challenge the act of the Governor General on the ground that he had not the power to do as he has done. The motion is a censure upon the policy—I ask the House to remember that—and not upon the power. After reciting matters of history, partly true and partly inaccurate, as most histories are, the resolution winds up in these words:

> That under these circumstances this House is of the opinion that the issue of the said warrants was in contravention of the well understood principle of parliamentary control, an abuse of the powers vested in the Governor General in Council——

Acknowledging the power, but claiming the issue of the warrants under the circumstances to be an abuse of the power. So that we are not called upon to sit in judgment on the legal question, as the hon. gentleman himself has apparently given that the go-by, and is apparently willing to rest the censure of the Government on the abuse of the power.

I am answering the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) under somewhat difficult circumstances. I am only encouraged to say what I intend to say by the fact that he opened his speech, which was very interesting to those who understood it, by stating in English what his strongest point was. Well, Sir, if there is a ready answer to his strongest point, which the hon. member was good enough to give us in the language I do understand, I think I may allow, as I am bound under the circumstances to allow, the remainder of the hon. gentleman's speech to go unanswered, so far as I am concerned. The hon. gentleman drew a distinction between the warrants. The warrant of July, he said, was one which he was not prepared to censure the Government for having issued. But the motion does not distinguish between one warrant and the other. The motion censures the issue of the warrant of July as well as the warrant of August; and if the hon. gentleman feels that he cannot censure the Government for their conduct with respect to the July warrant, he cannot very consistently vote in support of that motion. But it does appear to me to be special pleading of the finest possible kind to say that what was done in July ought not to have been done on the 18th of August, because the House met upon the following day. No doubt, as was admitted in the debate in 1891, when the last Government was censured by a motion moved by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) for having issued a warrant for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the very day preceding the meeting of Parliament—no doubt, as was conceded by all, including even the Minister who had to do with it, the issue of a warrant on the eve of the meeting of Parliament certainly

required strong grounds to support it. But, Sir, are there not the strong grounds? Remember that these wages were overdue from the 15th of August; remember that preparations were being made for their payment from the 14th, and that, by reason of the circumlocution necessary in these matters, they had not culminated until the 18th; and if this warrant had not been issued, it is perfectly plain and clear that the Government would not have had the money to-day, because even to-day this House refused to allow the grant for the Militia Estimates to take more than a single step. The hon. gentleman who wants the Government condemned, himself rose in his place and refused to allow these Militia Estimates to be advanced one single stage. In point of fact, he merely consented to what he could not avoid, that is, that the House should take only one stage to-day. So that in the early days of September we have not reached a stage where we are able to pay these employees on canals and railways or carry on the necessary business of the country by means of the ordinary supplies obtained from Parliament. If, therefore, it was right to grant the warrant on the 18th of July, I am unable to discover any reasoning which would make it improper to do practically the same thing on the 18th of August, notwithstanding that the House was to meet on the following day.

For these reasons, Sir, I shall not hesitate to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for York. I do not propose to criticise the long preamble of this resolution. I desire to place my reasons on plain, clear, and definite grounds. I desire no hair-splitting in support of the vote I propose to give. The money having been required for honest and proper purposes, the necessities of the case having been such that the money could only be obtained in this way, and the Minister clothed with the responsibility of the administration of justice, a distinguished jurist having advised that there was the power to do what has been done, for my part I am prepared to take the full responsibility of voting against the resolution in amendment to the motion to go into Supply.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it will not be expected that I should attempt to answer the legal argument of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McCarthy). But it was said by the hon. gentleman himself at the outset that this question involved more than matters of law—that it involved also matters of common sense; and on that ground I may attempt to discuss the question. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat laid down a very wholesome rule at the outset, that is, that questions of this kind should be discussed wholly apart from political considerations, which only becloud the question, instead of making it clear. But I fear that the hon. gentleman has not been able to live up to his professions in that respect. I fear that before he sat down he attempted not only to justify his vote on this occasion, but his support of the party with which he is now so completely in accord. I am glad to know that this question is not wholly and solely a legal question, but that it has also, as was said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), a business and common-sense side. If we commence with the power that is granted under the statute, the House must recognize that it is an extraordinary power, which, at the time it was given, it was felt should be hedged round with the greatest safeguards. It was one that must have appealed to the minds of those who were passing the Act as susceptible, at all times, of abuse, and which therefore ought to be surrounded with the greatest possible safeguards. The Act itself makes this clear. It reads as follows:—

> If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building, which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided by Parliament is urgently required for the public good——

The language is very explicit, and an example is given to make it perfectly clear what ought to come within the meaning of the Act. Why did the Act not go futher, in defining the particular cases to which the Act would apply? Is it not perfectly clear that it did not do so for the simple reason that it is not possible to contain in a statute every case that might arise? But this particular example was given to indicate clearly the description of cases intended to be covered by the words "unforeseen and unprovided for" as coming within the meaning of the statute. Does the present case come clearly within that meaning of the words "unforeseen and unprovided for?" Does the latter part of the section include cases that were foreseen but were not provided for? If it does not, then the case under discussion does not come within the meaning of the words which I have quoted? But let me go further and show that this case is one that came to the knowledge of Parliament when it last sat. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has declared that we are in no sense answerable for the acts of the last Parliament. I reply to the hon. gentleman that the last Parliament of Canada is not now on trial, but the Government is on trial. Parliaments are not perpetual but Governments are. In the words used by May, "There is no moment in the life of the sovereign in which he has not advisers." Therefore, I say that the Government is perpetual; and when the sovereign or the Governor General departs from the strict rule of law, the Ministers who advise that course are wholly responsible. It is upon that ground that a vote of censure is now proposed—not to censure the last Parliament, but the Government which

has taken upon itself to advise not only an illegal but an unconstitutional act. Was this matter within the knowledge of the last Parliament? If it was within the knowledge of the last Parliament, then it does not come under the Act. No hon. gentleman will say that this is a place where hon. members met for the mere purpose of amusement. They come here to discuss the business of the country, and if Parliament failed, through a policy of obstruction, to vote the supplies last session, this Government is responsible, and those gentlemen who were called upon to form a Government cannot be disassociated from their acts when in Opposition last session.

Taking the question wholly on a common sense and business point of view, it cannot be said that they can be absolutely and entirely freed from any act of theirs or the consequences. And what are the consequences? Parliament was clearly cognizant and knew, in every sense possible, that the supplies had to be voted, that an honest and fair effort had been made to vote those supplies, and that the effort had been frustrated by obstruction. That is a matter which is perfectly clear to this House. Therefore, I say that Parliament was perfectly cognizant, it had every means of knowing, every means was placed at its disposal for the purpose of knowing, and surely no hon. gentleman will attempt to say that this was a matter wholly unforeseen and which could not have been provided for. Why, it did not involve a single item that might escape the attention of Parliament, but involved the whole expenditure of the country. Therefore, no one can seriously contend that Parliament was not fully aware of the consequences of its own acts, and every hon. gentleman who then sat in the House is in no sense free from the consequences of his conduct.

The next point is: was Parliament then sitting illegally; had it the right to consider the Estimates placed before it, and had it the right to pass the Estimates? No one disputes that. When those Estimates were submitted to the House, what was the position and course of hon. gentlemen? Why, when, upon the 28th January, about one month after Parliament had assembled, it was proposed by the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) to go into Supply, or in other words, to set about voting supplies for the public service, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose in his place and declared that it would be impossible to intelligibly discuss the Estimates then before the House, because the Auditor General's Report was not then upon the Table and in the hands of members. If that were a good reason, I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who has been in his place the greater part of this debate, what reason can he assign now for going on with the Estimates, when the Auditor General's Report, closing the 30th June, 1896, is not on the Table? If that were a good reason then, it would be an equally good reason now. If it was not a reasonable excuse then, it cannot be reasonable now. There were others who took the same ground.

The hon. member for Bothwell, then Mr. Mills, took very strong ground. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and the hon. member for Yamaska, took the same ground. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), whom I see in his place, also raised his voice against it. Then, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) took the same ground. And a single item was permitted to be passed on that occasion, merely the salaries for the Governor General's Secretary's Office, an item of $11,000 odd. There was another stage; another effort was made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to further the Estimates, in order that the public service might be provided for. On the 4th February, which was not early in the session, because Parliament did not rise until the 23rd of April, it was proposed by the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) that Thursdays should be taken as Government days, in order that the work devolving upon the Government—mainly the passing of the Estimates and of one Bill, for the passing of which the House had met—might be dealt with. Strong objection was taken on that occasion also; and on what ground? Why, the ground was taken that it was altogether too early to propose a motion of this kind. The present First Minister (Mr. Laurier) took that ground, and he took the trouble to prepare a very long table to show that for eleven years, at least, the House had been in session from thirty-five to forty days before a motion of that kind was proposed, and, therefore, it was improper at that stage to think of narrowing the rights of private members in this House for the purpose of furthering the business of the Government. And another reason was urged. The fact that the Remedial Bill was not then down was given as a reason for not proceeding with the Estimates. Who engaged in that contention? One might have expected some slight objection to be raised, and as readily disposed of by the Government of the day. But I find that the Hon. David Mills took strong objection to the Government's proposal on the grounds I have given. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. Postmaster General also took the same ground. Another was the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette). He is not a Minister, but he is a prospective Minister: he is sitting on the doorstep, he is a waiting candidate; and though he has been disappointed, he certainly had a standing in the party that gave him the right to speak with some authority. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr.

Lavergne) and the hon. Controller of Customs took the same ground. Now, let me turn again and see how long the House has been in session before the First Minister proposed to take two of the days of the week. I am going to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to read their acts of the past in the light of what we find in the present. Why, Sir, the House was just nine days in session when the proposition was made to take two days in the week. I am bound to say that the objection taken by these hon. gentlemen to such a course, when proposed by the late Government, was futile, idle, worthless and untenable. I am glad to say that the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) readily assented to the proposal of this session, to which I have just referred, in order to promote the public business.

Now we come to what may be called more particularly the constitutional side of the question, that which, apart from law, involves serious consequences as a matter of usage. Our constitution, while largely sanctioned by law, is made up of usages and customs that have been found wholesome in the past for our guidance, and where it was impossible that law could intervene or where there was no Act upon the statute-book clearly and decisively covering the case. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce asks what the Government could have done, if they had not applied for Governor General's warrants. I tell the hon. gentleman that one course was open to them, and one course only, and that was to have fairly, and honestly, and courageously met Parliament. And why was there no other course open to them ? Why, Sir, what reasons could be urged why Parliament could not meet ? It may be said it would be inconvenient ; it may be said the time was short. It may be said the public service might have suffered or been strained during that period. I am prepared to admit that that might possibly have been the case. But I want to point out, and I hope to do so later on, that the consequences of following a different course are so serious as to entirely outweigh any danger of that kind. It was said by the hon. gentleman who last spoke, and has been stated repeatedly in this House, that a disastrous state of affairs would follow, if these warrants had not been issued. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce declared that we were, after all, to a large extent, public carriers, and that, had these warrants not issued, the Government railways would stop, and the locks of the canals would no longer open. It was also stated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) that even the lighthouses would be no longer attended. But this seems to me to be merely idle talk. We know that that could not and would not happen. The Queen's Government must, and would go on in this country. The public service would not receive any shock from which it would not quickly recover. Why, Sir, were there no Governor General's warrants issued between the 30th June and the 11th July ? The same reason would apply to the 12th of July, and the 13th of July, and so on from day to day, with just as much force and just as much logic as to the days following the coming into power of hon. gentlemen opposite and the issuing of these warrants. I admit that it was a case of great necessity. But I think the ground taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is so strong that we can well afford to admit these contentions of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, admitting, as I do, that it would have inconvenienced hon. gentlemen somewhat to have met, they could have met, and the public service would have gone on, and there would have been no stoppage of the business of the country, as I think every one who is the least acquainted with the business of this country will acknowledge. Therefore that argument cannot be urged. But there is another thing. Hon. gentlemen assume that such and such would occur, that everything would be at a standstill, the civil servants would be in the poor-house, and it would be impossible for the public service to go on. But they had the means in their hands, they could have met Parliament, and Parliament could have voted a sum of money within a reasonable time. It is not fair to argue that there would have been obstruction ; the readiness with which the leaders on this side of the House have assented to every reasonable proposition, is a complete answer to what was stated a few moments ago by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). But hon. gentlemen assuming a state of things that cannot happen, plead necessity. Now, I have admitted the necessity, but I say the necessity does not warrant in any sense the action the Government have taken. Why, Sir, let us lay down for the first time the principle in this House that on the ground of urgency an act of that kind can be committed, and you have opened the door to the widest and broadest consequences you can imagine. You absolutely place no limit upon the power of the Government the moment you plead public necessity. No public necessity can be so great, particularly the public necessity that arose under these circumstances, as to justify a violation of the constitution. I say upon that ground urgency cannot be pleaded, especially by hon. gentlemen who are the principal offenders, who brought about that state of affairs themselves, and who now come to the Governor General and ask relief from the consequences of their own act. I will go so far as to say that if the time is frittered away, if by an adverse vote, by obstruction, or by any act committed by either of the parties, or by both parties conjointly—I say even then the Government are not relieved from the consequences of those acts, and it is equally doubtful whether either this Government or a Conservative Government could go and ask for Governor

General's warrants, and I do not understand that the leader of the Opposition has stated that that would have been the position of the Conservative party had they come to power. The plain fact is that in either case they should have come to Parliament, and have made the provision. They might have been inconvenienced, it is true, but the inconvenience of a political party is not to be weighed against the consequences following the violation of the constitution.

I am going to ask now whether a single reason pleaded by hon. gentlemen opposite, is a public reason? Will hon. gentlemen cite one reason advanced from the time this debate began up to this moment, that is a public reason? Every one of them is a party reason. The excuse made in the first instance that the Auditor General's Report was not laid upon the Table, was not a public reason, it was a party reason, it was an obstructive reason. So with regard to taking an additional day for the business of the Government, and taking certain days away from private members. Were the reasons then urged public or party reasons? Whether Parliament should have met on the 16th July, is wholly a party and not a public question. Whether the Governor General's warrant should be issued in order to let hon. gentlemen out of the difficulty which they led themselves into, against the will of the House and the party who was attempting to follow the constitution in providing for the public service, was a party question. I say they knew perfectly what the consequence would be, and I say these were party reasons from beginning to end. Asking the advice of His Excellency to grant these warrants is purely a party expedient.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Louder.

Mr. CLANCY. If my hon. friend has been deprived of any of the seven senses ordinarily given to hon. gentlemen, I hope he will not ask me to do the work for him. Now, Mr. Speaker, the kernel of this whole question is this: has the action of the Government—not the action of Parliament, as the hon. member for Simcoe endeavoured to argue—been of the kind that can be fairly justified in the light of law and the constitution? That seems to me to be plainly the kernel of the whole thing. It is not contended by hon. gentlemen that they are legally right. It has been admitted, both by the hon. member for Simcoe and by others preceding him upon that side of the House that it is necessary to give a literal meaning to the statute in order to justify the action of the Government. Then, if the statute is given its literal meaning entirely, and according to the advice of the Minister of Justice, it does rest upon that ground, it is a very slight one indeed, and is always open to serious doubts. I should hope that the constitution rests upon better ground: I should hope that this Parliament would act upon sounder and better grounds, and upon better security, than the mere advice of any gentleman, I care not how high his standing, either in Parliament or in the legal profession. I should hope that we would seek better ground to sanction a principle or a practice now introduced for the first time in the history of Canada, than the opinion of the Minister of Justice, however distinguished that gentleman may be. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, at the close of his speech, declared in the most explicit terms that he did not want this to be taken as a precedent. The hon. member for Simcoe declared that no other case like this was likely to arise. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen are clearly shrinking from the consequences of their position. They ask this Parliament to justify them upon two grounds, one is that of public necessity, and the other is the improbability of so extraordinary a case as this arising again. Now, I would not care to give a silent vote upon a question of so grave an importance as this. If we declare ourselves as saying that this is a proper thing to do, we shall have declared for all time in Canada, and it will be so understood, that this is a sound and justifiable practice. We are sanctioning a precedent of that kind by a vote of the House, we are giving it all the weight and authority that Parliament can give it, and the fact will be cited in the future as a case where the Government of the day was sustained by a majority of the House of Commons of Canada as having done a proper thing in regard to these warrants. Why, Sir, it will be said that a political party, who chose to refuse supplies, to obstruct Parliament, to prevent a vote being taken for that purpose, and following upon a general election, knowing that no appropriation was made for the public service, they took office and went to the Governor General and asked for a warrant, the warrant was granted, and their act was sanctioned by a House of Commons freshly returned from the country. I deny that a mandate of that kind has been given to Parliament, or that such a question was before the people, or that this is a case that can be set aside on the mere flimsy ground that it is not likely to again occur. This is opening the door, it is the first step, it is an invitation for the future, it is placing a case on the records of Parliament indicating that parliamentary government is at an end. We do so if we lay down this as a principle. No hon. member can escape from the consequence of his vote on this occasion; no hon. member can do so on the ground that no other case of this kind could arise. He cannot control the future; and I say that hon. members on both sides of the House should hesitate before they give their sanction for party purposes, for party advantage, to a course of action which will tend to destroy the principles of our constitution.

Mr. BRITTON. I desire to add a few words to this discussion before it closes. Although this discussion commenced with an appeal by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and was followed by a speech by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who appealed to the fairness of those who entered the House as independent members to consider this matter altogether apart from party feelings and party prejudices, we find that when an hon. member, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), a distinguished member of this House and a still more distinguished member of the legal profession, a gentleman who is acknowledged wherever he is known to have a candid and fair mind, rose outside of fealty to any party, and on the invitation which hon. gentlemen opposite extended to him, gave to this matter his best consideration, both on the question of public policy and also as a matter of law, and came to the conclusion that he could not support the resolution of the hon. member for York, we found that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who is for party first and all the time, began a speech this afternoon by an attack on that hon. gentleman, accusing him of trying to find a way to support hon. gentlemen on the Government benches, and having found it he announced that he had come to the conclusion that he must vote against this amendment. That does not afford very much encouragement to independent members to think independently, if a party man, such as the hon. member for Bothwell, appears to be, is so ready to charge an hon. member with want of independence and a desire to go out of his way to support the Government, when he states to the House, as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did, that he honestly and fairly gave the best consideration he could to this question, and treating it on the two grounds he put forward to the House, he felt obliged to come to the conclusion that he could not support the resolution. I desire to speak briefly in regard to the legal aspect of the case, and I say that even if there is any violation of the letter of the statute, which I do not in any way admit, as I shall, I think, be prepared to show has not been the case, certainly there has been no violation of the spirit of the Act which is under discussion. When any one refers to the Act, and it has been quoted so frequently during the progress of this debate that I shall not repeat it again, he will see that it was intended to apply exactly to such a state of affairs as was set forth by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in the speech he delivered in 1891, and it was quoted no doubt correctly because no objection was taken to the quotation made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) yesterday. If it was intended to cover such a state of affairs as has been described as existing at the time the Government came into power, then there certainly has been no violation of the Act. In judging it we have to consider and call attention to the whole section and not to the portion of it that has been quoted, and I shall have to quote it as determining whether that state of things existed at the time the present Government came into power or not; and reading the whole section, hon. members will find that precisely that state of things did exist, and it was a time when above all others hon. gentlemen were justified in invoking the aid of the Audit Act if they ever should invoke it. The whole case of the Opposition rests on the proposition that this expenditure was foreseen. I think I am not doing any injustice to hon. gentlemen opposite when I state that their case rests upon that distinct proposition. If that was unforeseen expenditure, then the Opposition will admit that the Government were right in the course they adopted. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen to follow me in a few words I shall say in support of this point, which I want to make. It is said that the expenditure was foreseen, or, to use the words of the Act, it was not unforeseen. If foreseen, I ask when was it foreseen, by whom was it foreseen? Because I contend that to apply this Act at all and give a meaning to it, the expenditure must have been foreseen at a time when the persons who had to apply the Act had it in their power to raise the money in some other way, and that the expenditure had to be foreseen at that time and by those persons. I contend that this state of things never existed. At the time when this was foreseen these hon. gentlemen had not the power to apply the Act and provide the expenditure in the ordinary way. Hon. members on this side of the House did not constitute the Government, hon. gentlemen opposite formed the Government and they foresaw that expenditure, but when the time came to provide for it they could not do so; and these hon. gentlemen who are now in a position to provide for it, never foresaw the necessity of the expenditure in question. If that is so, then I can only supplement the argument made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who spoke with such force and lucidity, in saying that to all intents and purposes, applying this section as any reasonable man would apply and as a lawyer would apply it, the ground is cut entirely from the feet of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and those who support him and rest their proposition on the fact that the expenditure is foreseen. In a sense, of course, it was foreseen. I dare say it was foreseen by the officials in charge of the department. Those who have charge of the Intercolonial Railway no doubt foresaw the expenses necessary to carry on the working of the road, and those in charge of the canals saw that certain expenditures were necessary to operate the canals. Hon. gentlemen who were on the Treasury benches at that time naturally foresaw the ne-

cessity of the expenditures and provided to meet them in the Estimates. That is the clearest evidence that it was foreseen by them, but at that time these gentlemen now on the Treasury benches were not in existence as a Government, and indeed some of them were not in the House at all. But even if they were in the House, they were not in a position to govern in the matter, and so the men whose duty it was to provide in the ordinary way never in the proper sense of the word, foresaw the necessity of this expenditure. It matters little how much of this they foresaw, if the persons who had the power to provide the money in the ordinary way did not foresee it. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) stated that he would not hold the members who were not in the House at that time in any way responsible. That brings me to the question as to whether the last Parliament did right whole circumstances connected with the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that we are hardly in a position to-day to sit in judgment upon the last Parliament. The whole circumstances connected with the case in the last Parliament are so fresh in the minds of all the members in this House that it is hardly worth while to review them at length. However, it may not be amiss, and I take the liberty of saying in that regard that we had perhaps better look back a little at the history of 1895. In the beginning of that year the members of the then Government never contemplated even the holding of a fifth session. They were all through the country campaigning for an election, and it was well understood by their friends and by the public that there was to be no fifth session. They went to the country making their election addresses and testing public feeling to some extent, and when they found that public feeling was very adverse to them, they at the last moment changed their minds and called a fifth session of Parliament. If I had the power of description of some hon. gentlemen opposite, or of some hon. gentlemen on my side of the House, it would be no doubt very painful to hon. gentlemen opposite if I were to describe what took place in the last Parliament. We know that there were heartburnings and jealousies amongst the members of the Cabinet, and although on the hustings they told us what a happy family they were, we know that they were anything but happy, and that the result of the fifth session in 1895 was anything but satisfactory to them. Then we had the sixth session of Parliament, which was exceptional in its character in two ways. First, because it is the only session, so far as I know, apart from the present one, which was not called for general legislation, but simply for one object: and, in the second place, it was exceptional in that it was the only occasion in the history of this Dominion that a sixth session of Parliament had been called. Now, I ask my hon. friends opposite, who are very particular in this matter, who say that the Government strained the law a little, what did they do as regards straining the law by calling a sixth session of Paliament? It was never the spirit of the law that there should be a sixth session, but they took advantage of the letter of the law, and held a sixth session, unproductive as it was of any good results to the country. The session of 1896 was remarkable, it is said by hon. gentlemen opposite, for the obstruction of the then Opposition, which prevented the Government from getting supplies. In view of what I have briefly summarized as to what took place in the country, and also during the fifth and sixth sessions of the last Parliament, and in view of the charge, since sustained, that the then Government did not possess the confidence of the country, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask hon. gentlemen, if the Liberal party were not perfectly right in doing what they then did? I think I can establish outside of my own individual opinion, that what the members of the then Opposition did in refusing supplies was perfectly justifiable. I will establish it, first, by asking any candid man now on the Opposition benches—the leader or any of the rank and file—if under similar circumstances had the position been reversed, would they not have done the same thing? Unquestionably they would. But I have something further to say about that. Whatever was done by the Opposition in the last Parliament was certainly ratified by the people. That Parliament was dissolved and the electorate had an opportunity of pronouncing upon the conduct of its members. The arguments that were used all over the country during the campaign were in regard to these tactics pursued by the Opposition, and the people were asked, time and again, to refuse to have anything to do with men who were such obstructionists. The sovereign people heard all these arguments, and on the 23rd day of June they gave their decision. There was an appeal to the jury of the people and the people have rendered their verdict to the effect that the obstructionists—if obstructionists they were—in the last session of the last Parliament were perfectly right. If the sovereign people—our masters, and the masters even of those gentlemen opposite—if they say that the Opposition in the last Parliament was perfectly right, what right have we, Parliament as we are, to say that the people have been wrong, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has just said. I say that we were perfectly right in refusing supplies, and if we were right, it cannot be invoked as any argument why the present Government should or should

not have been in a position to have asked the assistance of the Governor General by these warrants.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BRITTON. Mr. Speaker, at the hour of recess, I had arrived in the history of events at the 23rd of June. Shortly after that the Government resigned and a new Government came in. The new Government accepted office on the eve of the day on which Parliament was to assemble. They found the treasury empty. They had all the duties of their offices to perform; they were new to them; they were obliged to form the acquaintance of what the pigeonholes contained and of their official staff; they had thrust upon them at that moment all the work necessary to carry on the Government of the country. The first matter of importance to them was the matter of money for the carrying on of the affairs of the Government, and naturally enough they looked about to see how that could be raised. The first thing they would naturally do, and did do, was to look at this Audit Act, an Act admittedly difficult of construction, an Act admittedly so worded as to prevent any man, be he never so good a lawyer, being absolutely sure what its true and real construction is. In reading it and in getting advice upon it, the Government believed that it authorized them to raise money upon Governor's warrants; and if hon. members have not already made up their minds, I think they will conclude before this debate closes, that the Government were perfectly justified, both in the construction of the Act, and in the reasons which influenced them in believing that they had the authority of this Act for the use of the Governor's warrant. Now, Sir, I do not admit that this statute is limited to the narrow construction that is put upon it. I do not profess to give an opinion which must necessarily be right in this matter; but, on the other hand, I do not admit that the construction which hon. gentlemen opposite have put upon the Act is the true construction and the one that ought to be put upon it. I think their construction is altogether too narrow:

> If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.

I submit with confidence that this section may be read thus:

> Or any occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen is urgently and immediately required for the public good.,

And I am satisfied that there are lawyers whose opinion I would be prepared to respect, who would with perfect confidence and sincerity, and without any desire to be mere party politicians, give it as their opinion that that would be a perfectly fair reading of the Act. If that be so, it would follow that it would be equally a fair reading of the Act if I left out these words "not foreseen," and read it thus:

> Or any occasion arises when any expenditure not provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good.

If that be so, then the Government were entirely within the letter of the law. I admit also that the word "or" may sometimes be, and in some cases has been construed by the courts to mean "and," and that a statute would be inconsistent unless it were read "and." But that is a long way from saying that in this case it is necessary that this word be read as "and." No judge has pronounced upon this Act, to say that this word "or" must be read as "and." I am aware of the doubts that have been expressed in reference to this matter; but I am dealing with it now as a question which the Government had in hand at the time they were called upon to raise money to carry on the affairs of this country; and I say that, dealing with it merely as a matter of construction, by lawyers in the Government, or by lawyers whom they might call to their aid, apart altogether from the opinion of the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), their legal adviser, it would not be going too far to say that they might read it in the way I have read it, and say that that section provided for these two cases—the one where the expenditure was not foreseen, and the other where the expenditure was not provided for by Parliament. Admitting, as I do, that the word "or" is not always used in statutes disjunctively, but is also sometimes used as explanatory of a preceding word; and has sometimes been construed as meaning "and," I say that is still a long way short of saying that this word must be so read in this case. So that it seems to me that the Government had authority for issuing the Governor General's warrant under the two branches of the statute. If that is so, or if there was reasonable ground for believing that they had authority, then what becomes of the constitutional question at this date in this new Parliament? It seems to me that the constitutional question is only put forward for some other purpose than to get the expression of Parliament on any con-

stitutional principle for future guidance. I do not know that there is anything the present Ministry could do that my hon. friends opposite would consider constitutional. I think, perhaps, there is one thing they might have done that would be considered quite constitutional by these hon. gentlemen ; that is, they might have voted the supplies in the sixth session of Parliament ; they might possibly, by reason of having voted those supplies, have stayed in Opposition ; and I dare say hon. gentlemen opposite would have considered it perfectly constitutional for the party on this side always to remain in Opposition. Apart from that, I am afraid it would be rather difficult to satisfy them. At the last election and before it hon. gentlemen opposite talked and acted as if they owned this whole country from ocean to ocean. It was my Parliament, it was my car, it was my everything else ; and, like master like man, they were the same all through the country. In fact the Liberals had no right to say anything or to own anything, and it would be only natural to suppose that their only constitutional course would be always to remain in Opposition. Unfortunately the Opposition did not take that view nor did the people, and we have crossed sides. Why are all these precedents put forward ? I submit that they are not in point. I can hardly hope to add anything to the argument of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on that point. This is purely a question of the construction of a statute. We can endorse many of the propositions which were made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. We can endorse them when they say that it is wrong to use public money improperly and that the necessity of the public service does not justify a violation of the statute. We admit all these aphorisms. This is not a question of what the law should be, but of what it is. But if it had been put forward, by way of resolution or suggestion or anything of that kind from the other side of the House, that this section ought to be amended to provide against anything of this kind being done in the future, two questions would have arisen. First, whether it would not be proper that such warrants should issue under similar circumstances, if you could conceive a similar circumstance ever arising again. The other question is, assuming that these circumstances would never arise again, would it be proper to pass statutes to prevent Governor General's warrants issuing on the eve of Parliament. If a suggestion of that kind were put forward, very likely some of the hon. members on this side would agree. But that is not the question submitted. It is simply a question of the construction of the statute as it is, and the Government were perfectly right, acting under the advice they got and in view of all the circumstances, in taking the course they did. The constitution is not in danger ; the treasury is in safe hands. There is no danger of this treasury being looted either by the Liberal Government, and that being so, the threatened danger is only threatened very remotely. The people feel that they are perfectly safe in this matter, and I would ask who it is that is raising an outcry about the constitution being in danger ? Have we heard of any public meeting on the question ? Have we heard it debated in the press except, so far as the press have discussed the question raised in this debate? Do we find that the men who are in trade complain of the Government having raised the money in this way ? Do we find that persons engaged on the canals or manufacturing enterprises are complaining ? Do we hear that merchants are complaining of their bills being paid by money thus put in circulation by the Government ? Has any class complained ? If we find no one complaining, why is this resolution now before the House—a resolution of want of confidence ? My understanding of responsible government is that the Government is responsible to the people. They must have a majority of members of Parliament at their back. If the Opposition think they are not acting in the interests of the people and protecting the people ; it is the duty of the Opposition to call attention to their conduct and see whether Parliament and the people approved of it, but in this case there is no such agitation, and no reason why anything of this kind should be done. This is a want of confidence motion, pure and simple. Now, if there is any reason for a want of confidence motion, it has certainly not appeared in public, and the public so far have not manifested the slightest interest in the matter. They desire, on the contrary, that the Government should have a fair trial and have time and opportunity to mature its policy and present it to the next Parliament.

Another objection is that the last of the Governor General's warrants was only issued the day before Parliament met. I observe, from my reading of the section that these warrants cannot issue when Parliament is in session. The Government were obliged therefore, if they issued this warrant at all, to issue it before Parliament met. If the Government had not done so then they would have been met with the difficulty which no one knows better than the members of the Opposition. We met on the 19th of August and it is now the 4th of September, and supplies have not been granted. This is in the natural order of things, under the procedure which hon. gentlemen opposite have rightly required to be gone through before supplies can be granted. If that be so, how much longer delay would there be if hon. gentlemen opposite desired to obstruct and prevent the money going into the hands of the treasury. There was no secret about this Governor General's warrant. It was issued before Parliament met, because after

Parliament met, these warrants could not issue, and the employees who were in want of the money would have to wait until it suited the pleasure of hon. gentlemen opposite to grant out of their goodness and kindness the supplies for carrying on the government. There is therefore no force or point in the objection that it was only the day before Parliament met that this warrant was issued. We are a practical people. This state of things in which we find ourselves, it has been said, is without precedent. These precedents that have been quoted certainly do not apply, because no circumstances such as existed at the time of the precedents quoted exist now; no such law as we are dealing with was under consideration at the time any of these precedents were established; and therefore they are not applicable. We are dealing with a new state of things; we are dealing with a statute that is peculiarly our own; we are dealing with circumstances that were, unfortunately, peculiarly the property of the Dominion of Canada. No other country ever had such a Government as our last one: no other country ever had such a state of things as was found to exist at the dissolution of the last Parliament. And if, as is admitted, no other country has a statute like this, there is no object in citing precedents when they have no application to the peculiar circumstances with which we are dealing. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in his address, distinguished between party reasons and public reasons. All I can say in answer to this is that the reasons the Government adopted were reasons for the public good; it seems to me, therefore, that they are public reasons, and the distinction the hon. gentleman draws, is, therefore, hardly in point. I listened with admiration to the addresses made during this debate. I think I received a great deal of instruction upon the point under discussion. I certainly listened with the greatest possible pleasure to the addresses of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). The industry and ability with which their side of the case was presented was certainly something to be admired and commended. I feel, however, that I cannot agree with the arguments they presented, and I have tried to consider this question as fairly as I can. The reasons I have given are reasons that have commended themselves to me, so that I am obliged to oppose the amendment. And further, even if not satisfied as I have been, as to the true construction of this statute or as to the construction that may be put upon it, I should have no reason to go against the Government and in favour of this amendment under these circumstances. The Government having read the whole Act, acted because they believed that this was urgently and immediately needed. The argument was addressed to the House that it could not be conceded that this money was urgently and immediately needed when some of it was for salaries payable in September. One hon. gentleman went so far as to say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had admitted that the Government's act was in part unauthorized. I did not understand the hon. Minister to make any such admission and I shall be surprised to know that he did make it. It appears to me that the phrase "urgently and immediately needed" must be read in the light of common sense. What is "urgent" in one case cannot be said to be "urgent" in another case. "Immediately" must be differently interpreted according to the circumstance of the case. Lawyers will appreciate the argument I use when I say that these words are used in very much the same sense as the words "reasonable time" which we find used in many cases. The interpretation is a question for the jury; it is governed by the peculiar circumstances under which the words are used. "Urgently and immediately needed" is as applicable to the money required for September as it was to the money required for August. We are in September now, and we may reach the end of September before the supply for these purposes is granted. And, at any rate, it was right for a forehanded Government, a Government that did not wish to wait for the last moment so that they might find themselves in a position of difficulty, the desire to be ready for any emergency that might arise in carrying on the affairs of the Government, to secure this money on the ground that it was urgently and immediately required within the fair meaning of the statute. It has been pointed out that the hon. Minister of Justice gave his opinion in favour of the issue of the Governor General's warrants. But the hon. member for Pictou says that that was not a reasoned opinion, and therefore it is not worth so much as it would be if it were a reasoned opinion. I do not know what is meant in that sense by a reasoned opinion. The Minister of Justice cites a section of the clause and certain words of the section. Surely it is going too far to say that the Minister did not read the section and consider it clause by clause in coming to such an opinion. If we read the section and consider it clause by clause in coming to an opinion, that is a considered opinion though it may not be so expressed. And, therefore, I say it was an improper use of the word to say that it was not a considered opinion. Then we have the Solicitor General. He has made his statement to the House as a member advising the Government. And these men, acting in good faith, having considered the matter and thinking it right and proper to use their power in this way, it would be, it seems to me, a very arbitrary and unfair thing for the House to condemn them as is sought to be done by the resolution proposed by the hon. member for York.

Thus I have tried to deal with the whole case in all its aspects. To recapitulate: The expenditure was not foreseen in the proper sense of the word. If hon. gentlemen say that that word means, foreseen by Parliament, I say that the Parliament that foresaw it is composed by individuals and is led and controlled by the Government, that the Government have to present these matters for the consideration of Parliament, as it is not permitted to private members to present Government measures, and the Government that was in existence at the time this expenditure was foreseen in the sense they put it is not this Parliament, and the persons who can provide for it are not the ones who foresaw it. The men who did foresee it could not provide for it, and the Parliament that could have provided did not foresee it. As to the other branch of the statute, I say it is quite within that, for the Government were advised that they had the right to take this course, and so, it seems to me, we ought not to object to their doing it. Then the money was urgently and immediately required within the fair meaning of these words. So that on a fair interpretation I submit that the Government were perfectly right in doing as they did. Then as a question of policy they were right. The duty was upon the Government to administer the affairs of this country. They were obliged to do what was necessary, what was urgently and immediately required, in the interest of the people of the country. They did not attempt to use the money for any improper purpose. There is no attempt to cast suspicion upon them that one penny of the money was to be used except for the good of Canada. I close by trying to emphasize what was said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) in suplementing the report of the case as given by hon. gentlemen opposite showed the House that in cases where they seemed to contravene the statute, their act would be authorized and justified so long as it was a reasonable and proper thing to anticipate that the House would, when asked to do so, vote the supply. For all these reasons I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. It is somewhat strange, Mr. Speaker, that those who have defended the action of the Government have differed amongst themselves, have misstated the facts, have flung principles that they had enunciated in this House to the winds, and they interpret the Act of Parliament in a conflicting manner. Now, the learned gentleman who has preceded me (Mr. Britton) has contended, as one or two other hon. gentlemen have ventured to contend, that the clause can be interpreted as if "or" is disjunctive. Well, it is hardly necessary to discuss that here, when we have the admission from the hon. and learned junior member from Halifax that the construction placed upon that clause upon this side of the House is the correct one; and when we have the admission from the hon. and learned member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that the construction placed upon that clause on this side of the House is the correct one. In fact I think the hon. member who has just spoken is the only one who has taken a different view, with the exception, to my great surprise, of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I must say that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in making an apology, has said things that he had, as it were by anticipation, denounced, and he was hardly the old member for South Oxford that this House has known in the past. He did try, in a halting and hesitating way, to make the contention made by my hon. friend who has just spoken, that you could interpret that clause as if it meant that the expenditures might either be unforeseen or unprovided for. Well, if it meant that Governor General's warrants may issue foi any expenditures that are unprovided for by this House, then Parliament, in passing that legislation, meant to denude itself of its most important function. Every other function of this Parliament is trifling compared with its duty to control the expenditure of the country; and if any expenditures that are unprovided for can be met by Governor General's warrants, then we should have a state of things like this, that appropriations might be brought down here to the extent of a couple of million of dollars, and that the thirty odd million dollars that would be necessary for carrying on the business of the country, and that were unprovided for, could be raised by Governor General's warrants. Now, Sir, that seems to me to be a "reductio ad absurdum." But, as I say, it is not necessary to dwell upon that view of the case, because it is conceded by men who can speak with authority, that, notwithstanding the letter of the Minister of Justice, the true interpretation of that clause is as if "or" were "and unforeseen and unprovided for." Now, it is a very peculiar thing also to find a gentleman who can speak with such evident authority as the junior member for Halifax, and who is evidently a highly instructed man, deprecating the discussion of a constitutional question because, forsooth, there is no disturbance in the country, and the public mind is not excited. Why, Mr. Speaker, is it likely that in the case of any attempt to override the safeguards of the constitution, and the safeguards of the cherished liberties of the people of Canada, and the safeguards of that great boon to the world, the British constitution—is it likely that you will find amongst the populace such a keen appreciation of the evils that an invasion of the constitution would work, that you would have public meetings, excited assemblages, with resolutions passed and petitions sent up to the House? Sir, look at the position We are not, forsooth, to discuss this ques-

tion. If the Government of Canada has done any injury to the constitution, if the Government of Canada has committed a crime and a misdemeanour against that constitution, we are not to arraign the Government here, we are not to condemn the Government, because the public mind is not excited. Why, it is one of the most extraordinary contentions, especially when made by a member of a profession whose members must know well that the constitution has not been built up, and has not been safeguarded by public meetings and excited assemblages, but by enlightened men, members of legislatures, and most of them belonging to the profession of the hon. and learned gentleman himself. Now, Sir, my hon. friend who has just taken his seat made a very extraordinary contention in interpreting this clause. He says: "The whole case rests on this, was the expenditure foreseen?" And he asks when and by whom? He says it could not have been foreseen by the present Government, and therefore the present Government need take no notice of the clause in the Act of Parliament, and we have nothing whatever to do with their conduct. Of course, the only persons who could foresee the need of that expenditure would be the Government of the time, and that they did foresee it is shown in the records of "Hansard" last year. My hon. friend from North Simcoe, who is not in his seat, made a misstatement and it is not the only instance of a misstatement of facts in his speech; and the speech of the member for Simcoe also fell far short of anything we have been accustomed to hear from him in this House. It may be stated of him as truly as of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the role of apologists for unconstitutional Ministers does not become them. Well, the need of that expenditure was foreseen, and my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster). I am in a position to say—and having said that I will pass away from it, because no doubt he will deal with it himself—the hon. member for York did make those appeals for a qualified vote, for a portion of the Estimates, that the hon. member for North Simcoe said he did not do.

Now the main argument, I take it, after all of hon. gentlemen opposite is the necessity of the case. They practically give up the construction of that clause, they practically admit that that clause is against them, and in fact the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is reduced to this: they say, what alternative had the Government? And they admit, like my hon. friend from Simcoe, that if an alternative can be stated that was within the power of the Government to take, and if they have not taken that alternative as a course preferential to invading the constitution, then the Government stands before this House worthy of the condemnation this resolution invites. Now, the hon. member for Simcoe says. What could they do? Suppose they had met Parliament on the 16th July, as they should have done, and as they could have done.

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said his friend the Whip, who sits near him, might have met the House, and asked, as he should have done, or some other hon. gentleman representing the Government should have done, for a vote of credit; and he asked how would they have been treated? How has the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) treated the Government from the very moment the Finance Minister appealed to him to give him a militia vote? I believe it was passed in fifteen or sixteen minutes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is not passed yet.

Mr. DAVIN. That is as regards concurrence; the vote was passed very rapidly; at all events, there has been no delay. If, under such circumstances, the Opposition refused to pass the votes asked, would not the responsibility before Canada rest at the door of the Opposition?

Mr. BRITTON. Some hon. members opposite do not believe that.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman dwelt on immediate necessity; and the Finance Minister, or whoever else asked for the warrants, must have asserted there was immediate necessity. What would immediate necessity mean? It would mean that the money was due. I say the money was not due. There are hon. members who will rise and support the Government on this occasion, and yet some members from these very benches formerly denounced dealing with public servants in any different manner than as employees of private individuals would be dealt with. I repeat, the money was not due. That money, asked for in June was not due, that money asked for in August was not due. The custom on the Hill here is to pay civil servants fifteen days before the money is earned. But I apprehend the bare fact that the custom is followed to oblige the civil servants, is not any justification for the Government of Canada invading the constitution. Outside of the men on the Hill, they are only paid as are servants of private individuals—they are paid when the money is due, at the end of the month, and in some cases not till the 10th of the following month. My hon. and learned friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) drew a vivid picture of the wheels stopping and the public machinery no longer doing its work, and he gave us a picture of a ship and told us that the lighthouse men would have ceased working. But they are paid only quarterly, and their money is not due yet. This is the dire necessity for which hon. gentlemen opposite have invaded the constitution, and done what the resolution of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster)

said, usurped power which does not properly belong to the Executive, and for which there was no necessity whatever. My hon. friend from Halifax, I rather think, was unjust to the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney). He referred to the hon. gentleman's quotation from Todd on "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," and he quoted my hon. friend so far as he went, and then said he did not go far enough, and he quoted the following sentence :—

Unless it may be presumed not only that both branches of the legislature will hold the expenditure itself unobjectionable, but also that they will approve of that expenditure being made in anticipation of their consent.

My hon. friend did not read far enough, said the hon. gentleman ; and it is a very common practice, as you know, Mr. Speaker, being a member of the long robe, yourself, for learned gentlemen to read authorities and sometimes read judgments just so far as it suits them. But if my hon. friend had gone far enough, he would have read as follows :—

The Governor was justified in accepting, as the interpreter of the public will, a ministry presumed to possess the confidence of the legislature, but if the law required him to do one thing, and his Ministers recommended him another course, it was his plain duty to obey the law ; and it would be idle to object that such obedience was unconstitutional ; for the Governor is himself a branch of the legislature.

When my hon. friend from Kent was reading this authority, to my great surprise another hon. and learned friend, the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) asked whether in the colony in question the same legislation obtained. It does not obtain. What does that mean ? It means that the case is stronger in Canada for the contention we make, because this legislation we are to-day discussing and interpreting, is not a clause giving license to a Ministry, but an Act restricting it in the exercise of a certain power. It restrains, it circumscribes, and it defines, and it so defines that no Ministry, as was stated eloquently in the speech delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1891, has any right whatever for any other purpose than for expenditures absolutely necessary, unforeseen and unprovided for, to obtain warrants. And in fact, what is the marginal note to the clause in question ? It is "accidents during recess." So that a state of things which comprises asking votes for all the departments and for running the whole civil business of the country was foreseen by the Ministry, which should have been allowed to provide for it : and you may just as well attempt to compress all the continent into a nutshell as to attempt to bring within four corners the extraordinary action of the Government in the present instance. It is a course that cannot in any way be justified from the point of view of constitutional precedent, or from the point of view of that common sense which some hon. gentlemen would enthrone above constitutional usage. The hon. member for South Oxford said that one ounce of common sense was worth a ton of precedents ; but I apprehend, in this Parliament, when we are commencing another term, that if the Government of this country, a new Government, has taken upon itself an utterly unconstitutional position and adopted an unconstitutional course, it behooves every man who is anxious for the welfare of this country and for the dignity of this Parliament and for its efficiency, to present here the true claims of the constitution, of which we are all proud and which we all revere, and within whose bounds we roam, and be prepared to defend that constitution. The First Minister, as the head of the Government, not only in this case specially, but in his general position, has taken unconstitutional ground, and for that reason it is of more importance that in a particular case like this we should protest against it as unconstitutional. I state this in passing, merely to emphasize the point I am making, that my hon. friend has come to Parliament at this moment to ask for Estimates, and yet we have had a Speech from the Throne in which there was no legislation outlined and no explanation of policy given. There is a precedent, I grant, in British history for coming down to the House with a Queen's Speech of that character, but there is no precedent for adopting the course of the First Minister remaining all the time in the House without explaining from his place the policy of the Ministry. There is a precedent, I say, in the Imperial House of Commons, when Estimates were asked, and the Queen's Speech promised no legislation, but then the leader of the House explained the policy of his Government. The position at the present moment is, that ab initio this Government has taken up an unconstitutional position, and therefore, a fortiori, we are bound to condemn their course in regard to these warrants. I have quoted from Todd, and I want to make another quotation for the behoof mainly of the gentlemen of the long robe. I have in my hand "Thirty years of Colonial Government" by Bowdin, and during the former deadlock in Victoria of 1867-8 ; Lord Canterbury in a memorandum addressed to the Minister, wrote as follows :—

It is clearly the duty of a constitutional government to look to parliamentary supplies, whether annual or fixed, and to parliamentary supplies alone, for meeting the liabilities of the government ; and it would be difficult to prove by abstract reasoning that the legitimate consequence, in a constitutional point of view, of the refusal of parliamentary supplies, is not the discontinuance of every service to the maintenance of which those supplies would, if available by the government, have been applied. Such a conclusion would, under existing circumstances involve the disbandment of the police, the cessation of discipline and inspection in the prisons and lunatic asylums, the discontinuance of the postal and railway services, and the complete disorganization of every branch of the public

service, excepting those for which provision is made by special Appropriation Acts.

And again:

Attention has been called here to the fact that when, in 1848, one branch of the legislature of British Guiana, under the influence of the planter oligarchy, had "stopped the supplies" in that colony, the governor was positively instructed by the then Secretary of State (Earl Grey) that "he must strictly confine himself to his legal powers, and that those public services for which he was refused the means of providing must be discontinued, even if this involved disbanding the police, shutting up the hospitals, and an interruption of the regular administration of justice."

Earl Grey, one of the greatest constitutional statesmen that England has produced, wrote:

For my own part, I greatly regretted the certain increase of the difficulties of the colonists, and the great danger to their lives and property which might arise from their refusing to the government the means of meeting the charges of the civil establishment, including the police; but I did not think that those who were determined to proceed to these extremities ought to be relieved from the consequences of their own conduct. On the contrary, I thought it absolutely necessary that they should be made to feel that we (i.e. the Imperial authorities) would not flinch from the course that we had deliberately adopted, and that they must be prepared to meet the consequences of their own measures, of which the responsibility would rest solely on themselves.

Sir, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) described the present Government as in the woods. He described them as in a fix. But, Sir, who got them into the wood? He described them as in a great difficulty; but who contrived the difficulty? Why, Sir, what has happened is, that a great constitutional difficulty was created by the hon. gentlemen themselves, and then when they found themselves face to face with that constitutional difficulty, they aggravated the position and they committed a flagrant breach of the constitution in order to solve the difficulty they had themselves created. And when the hon. and learned member (Mr. Russell) speaks of the Government as having been in a position that they could not get out of, he condemns them by implication for having taken that course, if there was a constitutional alternative. I say to him, that there was such an alternative, and I will ask the attention of the House while I point out what the alternative was. To begin with, they could have met Parliament on the 16th of July. They could have asked for a vote of credit from Parliament the very day that in my opinion they broke into the constitution of this country. But, suppose they thought that would be inconvenient, what was to prevent them having a prorogation for twelve days. If they had prorogued for twelve days they could have met here with many of the Ministers in their seats; they could have had a vote of credit then, and they could have had the civil servants paid up to the very hour any money was due them. Under these circumstances they could have avoided taking a course which if allowed to be a precedent, without the condemnation of this House of Commons, is a course capable of leading to the gravest possible evils in the future. One hon. member (Mr. Robertson) of Toronto who spoke with the authority of a great business man said that no harm had been done. Granted that no harm has been done; granted that this money improperly obtained has been properly applied; what is to prevent some other ministry not so perfect as the present one; what, if we acknowledge this principle, is to prevent a corrupt ministry, after Parliament rises, going to the Governor General and raising millions of money on warrants, and probably contriving the greatest possible evil to Canada. What is to prevent such a corrupt ministry upsetting our aims for the progress of this country which we all cherish, and it may be, laying the foundation of a most reprehensible procedure which we might not be able to destroy when we had discovered it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is for this House to ask itself: Has there been an unconstitutional act committed by this Government? If the House comes to the conclusion that an unconstitutional act has been committed, then I say it is the duty of every man in this House irrespective of party—in saying this I echo the appeal made from the Opposition benches in 1891 by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who asked every man in this House to express his opinion on the constitutional aspect of a question as he brought it before Parliament—I say that it is the duty of every man in this House, to whatever side he belongs, to condemn the Government if the Government has been guilty of unconstitutional conduct. Sir, I want to refer very briefly to what the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said in regard to the position taken by the Minister of Justice; and I must say that I was rather surprised to hear the tone taken by the member for Simcoe in regard to the Minister of Justice. He himself declared what his opinion of the true reading of the clause in the Act was, and he told us that he differed from the Minister of Justice; but he added: A man would be a brave man who would set up his opinion against the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat. Sir, a man would be a brave man who might set up his opinion against that of the Minister of Justice if he were presiding as a judge. If the Minister of Justice were to go back to the bench that he once adorned, and were to pronounce an opinion, I would not take his opinion always; but I would regard it with the greatest possible respect. I would consider him as an authority, but I would not treat his authority with any more deference than the authority of any other eminent lawyer; and when we have

eminent lawyers in this House endorsing our view of the interpretation of that clause, and have Maxwell here as an authority to confirm it, I do not think it requires an extraordinary amount of temerity to differ from the Minister of Justice when he is pronouncing an opinion, not merely as a lawyer, but as a member of a Government and a politician. And, Sir, my respect for that authority, speaking as a politician, is greatly diminished when I find that gentleman in another place, in response to questions in regard to another matter in which this Government is also concerned—questions in regard to the legal position and the legal rights of civil servants, and what they ought to do and ought not to do—speaking in this manner, as he is reported to have done :

> Sir Oliver Mowat said it was only a cause for removal. The question of removal was at the discretion of the Government. He frankly admitted that in Ontario officials worked "for the common good." They had plenty of opportunity of considering what would happen them did a Conservative Government come in, but the fact was that a Conservative Government did not come in.

Sir, when a man in his eminent position talks with that levity on a subject like that, I think it is calculated to minimize our respect for an opinion which I must still contend he gives not merely as a lawyer, but in part as a politician.

Now, Sir, in the course of this debate my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), to my immense surprise, also eulogized the Minister of Justice in this matter. I am sorry that hon. member is not here, because I should have liked to remind him that when this Government was formed he was very free with opinions about the ability, the authority, and the complete mental equipment of the present Minister of Justice, which were not quite consonant with the high opinion that he has expressed in the course of this debate. However, that is neither here nor there. The only point I wish to make on that subject is this, that I do not think that this House should feel that the argument from authority which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) gave us, is an argument that we should pay any attention to whatever. I do not dwell on the $7,000 vote, because I think that has been sufficiently dealt with.

Now, Sir, in 1887, when this subject was brought before the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he gave as a reason for bringing it before the House that we were at the commencement of a new term, and that there were a number of new members in the House of Commons. If my memory serves me correctly, there are a larger number of new members in this House of Commons than there were in the House of Commons of 1887, and I do not think that any subject could be brought before a House containing new members which would be of more importance than questions that relate to the main function of the House of Commons, and that touch our constitutional position. I repeat again the proposition I made at the commencement of these remarks, that there is no function of this House so important as the function of controlling expenditure ; and in my opinion there is nothing that should be so impressed upon all of us as this, that it is our duty to scan with a lynx eye the expenditure, and the action of the Executive in that regard. Well, Sir, I have heard remarks something like this in regard to the Executive : "Oh, they won't do this, they won't do that, they won't do the other." That, Sir, is not a position in which I have ever regarded the Executive. I have never held—and perhaps it is because I received some of my political education in looking down on the English House of Commons—I have never held that it was the proper course of a member of this House to completely efface himself before the Ministry of the day. I have never held that this House should efface itself. On the contrary, what is the Ministry ? Only servants of the Crown ; and not only servants of the Crown, but servants of this Parliament ; and, being servants of this Parliament, servants of the people of Canada : and I say that it is our duty not only to criticise what they do, but to press upon their attention those things that we think should be done in the interest of the people of Canada ; and if they will not do the things that we think they ought to do, we should, by every means in our power, force them to do them. I do not hold that it is wholesome for a Ministry, especially a Ministry just come into power, or for the House of Commons or the country, that Parliament should efface itself before them. For that reason I am glad that there are a considerable number of independent men in this Parliament, and we shall see whether these independent men will leaven public life to the extent that it was fondly dreamed by many they would do. This clause, Sir, is a lion in the path of a Ministry that would seek by indirection to accomplish either corrupt ends or ends that this Parliament had not approved of ; and if Parliament relaxes the hold that this clause gives it on the Ministry, it gives up a great part of its power. If the control which this clause indicates should be exercised by Parliament is given up, and if we take the view that provided a Ministry has a majority—which seems to be one of the arguments that impressed one hon. gentleman—and can hope to get a majority in the other House, then, forsooth, the Ministry can do anything ; that is not a view which I think will commend itself to any student of the English constitution. I consider that, Sir, a most dangerous view. It is a view that might give us a Ministry bent on carrying out just what its own whim would dictate, and bent upon courses that would be against the wishes of the

people and against the best wishes of the country.

Now, the hon. member for South Oxford referred to the fact that previous governments had made expenditures by means of Governor General's warrants, but he did not attempt to go into the instances in which they had done so. He himself said that two blacks would not make one white. But there is another reason. I have been diligent to look at what was done with regard to those warrants, and I could not find a single case in the past twenty-five years to parallel what was done by this Government. What do you find? You find, for instance, that in order to eke the expenditure on certain works a certain sum was needed, and to obtain this the warrant was issued. But there is not a single instance of a wholesale warrant such as that we are now dealing with, a warrant providing for the expenditure in a large number of departments, and in fact a course which, if we sanction it and make it a precedent, will enable any future Ministry to entirely override the control of Parliament over the expenditure. Not merely shall we have what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared an occasional invasion of the constitution, but we shall have, as in the present instance, a violation of the constitution. I consider that the resolution of the hon. member for York puts the case very clearly:

> That under those circumstances this House is of opinion that the issue of the said warrants was in contravention of the well understood principle of parliamentary control and abuse of the powers vested in the Governor General in Council in the said Act and by the said Act and a usurpation fraught with danger to public property and constitutional government.

The only excuse that can be given is that the Government was in the woods and had to get out, and many hon. gentlemen seem to think that there was no alternative. I have shown that there was a constitutional alternative, that these hon. gentlemen who have admitted that if there was a constitutional alternative the Government was bound to take it, must condemn the course of the Government as an invasion of the constitution, as overriding the control of Parliament in a high-handed way, as a wanton breaking in of the very walls and citadel of our constitution, and as a course that deserves the condemnation of Parliament, and such as will have the condemnation of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. After the lengthy arguments that have been advanced pro and con, it is not my intention to delay the House long, but as I do not wish to give a silent vote, I am constrained to state a few of the reasons why I support this motion. This is one of the most important questions which has engaged the attention of Parliament for a long time, because it is at the foundation of our system of constitutional government; and a violation of one of the principles upon which that constitution is based would be very serious in its consequences. Therefore, we are bound to guard that constitution with the greatest care. What was the statute intended for? It was intended to prevent the abuse of power by the Executive, to prevent their raising and paying money in a way that is contrary to law. There is no doubt that the history of the British Empire affords instance after instance where we have had grave offences committed upon the rights of the people where there was great injustice done the Parliament of the day, where the Crown was encroaching on the rights of the people to an extent that it was absolutely necessary to provide some remedy; and we, as one of the colonial dependencies of the British Empire, have endeavoured to provide a remedy, and have embodied it in the shape of a law, under which our Government have been acting for years. The ablest parliamentarians and some of the ablest lawyers we have had in this House have given expression to their views on this question; and so far as I can read, the highest legal opinion of the House is that the act of the present Government is not only a violation of the constitution, but an illegal act. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said that ours is the only colonial dependency which has this provision for the Executive raising and using money, and he asked what would the Government have done had they not resorted to it. What have they done in other dependencies of the British Empire under circumstances quite as difficult to overcome? They called Parliament together and got a vote of credit or they adjourned Parliament from day to day until such time as the money was provided, and no doubt the hon. gentlemen who, for the time being, control the destinies of Canada could have done the same thing. The consensus of legal opinion in the House is that the interpretation put upon the Act by the hon. members for York and Pictou is the correct one. The whole speech of the hon. member for South Oxford was an apology rather than a defence. He did not claim that he had acted in strict accordance with the law, but he said that under the circumstances, it was good policy. Now, it may be good policy to do something that is entirely illegal and unconstitutional, but it is not justification for the violation of the law or a breach of the constitution. There appears to be a difference of opinion as to how this law should read, as to whether the word "or" should be used as found in the Act or the word "and" substituted for it, but the most eminent lawyers, according to my reading, agree that it is a proper reading of the clause to read the word "and" instead of "or." According to this reading, the law requires that the expenditure should be both unforeseen and unprovided for.

Well, no one can pretend that the expenditure was unforeseen. Some have urged that the present Parliament could not have foreseen it because many of us were not members of the former House. But the point is whether the Government of that day had foreseen it. There can be no doubt that the expenditure was foreseen since an attempt was made last session to provide for it, and because that attempt was frustrated by hon. members on the opposite side of the House, who were then in Opposition, that can be no justification for the course taken by this Government. It is true that the expenditure was unprovided for, but my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has given the strongest reason why the contention that because it was unprovided for, the Government were justified in obtaining the warrants cannot hold. As the hon. gentleman pointed out, if a Ministry were in power who would not be as honest as those holding office, and who would be more venal, and who had a sufficient majority to support them, whether right or wrong, they might ask Parliament to vote only a million dollars and raise the other thirty-five millions by Governor General's warrants on the plea of urgent need. And, therefore, I think that argument cannot by any means hold good. Now, what did the hon. gentlemen fall back upon? They fell back upon excuses. They did not claim they had not violated the law; they did not claim that the Act was, strictly speaking, constitutional; but they tried to justify themselves by saying that the money was urgently needed and that this was the only way to get it. They say the country would have suffered, if they had not got it. These things are no justification. The man on the highway, who has no money, may feel that he urgently needs it; but that would not justify him in putting a pistol to the head of the first passer-by, demanding his pocket-book. But the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says that this is the only way in which they could conveniently get the money. The only way some men can conveniently get money is to forge a note. But that does not justify the act. Nor is such an argument a justification in this case. One may devise ways and means where another man would fail to do so. But because a man charged with the duty did not see any other way to raise the money, that does not justify them in doing an illegal act. Then, hon. gentlemen say a strict and legal interpretation of the law is so and so, and that the Minister of Justice, who gives advice to the Government, is justified in advising them that they had a right to take this step. I would like to ask these gentlemen, members of the legal profession, a question. Suppose that Act applied to individuals, and there were penalties attached to the violation of it. Suppose a private individual, who had violated the law, went to these gentlemen and paid them $25 fee, would they tell him: You are not guilty: you are strictly within your legal rights and justified in doing what you did? There is not one of these gentlemen would give that advice to a private individual. And, if it could not be correctly given to a private individual, it cannot be held proper and legitimate for a government. If a fair interpretation would not justify the act in a private individual, certainly it would not in the case of a government. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) endeavoured to enlighten the House on the subject, and I think he gave the best illustration of the old adage: When you have no case, abuse the plaintiff's counsel. He did not advance argument, nor did he attempt to give a fair interpretation of the law; the whole course of his speech was abuse of the Opposition. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) talked around the question, without trying to grapple with it. His exposition reminds me of what the professor said when he was asked to give a definition of chemistry. He said: You take an effervescent, and add a delequescent; there will be a precipitation; that is a conglomeration and amounts to a demonstration. That was as plain to my mind as the hon. gentleman made the legal aspect of this case. The hon. member is a gentleman of high legal attainments, no doubt. But I said to a friend, while he was speaking: I believe he is afraid to put on record his legal opinion on this question, for fear that some time in the future it may be quoted against him in the House. He knows his friends have done what was unjustifiable, and, as he cannot offer a proper defence, he is simply trying to mystify his hearers. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) gave several reasons. For instance, he asked: If the House had been called together, how do we know that the gentlemen of the Opposition would have voted the Estimates without delay and trouble; we know they are not disposed to be too agreeable now, and, if they had been called together in the dog-days, what would they have done? That is a gratuitous assumption, and one that we have no right to make. We must assume that men come here to do their duty and to get through the work before them in due course. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should make such an assumption. But he gave several other reasons that I thought about as unfair. He said: What else could the Government do? And because he could not tell what else they could do, therefore, he held that they were justified in breaking the law. I do not agree with him. He said that this was the most convenient way for them to raise the money. But that did not make it legal or constitutional. Urgent need is given as a justification. But, as I have stated, you might cite a hundred cases of urgent need, but merely to establish the fact of that urgent need is not to justify the violating of an Act of Parliament. Nor can that justification

be fairly urged in this case. In this debate cases have been cited in English history where there was the most urgent need, where not only one branch, but many branches of the civil service were blocked, to the serious injury of the country. But that was not given as a reason to justify the Government in violating the law. It is said that the service of the country would have suffered, if this course had not been taken. Many people suffer because things are not done, but though the suffering were ten times as great as it is, that would be no justification for violation of the law. But is it a fact that any great suffering would result? Would any great hardship result, if the members of the civil service were not paid on the 15th, seeing their money is not earned until the end of the month? Would there be any injustice to those members of the service who are not paid until the last of the month, if they are not paid until that time? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) admitted that, with regard to a portion of the money, the act might be illegal—some $7,000 or $10,000. That shows either great laxity on the part of the individuals charged with the duty, or a want of knowledge or desire to do right. If they were not sufficiently conversant with their duties to know that they were seeking to get money in an illegal manner, that fact is not a great compliment to their intelligence. If they showed negligence of their duty, if they overlooked it, it is equally against them as business men; and if they did not know it and still raised this money illegally, I can only say it was much worse still. Now, whatever justification there might have been for issuing the first Governor General's warrant, there is certainly, in my opinion, none for the second. It is contended by some that there would have been considerable hardship if the first warrant had not been issued, but certainly that cannot apply to the second, because the second was issued only one day before this House was called together. We have already voted, within a period of less than one hour, over $460,000 for militia purposes in Canada. Is that an evidence that the House would not be prepared to assist the Government in getting a vote of credit in case an emergency like this arose, provided it was asked for at the beginning of Parliament? I say there is no reason to believe that the Opposition in this House would not join willingly in giving the Government a vote of credit to carry on the affairs of the country, provided there was need. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), I think, said that if the Government had met the House they could not have got the money. Well, if the House would not have given it, there must have been something wrong; and from his standpoint he is assuming that there was something wrong, because if it was right, the House would have given it without any trouble, and I say I am justified in believing that the House would have given it, provided the Government had asked it, as a great deal of that money, and in fact all of it, was needed for payments that would accrue after the meeting of this House. I say whatever justification there may have been for issuing the first warrant, there is certainly none for the second.

Now, it seems to me there are a few reasons why we should support the amendment of the hon. member for York. First, because we should be very careful not to establish a bad precedent, and I think hon. gentlemen will admit that it would be a bad precedent if that act were sanctioned by this Parliament. One hon. gentleman has said, Oh, it is a matter of no importance, and you have no right to challenge the conduct of the Government; but the Minister of Trade and Commerce said with regard to that:

> I admit frankly that the present Government assumed a grave responsibility, for which they may be rightly called to account before this House, in issuing the Governor General's warrants which they did upon the dates the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Now, he recognizes that it is the right and duty of this House to call them to account for it. The hon. gentleman gave several instances where he himself and other supporters of the Government have admitted that the very principle we are contending for now is the correct principle. Well, because the hon. gentlemen opposite did not give heed to their own arguments, is that a reason to say that the arguments are not sound? Now, hon. gentlemen who advanced those arguments—and they were advanced by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, by the Hon. Mr. Blake, by the Hon. Mr. Mills, and by several other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House—they were either wrong then, or they were right. They advanced them believing them to be right, I assume they did, because I have no right to assume that they are not honest men. They believed their arguments to be sound and applicable then to the very question at issue to-day. Now, if they were correct when they were in Opposition, they must be correct to-day when they are in power. If their arguments were correct then in condemning a government who were violating that very principle, then their arguments are equally correct to-day; and it is no justification to say that because the arguments were not heeded by the Government of the day, that therefore they were unsound. It would be stultifying their own manhood, it would be declaring that they were dishonest at the time, and that the arguments they advanced then were not sound. Now, if those arguments were sound when they were cited, I say that no stronger condemnation could be given of the conduct of the men who were instrumental in issuing those warrants than those very arguments. When men have been brought

face to face with their own records, with their own reasoning, with their own interpretation of law, and they won't admit it, what conclusion can we come to with regard to them ? Certainly not a very favourable one. Then I say we are justified in supporting this resolution because, in the first place, we do not want to establish a bad precedent. We know how prone constitutional lawyers are to have regard to precedents, and we know how prone judges are to have regard to precedents, and how often lawyers quote precedents as a justification for this or that. Then I say, knowing that, it becomes of great importance that we look well into it, and not establish a bad precedent, and I think many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House admit themselves that if we allowed this to go without challenge, it would be establishing a bad precedent. Certainly if we establish this precedent it will be quoted by constitutional authorities in the future as a justification for doing the same thing. Then I oppose it because I believe it to be illegal. I will not take my own interpretation of the law, but I will take the strict interpretation of the law given by the hon. member for North Simcoe, by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, by the member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), and by several other prominent legal gentlemen who, on that side of the House, have agreed with the interpretation put upon the law by the hon. member for York. Then I say it is an illegal act, and for that reason I support the amendment. I support the amendment because the act of the Government is unconstitutional, and because so much trouble has arisen in the early history of our country, and in other dependencies of the British Empire, where violations of the constitution have taken place. We are supposed to know our constitution better than those who have gone before us, we should profit by the experience of the ages, and for that reason, if for no other, I shall support the amendment. I support it because it condemns the Government for doing what I believe to be an unconstitutional act, and what I believe would be establishing a bad precedent, if we allowed it to pass without challenging it from this side of the House.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. As there are so few members in the House at this hour, I think it would be becoming on my part to move that this debate be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, go on.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well, Sir, the law on this subject, is as follows :—

If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof ; or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good ; then, on report of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.

The question before the House is whether under the circumstances that occurred it was advisable and justifiable for the Government to ask for a warrant from His Excellency the Governor General in order to cover the amounts required to pay the current salaries of the officials of the Government. The elections which have just been held took place on 23rd June last, as every hon. member of this House will remember very well. On 10th July, the late Administration handed in its resignation, that date being very shortly after the elections. But from the moment the result of the elections was known through the press we were informed that hon. gentlemen sitting to-day on the other side of the House had a Cabinet already organized, and were prepared to take the positions which were to become vacant, and also that their policy was well and carefully laid down and prepared, it having been discussed during the elections. Therefore, any further delay in the organizing of a new Government was not required, at least in accordance with the statements which appeared in the public press. A good many days were allowed to pass in organizing a Government, which to-day is not yet complete, because there is still a portfolio, which is supposed to belong to the province which I have the honour to represent, not yet filled, but that is not the fault of Parliament or of the law. If fault there be, it is the fault of the party in power. The new Government, after this attempt to organize, instead of allowing this House to meet on 17th July, as duly called, postponed the assembling of Parliament, when there was no absolute necessity for doing so. The House might have met as duly called on 17th July, and thereby the necessity of issuing those special warrants would have been avoided. Then it was through the incapacity of the Government to meet the House, as was its duty, that involved the necessity of this breach of the law in regard to the issue of Governor General's warrants. As has been stated by some hon. gentlemen, if an excuse can be brought for the issue of the first warrant, the same ground does not exist with respect to the second.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should say "yes," because the latter one was issued the day before the opening of Parliament, and within twenty-four hours the power might have been secured in due course from the proper authority. I say, that the first important act of the present Adminstration has been a breach of the law, and a breach that has

on several occasions been condemned by leading members of the present Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then it has been a common practice, apparently, on the part of the late Government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It has been a common thing on the part of the present Government to reproach the late Government for doing what hon. gentlemen opposite now think they are justified in doing, because they are in power. All that was bad when we were in power has become good, because hon. gentlemen are now in the positions we occupied previously; and I may say, though perhaps it has no relation to the present subject, that judging by the way hon. gentlemen are acting they not only steal our faults, but they are on the eve of stealing our old policy, and we will know after next session whether even our fiscal and trade policy has not been stolen by the other side of the House, because hon. gentlemen in getting into those seats will find them warm enough not only to accept them, but to accept our policy as well.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then you will support them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Yes; if they frankly and honestly adopt our policy I will give them a frank and honest support, and I believe every hon. gentleman on this side of the House will do the same. On the present occasion the Government have made a mistake; not only have they made a mistake, but they have broken the law, for they have taken from Parliament the power to vote public money and order its expenditure, and they have taken the responsibility of making an expenditure which is entirely under the control of the House. If that should be allowed, why should we meet,—why should we incur this expenditure for calling the House together to vote Estimates? If the Adminstration has power to get from the Governor General a warrant in order to cover not only extraordinary expenditures which may be required, but all expenses for running the machine, what is the use of having a Parliament and a legislature, and of calling upon the people to elect members to come here and transact the public business of the country. I am surprised that the first important act of the present Administration should be one that cannot be called anything else but a breach of the law. If they keep on at that rate, if they are allowed to think they are vested with power to run the country just as they please, whether it is legal or not, I am afraid, Sir, that before very long the people of Canada will have discovered that they have made a mistake in entrusting the present Administration with the reins of government. At this late hour of the night and late stage of the debate, I shall not review the arguments brought forward in the discussion of this important question, but I merely confine myself to the wording of the law, which I interpret, not as a member of the bar, but as a practical business man. Under the circumstances, I fail to see that there was any ground at all for the Government to rest its case upon in securing the money under these warrants. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I enter my protest against this action of the Government, and I will gladly support the motion made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I wish to know if the Government would consent to an adjournment of the debate, as it is now after ten o'clock, and there are very few members in the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Better proceed.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, in this matter, which has been discussed for some time in the House, we have a question of a peculiarly important character, and one on which, perhaps, many members of the House wish to state the reasons which may induce them to vote on the one side or the other. It is only at rare intervals that such an important question can come up for discussion. It is very seldom that a similar chain of events can possibly occur, because, as has been frankly admitted from the other side of the House, the circumstances surrounding the case under consideration are altogether exceptional, and it might be a long time in the life of many of those present before there can be a recurrence of them, or before such a peculiar straining of the constitutional power of the Government could be known in this country. The taking of large sums of money by the Government through the agency of Governor General's warrants has been defended, and justified by hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, for a variety of reasons and in a variety of ways. There is one rather singular circumstance which has arisen in this debate. Although the occasion is one of great gravity, and although the Government is being charged with, perhaps, the gravest offence it could be guilty of in a constitutionally governed country, namely, that of violating the constitution and not administering, with strict regard, the laws of the country; yet, so far, the members of the Government have not seen fit—with the exception of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—to set up any of their own members to defend this act of theirs and to meet this attack of the Opposition. A number of their supporters have spoken, it is true, and they have possibly urged the same arguments, with perhaps as much force as they could have been urged by Ministers, yet, when students of our history come to read this volume of "Hansard," and try to reach a conclusion from this debate, they will find that these gentlemen who are charged with acting unconstitutionally and without due regard to

the laws of the country, have not thought proper to defend themselves on the floor of Parliament against the attacks of the Opposition, which have been, I maintain, urged with great candour, with great fairness, and I think I may also be pardoned for saying, with great ability as well. The attack in this case was led by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), who certainly showed that the occasion was one of serious importance. He brought his great and perhaps unrivalled powers as a debater to the service of his country on this occasion, and he made the case against the Government so strong that I am sure that every one who heard this debate must have remarked that even so practised and accomplished a debater as the Minister of Trade and Commers (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not show to advantage in replying to the attack made by the member for York (Mr. Foster). The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) seemed hampered, and gave every manifestation of the fact that he felt he was defending a bad cause. Perhaps it would occur to the members of the House: it would, very possibly, occur to citizens of the country who come to a knowledge of our transactions from reading the daily press, that the great discussion in which we are now engaged in this high court of Parliament, in this grand assize of the nation, as the Premier characterized Parliament, the other day—it would perhaps occur to them that this was apparently a waste of time. We find that on the Government side of the House there is a majority ready to use the force of numbers, ready to call into play what might be called its brute strength, to vote down and to repel the attack led by the Opposition. On the other hand, the Opposition are pledged by the action taken by their leaders, and by the opinions they have themselves expressed, to adhere to the position they have taken, and to persist in this trial of strength until they are actually defeated by that recourse to the force of numbers which it is in the power of the Government to use in their defence. Although we know beforehand what the result may be, and although we know that the Government have marshalled their friends to their support, and that although the arguments of this side of the House may conclusively prove that a great constitutional principle has been violated and an Act of this Parliament administered without due regard to its sense and meaning, still we owe it to our constituents and to our duties as representatives of the people of Canada, to protect, as far as we can, the basic principles of our constitution. Now, Sir, it might be argued that for that reason it was not the duty of the Opposition to persist in this attack. It might be held that it would have been enough for some representative gentleman on this side of the House to have simply stated the opinion of the Opposition, and to have given expression to the arguments which could be used against the action of the Government, and then, recognizing the fact that in the end the Government could not submit to their view, but must marshal their supporters and overcome the Opposition, by force of numbers, allow the matter to pass, being content simply with entering their protest against what has been done. But, Sir, it is not in that way that an Opposition must manage its business, or represent that portion of the population of the country that it is sent here to represent: and I may say, referring to the fact that we are discussing what is admitted to be the great, the central, the most important principle of all these constitutional principles around which our system of Government has grown up from rude and weak beginnings to that position in which it stands to-day, when the people represented in the House of Commons are so powerful, and so completely is their authority acknowledged, that one of the best and ablest speakers on the Government side of the House—I refer to the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell)—argued that we should not consider this subject at all; because, he maintained, even if in this particular the Government acted unconstitutionally, even if in this particular the rights of the Commons of Canada had been invaded, and injustice and wrong had been done, yet so strongly entrenched is the Commons of Canada in this great, inherited right of parliamentary control that even a breach of privilege or an injury done to the constitution could not be permanent, and why? Because that hon. gentleman would have gone on, if he had unfolded his argument, to say that even if such offences could occur, they would only be repeated with sufficient frequency to attract the attention of the people, and to arouse in their hearts and minds a sentiment that there was danger to their rights, and they would rally to the support of the Opposition, and drive from power any Government that was presuming too far on the support of its majority in Parliament. But, Sir, it is not proper that this act should be allowed to pass unchallenged; for if, as we on this side contend, a constitutional principle has been violated and an Act of Parliament has been strained in its interpretation by this Administration for their own convenience, then I maintain that it is our bounden duty not only to speak, but by our votes to mark in the most solemn manner possible our protest to show that even if the Government has, for reasons of expediency and policy, made up its mind to step beyond the line that marks its rights and privileges and powers, the representatives of the people in Parliament—the representatives of the minority, if I have to use that expression—are determined to direct the attention of the people to what has been done, and to make it apparent and evident that the Government of this country cannot commit such acts and hope to escape condemnation.

Now, Sir, no better proof of a bad and weak case can be found than the fact that poor or weak arguments are advanced in its defence: and when you find hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House advancing the most contradictory arguments, one gentleman answering another, and one practically tearing to tatters the arguments of another, you must come to the conclusion, if you believe in reason and common sense, that one or more of these contradictory sets of arguments are unsound and futile; and the very fact that they are set up in defence of the position the Government assume ought to be a sufficient proof to the people of the country that the Government have in this matter acted in a manner which they cannot successfully defend. Take, for instance, the argument of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). What was the wretched expedient—and I regret that I should be required to speak thus of the argument of a man whose great ability in debate is fully recognized here—what was the wretched expedient to which he was driven in defending the Government's course? He was driven to that wretched expedient, which he had to set up as his main defence, that his party had in the last session of the late Parliament resorted to an unconstitutional act, in order to deprive the Government of Canada, on the eve of dissolution, of those supplies which were necessary for carrying on the affairs of the country. A similar act on the part of an opposition in Great Britain would be called a constitutional wrong-doing. The hon. gentleman justifies the action of the Government in this instance in that act of wrong-doing perpetrated by himself and his supporters; and he was followed in the same argument by some other hon. gentlemen, in whose hands it was less unbecoming, because they do not occupy the same high position in this country as that hon. gentleman. Some of these hon. gentlemen have treated this matter with levity, and with expressions of contempt thrown across the floor at various hon. members on this side, while the majority at their back have encouraged and justified them by laughing at and contemning the efforts of the Opposition in condemning their conduct. I suppose it is not a very original observation to say that the criticism of the Government might be pursued on two different lines—first, on the line of legality of the course they followed, and secondly, on the line of the expediency of that course. The junior member for Halifax twitted his colleague the senior member (Mr. Borden) by saying that that hon. member, while professing to treat this as a legal question, had only devoted two or three minutes to the consideration of the legal question, and had devoted the rest of his time to considering the policy of the Government's course. Did not the junior member for Halifax fall into precisely the same error? He devoted a portion of his time, it is true, to the legal aspect of the question; and while I admire that hon. gentleman's legal ability, I found it exceedingly difficult to follow his argument. In fact it was so complicated that it realized to my mind that thicket in which he said the Government of this country were at one time involved. But the main, almost the only, defence has been that it was a matter of expediency, or a matter of policy; and I suppose the latter is the better word for them to use, though expediency is the honest word to use; because if their course is described justly, it must be called a course of expediency; and hon. gentlemen do well to rely on the defence that it was a policy of expediency; because the defence set up by the Minister of Trade and Commerce was set up only by wresting the sense of the statute, provided we are to be guided in determining that sense by the lawyers of eminence in the House who followed him; for, while he maintained that three different sets of circumstances were described in the statute—one, that of sudden accident, one, that of unforeseen circumstances, and one that of unprovided circumstances—under which the power of the statute might be involved, he was only enabled to do so by an interpretation of the Act as to which he was flatly contradicted both by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). These gentlemen amply sustained the contention of the hon. member for York, who argued that in interpreting the statute, its proper sense and meaning could only be learned by treating the word "or" where it occurs as "and," and I am sure that any one who listened to the argument of the hon. member for York that if you did accept the statute in the form in which it is and did not substitute "and" for "or," you would make the whole statute practically inoperative, except as regards its first clause describing the conditions where a sudden accident or catastrophe occurred, could not fail to be convinced. If you admit that in addition to the circumstances of some unforeseen accident or catastrophe happening, causing loss which had to be met by expenditure on the part of the Government, the Government may take the same means to raise money in other cases not provided for, then you give the Government of the day free permission to draw on the treasury when it pleases. It may happen at any time that some service will not be provided for, and apparently all that is necessary is to go to the Minister of Justice and tell him that in your opinion there is urgent necessity for certain expenditure which has not been provided for; and if he is disposed to accept your reasoning, you can obtain a Governor General's warrant by virtue of his opinion. I may say that the urgent necessity of the expenditure in this case has not been attempted to be proved by any one. If

you can point to the fact that through your own carlessness or neglect or indifference you did not provide for a certain service, this Government or any other Government will be in a position, provided it is armed with a Minister of Justice whose authority is as great as his interpretation of the law is poor, to draw any money it may require under Governor General's warrants. That would not be a safe position for the country to be in. The control of Parliament over expenditure is the great principle which is at the basis of a free Parliament. Without this inspiring idea in the minds of the Commons of England, without their determination not to allow the Government to spend any money without their sanction, the Commons of England would never have fought their way through centuries of difficulty and struggle to the full and free acceptance of that principle which is the right they most dearly cherish to-day. This was never better put than it was by the junior member for Halifax, when he said it was so strongly impressed in the minds of the Anglo-Saxon people that it is the corner stone of our parliamentary system and the palladium of our liberties, that even a breach of it endorsed by Parliament would fail to disturb the confidence of the people in the sense of security by which they hold that principle. That is one reason why we ought in this Parliament to give the clearest decision on that question ; and it is only to be hoped that this precedent, about to be established by the followers of the Government, may soon be overruled by some later and sounder decision to be given in this Parliament. We know very well that progress is not made without certain retrogressions. We know that the tide does not advance with a steady even flow, but that it appears to retire only to advance again steadily and gradually until it covers the shore. In like manner we look upon these ebbs and flows in the advance of our parliamentary institutions as mere temporary and trifling mutations, and it is to be hoped that even if this Parliament be now imbued by the idea of policy and expediency which appears to prevail on the Government benches and the necessity to uphold party interests, to the extent of recording upon "Hansard" what we all must look upon as a most dangerous and unfortunate innovation, it will at an early day take an opportunity to show that it acknowledges its error and return to the sound principle of only authorizing the expenditure of money to carry on the business of the country, which has been raised by the Government with the sanction of Parliament in the ordinary constitutional manner. The Government in this matter, as in a great many others, is in a very unfortunate, unhappy and difficult position, one in which they deserve no sympathy from hon. gentlemen on this side. I believe that they have been led into this morass by the very fact that they allowed themselves to be governed by what they conceive the requirements of party, and during last session followed an unconstitutional course. It is sad and regrettable to see a man who has held so long the proud position which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has held as one of the leaders of his party, argue that he and his party were justified last session in refusing the supplies to Her Majesty, and embarrassing the then Government. Why did he take this course ? Because he knew that by following that course he would derive for himself and his friends a certain amount of party advantage and place his opponents in an embarrassing position. If he did not rise to any higher idea, he was not particularly sensitive to the shame in which he stood, he was honest enough to admit frankly that no consideration of the necessities of the public business had weight with him but that the only consideration which did have weight with him and his supporters was to embarrass the Government. Was that a proper and dignified course for the Liberal party of Canada to follow ? I believe that no greater humiliation shall ever come to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce than to have it recorded that he exposed his own shame and the shame of his party by his defence in this House of their course last session, and I think that would be punishment enough. If hon. gentlemen on this side, when they occupied the Government benches, had no higher idea of their duty and responsibility, if they had no idea that their positions were for any other purpose than party advantage, they might have resorted to some expedient which would have prevented the Opposition from embarrassing them. Why, when they found themselves leading a hostile Parliament, when they found a deliberate organized conspiracy to defeat all their measures and deny the means to the Government of carrying on the administration, why should they not have used their powers and prerogative to prorogue Parliament and send these gentlemen who obstructed the business back home, and then have recourse to Governor General's warrants. They could have administered the government of the country by Governor General's warrants just as well as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. If this country was given merely as a tool or instrument to be used by the Opposition of that day for their own party advantage and to place certain gentlemen in power, it could not have been used more shamelessly and unblushingly than it was used by the late Opposition in the last session of Parliament. And I simply say that they are going on in the ignoble course upon which they entered last session, a course which they know themselves is in defiance of constitutional usage and that wrests the plain meaning of the Act of the legislature. And for what ? Is it for the good of the country ;

to set up a high example of how government should be carried on in a country containing an intelligent population which can send to Parliament such men as those who have adorned this legislature from confederation to the present day? Is it to show such an example and teach such a lesson to the world, or is it simply to use this country as a means for the party advantage of certain gentlemen? Now, Sir, I maintain that in so far as the defence has been attempted on the line that the action of the Government was justifiable, because circumstances compelled them to follow this course, that these circumstances, were such as induced them to refuse to vote supplies in the last Parliament, and that they can fairly blame the late Government for creating these circumstances, is a complete failure; or, if it is a success, I congratulate hon. gentlemen on the position in which they have placed themselves in the eyes of Canada by achieving that success. But, Sir, I am sure that even if we abandon the consideration of the general principle, even if we abandon the consideration of the Act in its entirety, all we have to do is to look into some of the details of this transaction to see plainly that if these gentlemen have not acted very irregularly or followed out a course of wrong-doing, they have at least shown the utmost laxity in administering their duties as the Government of Canada. Even if we admit that they were justified in drawing from the Treasury on Governor General's warrants, such sums as would pay for certain services of the country, will that justify them in all the expenditures they have made under these warrants? Why, Sir, it was admitted here on the floor of Parliament by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that in respect of one at least of the sums they have drawn from the Treasury, their position was absolutely indefensible. And, if this Government, after all its promises of purity and good government, after having been prepared by eighteen years of discipline and eighteen years of example of how a Government should be conducted, after coming into power, within the space of a few days has done so great a wrong as that we are now dealing with, and, after the passage of another month has repeated that wrong,—can it be fairly contended, as it has been contended—that the hon. Premier of this country is a gentleman of such brilliant statesmanship? And we have heard so much of his statesmanship during the course of this contest. Can it be an evidence of his statesmanship that he has in his very first act, violated a constitutional principle, wrested the statute and done a great wrong? For we have it on the testimony of his own Minister of Trade and Commerce, delivered here upon the floor of Parliament that, in so far as $7,000 included in these warrants is concerned, the position of the Government is absolutely indefensible.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Some of these hon. gentlemen laugh. They are good at laughing. They have $7,000 to which they are not entitled.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has it come down to that.

Mr. BELL (Pictou.) We may not have come down to it, but we have it as a starting point, and we have it on the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. And if we are not misled by the statements of the hon. member for York, when the Supplementary Estimates are laid on the Table, we shall find that we have climbed from $7,000 to many millions; and one more of those promises, one more of those illusory hopes held out to the people of Canada by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, will have gone to pieces. If it be true, as I believe it is, that the Government are involved in this Act, which certainly is going to be a bad record for them—the first blunder so far as we know, though there may be others—if they are involved in it by their own wrong-doing of last session, then it is one fine instance of retributive justice, and we may hope to see them suffer from the same cause in many cases in the future. In my mind it is impossible to defend the position of the Government, and the best proof of that is the fact that I cited when I began to address the House—that the argument of one of their supporters are answered by those of another. The Minister of Trade and Commerce in his interpretation of the law is flatly contradicted, not only by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), but by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), both of whom announced their intention of supporting the Government upon this question. If anything more were required to show that in respect of all these transactions the Government are absolutely indefensible, it would be the employment of such vague, futile, I might almost venture to say dishonest arguments as have been used in the course of this debate both in the discussion as to the legality and in that as to the expediency of their conduct. In one case they are directly contradicted by their own supporters, and in the other they have to admit wrong-doing and show such devotion of themselves to their party instead of to their country as will redound to their shame when it comes to be known by the people of this country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I do not think that any person who has had much parliamentary experience, would be at all discouraged

by the expressions that reach us from the other side of the House. Such a one as the last we heard, is a sound proceeding from vacancy—a peculiar, hollow sound; and it could not be expected that much intelligence would be found in the nighbourhood of the organ by which it was emitted. We cannot be expected to furnish more than argument to hon. gentlemen opposite. The capacity for understanding argument, if it has been denied by the Creator—and that laughter would indicate such a state of affairs—must be supplied by some Power greater than any in this House. To one who has had Parliamentary experience—and we will get it, I suppose—it is a well understood fact that it is the privilege of majorities to laugh at, and sneer at, and deride, every effort of an opposition to stop them in their course or to point out to the country the wrong in what they are doing. But that does not disconcert us; it ought not to disconcert us. The more these gentlemen disregard the voice of reason, the more they laugh and sneer at that which is the voice of the country, the sooner they will reach that downfall in which the good of Canada requires them to be involved at an early day.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the leader of the House if he would consent to an adjournment, as my remarks may be somewhat extended.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, go on; if they want the ounce of flesh, let them take it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, if the hon. gentleman is so inclined.

Mr. HAGGART. No; I think we can agree to adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was willing, but the member for York objects to it, so I do not care.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we had better adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if we can conclude this debate at the next sitting of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would like to have an assurance that we will.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be most happy to have the debate concluded at the next sitting.

Mr. HAGGART moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before the House adjourns, I would like to move:

That the name of Mr. Scriver be substituted for the name of Mr. Fortin on the Private Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Taylor for Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill No. 12) to incorporate the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.—(Mr. Bain.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 15) to amalgamate the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company, under the name of Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. The object of the Bill is to improve the position of the officers and men of the North-west Mounted Police. It is to provide that promotion shall be made from the ranks, and that officers, other than the commissioner, the assistant commissioner, and the medical officers, shall be appointed from among those who have served in the ranks, or from graduates of the Royal Military College, Kingston. At present the officers of the Mounted Police suffer from a disability in this way; they come under the Superannuation Act, and if a man has been sergeant-major for a number of years, and who would have a good allowance if he retired from the force as sergeant-major, yet if he becomes an officer of the Mounted

Police, and wished to retire a few years afterwards, he would have a very insignificant allowance. The other provision is to provide that in counting the superannuation of an officer it shall not be counted from the day of his receiving his commission, but from the time he has served in the Mounted Police.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PILOTAGE ACT.

Mr. McDOUGALL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to further amend "The Pilotage Act."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The object of the Bill is to amend chapter 59 of the Pilotage Act. Under that section certain ports in the maritime provinces have the power to exempt from pilotage a certain class of steamships. This exemption is brought into effect at the instance of the pilotage authorities, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The pilotage authorities of Sydney some years ago took advantage of that provision to exempt from pilotage certain vessels entering that port. Since that time the number of vessels entering the port under that privilege has increased so largely that a great deal of the time of the pilots has been spent in meeting these vessels without any remuneration to the pilots. When coming towards the port, these vessels are required to show a white flag, and for that reason they are known as white-flag steamers; but during dark weather it is impossible to distinguish a white flag from any other, and the pilots are consequently obliged often to go a long distance to meet one of these steamers, only to find that it is a white-flag steamer. For these reasons it is considered that it would be advisable, in order to maintain the efficiency of the service, to do away with this exemption, and to impose on these vessels pilotage dues to the extent of one-half of the regular rate.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PORTFOLIO OF THE INTERIOR.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government if any progress is being made with reference to the appointment of a Minister of Interior. It is very unusual, I believe, for so long a period to elapse without the appointment of a Minister under the circumstances as they exist, and I think it would be interesting to the House to know if there is a probability of a Minister of the Interior being appointed at an early day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I shall be able to give an answer to the hon. gentleman's question on Thursday.

SUPPLY BILL.

The resolution adopted in Committee of Ways and Means (4th instant) was reported and read the second time, and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $446,500 required to defray certain expenses in connection with the annual drill of the militia during the financial year ending the 30th day of June, 1897.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the interesting question at present before the House, brought forth by the motion of my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Foster) in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, I do so with a good deal of diffidence, not being a lawyer, and not having had a legal training. But that is not an excuse why I should not offer my opinion as I have been a member of this Chamber for the last twenty-four years, and I ought, at least, to have a knowledge of the constitutional mode in which our country is governed. I listened to the speech with which my hon. friend the member for York introduced this motion, and I congratulate him on the eloquent and lucid manner in which he did so. I also congratulate the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on the manner in which he supported the motion. On the constitutional aspect of the question I will not make many remarks, as I think it is admitted by every person in this House what the correct constitutional position is. I think it is admitted here, as in all English-speaking communities, that the House of Parliament should have control over the expenditure of the people's money, and that the circumstances must be most extraordinary which would justify the expenditure of a single cent of public money without a vote of this Chamber. I have been listening to the debates of this House on this subject for the last eighteen years, and I thought the principle upon which Governor General's warrants should be issued was settled beyond peradventure in this House in 1887, reaffirmed in 1891, and concurred in by both sides of the House. But, coming into this Chamber this session, I have been astonished to find that the Government of the day, who were so strenuous when in Opposition in support of the principle on which

these warrants should be issued, had departed from that principle as their first act as a Government. I was astonished to find it, because, there was no necessity for it. I was astonished to find the total abandonment of principles which these gentlemen had advocated for the last eighteen years, principles which they had declared underlay the constitution of this country, principles which were most sacred and were necessary to the security of this country and its proper government. There is no principle in our constitution more sacred than that of the control by the people's representatives of the public expenditure. That principle has been admitted by every hon. gentleman who has spoken in this debate. It is one held most sacred by every English-speaking community on the face of the globe. But what do we find? We find that the very first act of these hon. gentlemen on getting into power is to throw that principle to the winds; and I venture to predict that this will be the fate of every principle which they advocated in Opposition. Their conduct reminds me of a story which I read in the papers the other day. A gentleman who was travelling on a railway train went out and stood upon the platform of one of the cars. The negro porter came up to him and said: "Sir, you are not allowed to ride upon the platform." "Why," said he, "I purchased a ticket for the Pullman, and I have a right to ride on the platform if I like." "No, sir," retorted the porter, "the platforms are only used for the purposes of getting in on." So it is with these hon. gentlemen. They use platforms for the purpose of getting into power, but no sooner are they snugly ensconced in office than they leave their platforms behind them; and I venture to predict that every act of theirs for the next five or six years will be an abandonment of some plank or other of the platform which they used in order to get into office. Look through the debates of this House, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that every leader of the Opposition, you will find that the Hon. Edward Blake, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), from whom we have not yet had a word on the subject before the House, and you will find also that the late Sir John A. Macdonald, the late Sir John Thompson, and every lawyer of eminence in the House, were agreed as to the interpretation of this Act. But we have to-day this Government casting aside that principle, which both sides have recognized, and this they do as their first act on obtaining office. Their only defence is to wave before us the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat. They abandon their own principles—the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Lount), the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock)—all these gentlemen abandon the principles which they advocated during the past eighteen years, and their self-defence is the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat, given, as the hon. member for Toronto admits, in a hurry, asked for and got on the same day, excusing the issue of Governor General's warrants—an opinion at variance with that of the most eminent legal minds in this country, and at variance with the doctrine preached by these hon. gentlemen during the past eighteen years.

What were the reasons assigned for the obtaining of this warrant. The first reason was the necessity of the case, and the unforeseen circumstances. That was the reason assigned by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. Would this House believe that at the time the request was made for this warrant, and at the time it was issued, there was not one dollar due, nor would there be one dollar required by the Government for the next fourteen days to meet the expenditure of the country. These hon. gentlemen asked for the Governor General's warrant in order to pay something which was not due, and which would not be due for fourteen days after the warrant was issued. And then we have the extraordinary admission of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), that up to the first of September last, only one million dollars was expended of the two millions obtained by means of the Governor General's warrant. That hon. gentleman told us that the 1st of September of this year—twelve or thirteen days after the House met—one million dollars was expended of the two millions which they had raised by means of the Governor General's warrants. Can there be any justification for that? Is there anything, then, in the argument of these hon. gentlemen opposite that the necessity of the case was so urgent, that the employees were without their pay, that the railways might have to stop running, that there was a contract between the people of this country and the employees in the different post offices throughout the country, and that unless this money was paid all the wheels of government would have to stop—is there anything in this argument, when the facts show that not one single dollar was due for thirteen or fourteen days after the last warrant was issued, and that twelve or thirteen days after the House met there was a million dollars of the amount unexpended? A more extraordinary reason for a Governor General's warrant being issued I never heard before. What has the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to say to this, who was so opposed to the use of Governor General's warrants? What reason can the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) give for advising the Governor General, on the 18th August, to

issue his warrant on the ground that the amount was immediately required, when not a dollar was due, and when twelve days afterwards not one cent of the amount was expended ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). You are not correct.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman then differs from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). I shall read what that hon. gentleman said. It will be found on page 658 of "Hansard," date September 3rd. He said :

I find that, up to 31st August, 1896, we had expended a total sum of $3,268,000. I find—what is also a little significant—that up to 31st August, 1895, the late Government expended $3,900,000 ; that is to say, they found it necessary to spend about $640,000 more than we did. I am not attaching any blame to hon. gentlemen opposite for that expenditure. But the House will see in those two facts to which I call attention, there is proof that we did not unnecessarily have recourse to this extraordinary means for avoiding a great public disaster, and that we were exceedingly careful not to go an inch beyond what the necessities of the case required. Sir, of the $3,900,000 spent by hon. gentlemen opposite, and of the $3,268,000 spent by us, more than $2,250,000 were statutory expenditures, for which the authority of Parliament was not required. Of the rest, $1,700,000 expended by them, as against $1,000,000 spent by us.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries thus differs entirely from his colleague.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all, you do not understand.

Mr. HAGGART. I flatter myself that I do, but if the hon. gentleman will explain the difference, I would like to hear him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Go on.

Mr. HAGGART. It is all very well to say "You do not understand," but it is as clear as possible. The hon. gentleman says they have expended, up to the 31st August, $3,268,000. More than $2,250,000 were statutory expenditures, for which the authority of Parliament was not required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, oh.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may laugh. But up to 31st August there was only $3,200,000 odd spent, of which they had statutory authority for the expenditure of $2,250,000. The sum of $2,000,000 was got by Governor General's warrants, of which, therefore, only $1,000,000 was expended. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but there is no way to get out of the figures. On the 31st of August, twelve days after Parliament had met, they had $1,000,000 for which they had asked and secured the Governor General's signature on 18th August. Of that $1,000,000, I venture to say that not one-half is expended at the present time. Yet these hon. gentlemen must have signed a certificate to the Governor General that the money was needed immediately for the wants of the country, and, on the authority of the Minister of Justice for this country, asked the Governor General to sign the warrants. That disposes of the argument of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and it disposes also of the argument of my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Robertson). My hon. friend from East Toronto believes that the money was absolutely needed for the purpose of maintaining the country by paying the public employees, when the fact is that there was no necessity for such a course. Had hon. gentlemen opposite known their duty, immediately after the meeting of Parliament they would have brought down a Bill for credit, and this House would have given them a credit for a month or two without a moment's hesitation. These gentlemen swallow the principles that they have advocated for eighteen years, and for what ? Is it in order to carry on the affairs of the country ? By no means. No sensible man or men who knew the financial position of the country or who had any ability as administrators, would have required His Excellency to sign such warrants. It would have been easy, without violating the constitution, to get a credit long before it was needed to meet the legitimate requirements of the country. The argument that these hon. gentlemen relied upon was that they were driven to do what they did by the necessities of the case, to keep faith with the public contractors and to pay the necessary services of the country. But, even if this were all true, even if the money had been absolutely due and the non-payment of it would have caused great inconvenience, that was no sufficient argument for the violation of the constitution and for taking into the hands of the Executive powers which, in every English-speaking country in the world, are vested in Parliament. For the purpose of getting over a little temporary difficulty, they have actually violated the constitution of the country. I listened with a great deal of attention to the arguments in support of the contentions of the Ministry on this occasion. I listened with particular attention to arguments of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is it possible that this is the same gentleman who a few years ago argued in the very opposite direction ? What a complete somersault he has made in three or four years. He at one time posed as the great tribune of the people, who, more than any other in this country, stood up for the people's rights. He it was who exclaimed so clearly and precisely what the meaning of these two clauses of the Audit Act was. He was the man who stood firm and most fixed in his principles, and most decided in his enunciation of those principles. And look at the pitiable spectacle he made in replying to the argu-

ment of the ex-Minister of Finance. Do we not all remember the explanation he gave on a former occasion to show that the Act applied only to expenditures not foreseen or provided for by Parliament? But now he comes to the grammatical meaning of the word "or," and he says it is broad enough to cover the whole question, that the fact of the expenditure not being provided for was sufficient. It is only a few years ago that he said the true meaning of the clause, the meaning the courts would put upon it and the meaning that Parliament ought to put upon it, was unforeseen "and" unprovided for,—that the expenditure must be one called for by some accident such as an explosion blowing up of Militia building or the breaking away of a dam or something of that kind: or, as Mr. Blake put it, "accidents during the recess of Parliament." The very words of the Act are the best explanation of the Act. Expenses unexpectedly incurred during the recess alone justify the issue of Governor General's warrants. The attention of gentlemen opposite was directed during the last session of Parliament to the facts that would arise. They knew exactly when the elections were coming on, for that was stated by my hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and it was the more impressed upon them by the fact that they asked that the elections might be fixed a week earlier. They knew the exact time the House was to be called together, for it was announced that it would be called for the middle of July. These facts being known, the necessity for the passing of Estimates last session was pressed upon gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Simcoe denies the statement made by the Finance Minister of that time (Mr. Foster). I would ask the leader of the Government himself to say if the ex-Finance Minister did not go again and again to him to see if arrangements could not be made for a six months' supply to be granted, or a three months' supply, or, in default of that, if the hon. gentleman would not agree to give to the Government of the country a two months' supply. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in the House also made the statement which was denied the other evening by the hon. member for North Simcoe. Let me read to refresh the memory of the hon. member:

Mr. FOSTER. In the main Estimates there are two items I would like to have passed. What I want hon. gentlemen opposite to do is to make it unnecessary that the House should assemble here in July and have a summer session, which is inconvenient and expensive as well. The proposition I make to them is, if they cannot see their way to give us our working Estimates for next year, to give us at least two or three months' Estimates in order that Parliament may find it unnecessary to meet so soon. I think there is nothing unreasonable in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is utterly impossible.

Mr. HAGGART.

Then, what becomes of the argument of the hon. member for North Simcoe, who stated, without hesitation that he knew what interpretation the courts would put upon that clause; he knew what interpretation the House had put upon that clause; he knew the consensus of opinion in 1887 and in 1891; and his statement was that the law was clear, though perhaps the necessity of the case would justify the overriding of the law, and he gives the necessity as being a provision for the amount due to the civil service which the Governor General's warrant was asked for. When I stated to this House that not a single cent of the amount was due, he said it was partly the fault of the leader of the Opposition, and of my hon. friend from York. I was sorry to hear him say that the hon. member for York had made a misstatement, because I never heard him say what was attributed to him, that it was the duty of the Government to ask two or three months' Estimates. The facts are brought out clearly now by my statement, and I defy contradiction upon the subject. There was no immediate necessity for the warrants being issued. Last session when the Government could not pass their Estimates, they were willing to take six months, or even as low as two months' Estimates. Then the position of the hon. member for Simcoe is entirely untenable. He knows what the law is, he spoke on the subject, and he has no doubt what interpretation the courts would put upon it. His only justification was that of necessity; but there was no necessity, and consequently no excuse for overriding the Act of Parliament. Now, I will venture to criticise for a few moments some of the hon. members who spoke from the Government side, and who gave some most extraordinary interpretations of this statute. There was the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount), and I must compliment him on his first appearance in this House, and on the clear and lucid manner in which he made his statement, which shows, I think, that he gives promise of being a great accession to the debating talent of this House. But perhaps he does not deserve so much credit for that, because his whole life is passed in advancing and defending his views, either in courts of law or in addresses throughout the country. He came to this House with a reputation, and his speech the other night well sustains that reputation. But he dealt very gingerly with the interpretation of the statute. He made a sort of excuse for the interpretation given by the Minister of Justice. He says the Minister of Justice was taken suddenly and was required to give his opinion off-hand. He was asked for his opinion on the 14th, and on the same day he gave his meaning of the statute as justifying the issue of the Governor General's warrant. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to discuss the meaning of the words "and" and "or"; and he concludes that the grammatical

meaning, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) puts it, would be that technically they had a right to issue the warrant. I cannot understand those two views of the case. There is a clause in an Act of Parliament; if it bear two interpretations, according to the member for Halifax, you have a right to put two interpretations upon it, and to act upon them. Perhaps the reasonable construction is the one the court would put on it. There is also a technical construction which may be put upon it. The Governor General in Council may put upon it the interpretation that the court puts upon it, or they may take the technical view. I do not understand any such logic as that. It has either one legal meaning or it has not. It has no technical meaning different from the legal meaning. The interpretation which a court of law would put upon it is the interpretation that is to be followed. The Government have no option to follow either the reasonable interpretation of the statute or the technical construction. The hon. gentleman was very careful in his speech in giving his opinion as to what the true construction was; but he said that the technical construction was sufficient justification for the issue of the warrants, and he said he was confirmed in his opinion by the fact that the opinions of the Minister of Justice upon constitutional questions had been sustained, again and again, by the Privy Council in England. But I will venture to say that we have not heard in this House from any hon. gentleman, either on the Government side or on the Opposition side, saying that the technical construction which this hon. gentleman puts forward is one that any court in the land would sustain. The whole consensus of opinion in this House is that the reasonable construction of that clause in the Act is that the word "or" should be made "and." Now, I would call attention to the fact that the clause in the Audit Act is embodied in this clause, for it says that no sum of money shall be paid to any civil servant without an Appropriation Act. But the technical construction which the Minister of Justice puts upon that clause of the Audit Act overrides the distinct statement in the statute that no sum of money shall be paid to any civil servant in the employ of the Government without an Appropriation Act being first passed. I have not heard any hon. gentleman, either lawyer or layman, venture to say that this clause, technically construed, overrides that clause in the Audit Act I have referred to. Any hon. member who votes against the amendment of my hon. friend from York, knows very well that he will be voting against an express provision of an Act of Parliament. Now, I will leave the hon. member for Toronto, and deal with the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. member for Toronto justified his opinion concerning the purely technical construction of the statute, by the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to a statement of the hon. member for Halifax, showing that his opinion was not based upon a technical construction of the statute. Let me read from the argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). Referring to the opinion expressed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), who introduced the motion now before the House, the hon. gentleman said:

> I am inclined to accept that as being a fair interpretation of the statute, but my hon. friends will have to admit that it is not its literal meaning. * * * My proposition is this, that you can take either the literal or the sensible construction of the statutes. If you take the literal construction, it is quite sufficient to invoke the words of the statute in order to justify the issue of the warrants in question. All that is required is that the expenditure be unprovided for, even though it be not unforeseen. I do not assent to that as the proper construction of the statute. I think it is a literal but not a sensible construction. On the other hand, if you are going to depart from the mere literal interpretation and give the statute a sensible construction, according to the true intention, you must conclude that the expenditure in question was an unforeseen expenditure. It was foreseen in a dry, barren, literal and grammatical sense of the word. It is an expenditure which everybody could have foreseen in February or January last, but it is an expenditure as to which no human being could possibly have foreseen the circumstances which led to its not having been provided for. In that sense of the term, which is, to my mind, a fair and just sense of the term, it was really an unforeseen expenditure.

So the hon. member for Halifax took entirely different ground from that occupied by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount). Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to present a most extraordinary argument, in which he sought to make it appear that the circumstances antecedent affected the very wording of the statute. He said:

> I do not, however, press that point very strenuously. My argument is, that this statute is applicable whenever the expenditure was wholly of an unforeseen character, in the literal sense of the term, or when, being of a kind that could have been foreseen, the circumstances that prevented its being provided for could not have been foreseen.

Fancy such conditions entering into the construction of statutes, and that "the expenditure being wholly of an unforeseen character, the circumstances that prevented its being provided for could not have been foreseen." The hon. gentleman proceeded:

> I take it that the statute supplies whenever the circumstances are such that we could not have foreseen that the expenditure would not, and could not, be provided for, when required. If that be a fair reading of the statute, I should like to know if anybody could have foreseen that this Parliament could not meet in time to provide for this expenditure. Was it an absolutely foreseen circumstance that the elections could not have been held before the 23rd June?

Was it absolutely necessary that two months should elapse before the late Government was in a position to appeal to the electorate? Was it absolutely foreseen, assuming that the elections were to take place on the 23rd of June, that the late Government, after the verdict of the country had been rendered against them, would cling to their offices until the 10th of July, wholly without justification, in view of the peculiar condition of the public affairs of the country?

Fancy such a declaration made by a professor of constitutional law. Would the sage of Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—I wish he were in this House now—or the late hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) have laid down such a proposition, that such circumstances were to affect the interpretation of the statute? The hon. member for Halifax proceeded:

Let me go a step further, and say that, even if, as a matter of the technical reading of the statute, you cannot read it in the sense I do, the condition of things which actually had arisen brings the case within the equity of the statute. If you have one condition of things expressly provided for in the statute by express terms, and then you have another analogous condition of things which is not provided for by the express terms of the statute, and if you are able to draw the inference that, if the mind of the legislature had been directed to that analogous condition of things which is not expressly provided for in the statute, it would have taken pains to provide for it, exactly as it did expressly provide for the other condition, then you are at liberty to hold that the statute, by this enlarged construction, does include the analogous, as well as the one which is covered by its express terms.

The hon. gentleman went on, and made an argument in reply to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), in which he laid down the principle, that there was no justification for issuing the warrants and for the signature of the Governor General to the warrants which had been issued. The hon. gentleman quoted in support of his contention a despatch in which the Colonial Secretary—I think it was Lord Granville—reflects very severely on the Governor General of South Australia for signing certain warrants. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) said, referring to the hon. member for Kent, N.B.:

If he had read a little more to the House he would have thrown a light on the discussion which would not have been welcomed by the other side.

He continued:

But he failed to read these words from the despatch of Lord Granville:

Except in cases absolute and immediate necessity (such, for example, as the preservation of life), no expenditure of public money should be incurred without sanction of law.

That is an expression of opinion with which nobody quarrels. But here is a qualification that is of the utmost importance:

Unless it may be presumed, not only that both branches of the legislature will hold that it is unobjectionable——

That is this case exactly——

——but also that they will approve of the expenditure being made in anticipation of their consent.

The hon. gentleman goes on and misinterprets the statement made by my hon. friend and the quotation made. I suppose he took it from "Todd," who only partially copied the despatch to Lord Granville on the subject; but if the hon. gentleman had read the whole despatch, he would have seen how much he was mistaken in thinking that it afforded a reply to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney). The despatch is dated Downing Street, 30th September, 1868, and runs as follows:—

I apprehend that you cannot legally exercise a power of spending moneys without an Appropriation Act, and that you would prima facie be bound to refuse to sign a warrant sanctioning any expenditure of public money which has not been authorized by law.

But as in England, so in New South Wales, cases of supreme emergency may arise, when it may be impossible to adhere to strict and proper rule without detriment to the public interest, and when the government at home takes upon itself the responsibility of sanctioning such expenditure. Such are cases where a service voted requires more money than has been voted, or where some wholly unforeseen contingency arises of too urgent a nature to allow of the required expenditure being previously submitted to Parliament for their sanction.

Cases of this kind must be dealt with by the governor on the responsibility of his ministers, and he must exercise his own judgment upon a careful consideration of all the circumstances brought under his notice by those ministers.

I shall not attempt to give you more definite instructions upon this subject, as each case must stand or fall upon its own merits; but I should be disposed to say generally that such expenditure would be justifiable, first, on the ground of necessity, or, secondly, on the ground that it is sure to be subsequently sanctioned, joined to strong grounds of expediency, even though short of actual necessity.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) will see that Todd was speaking of a despatch sent by Earl Granville, and which was formally mentioned in a despatch of the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos on the same subject, and in which he was speaking of cases of emergency. Therefore, in order to justify the Governor General in issuing a warrant, there must not only be a case of emergency, but it must be a matter which is unforeseen, it must be an expenditure which is not provided for, and besides that, it must have the likelihood of the support of Parliament when it is brought before them for their assent. The statement of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) was strictly and literally accurate, and his arguments have remained unanswered in this House up to the present moment. No one has yet attempted to challenge the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney), that there is no power in the Parliament of Canada to justify the issuing of Governor General's warrants for the purpose of paying such sums of

money as were paid out of the proceeds of these warrants. Have we heard a word from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or have we heard a word from the leader of the Government in defence of the conduct of his Ministry. The only member of the Government who attempted to defend this most unusual proceeding was the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but let me ask, is there a lawyer in this House who will venture his reputation as a lawyer by justifying on legal grounds the advice which the Government gave to His Excellency? They shelter themselves behind an opinion of their Minister of Justice, and they say that Sir Oliver Mowat must be correct, because all his opinions on constitutional questions in times past have been sustained by the Privy Council. Let me ask hon. gentlemen, if they ever heard of Sir Oliver Mowat on any previous occasion giving an opinion on such an important subject to any legislature or to any person in Canada, without giving reasons in support of that opinion? But on this occasion Sir Oliver Mowat simply states the bald law on the question, and he does not advance a single reason in support of the advice he gave to the Minister. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr Lount) excuses him by saying that the question was put to him on the 14th of July, and he gave the opinion on the same day, and had to do it in a hurry. Well, Sir, on a question of such importance as this to the people of Canada, and under which the control of the public moneys was taken out of their hands and out of the hands of their representatives, it is not an extraordinary thing that the Minister of Justice did not give a single reason to justify his advice. There is not, I believe, a first-class lawyer from Halifax to Victoria who would venture a written opinion in the same direction. The conduct of the Ministry was a violation of a clause of the Audit Act, which says, that no money shall be expended by any person without an appropriation being first passed by the Parliament of Canada. I believe, as I said before, that there is not a first-class lawyer in Canada who would concur in the opinion of the Minister of Justice. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated plainly what the law on the matter is. He did not trim about it like the member for Toronto (Mr. Lount). There is no mental reservation in his mind, and I have very little doubt myself but that the member for Toronto (Mr. Lount) knew what the law was too. I believe also that the member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) knows the law, but he told us that the clause of the Act was to be interpreted by certain circumstances which were unforeseen and which preceded this event. The House thoroughly understood what the law was on the question, because it was decided in the debates of 1887 and 1891, but the member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) told us that the policy of the case was sufficient justification in his eyes for this extraordinary conduct of the Ministers. Is it not an extraordinary admission for a representative of the people to make, that policy was to regulate the law and the constitution of this country, and that our statute law should be overridden when a question of a policy came into play? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) told us that when the Government came into power on a certain day, they found debts which had to be paid. Sir, his premises were wrong; for there was not a single cent due at that time, nor would it be due for twelve or thirteen days afterwards. Last session the statement was made frankly to the House as to when the elections would be, and as to the meeting of Parliament on the 16th of July, and the responsibility for not passing the Supply Bill does not rest upon the present Opposition, but it rests entirely upon the Government of the country. They refused to give six months' supply; they refused to give three months; they refused to give two months. I think the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches at this moment must know the false position they now occupy. They are wiser now; and, if they had known what events would occur, they would gladly have given to the late Government two months' supply for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the country. No case can be cited in constitutional history, in any colony or in any part of the British Empire, of an opposition refusing to grant supplies to a government, whether it had nearly completed its term or not; while there are many examples of an opposition, though successful at the polls, coming back to the House and allowing a government in a minority to pass its Estimates. But hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition, took a course which they could not justify, and the result has been the illegal act which they are attempting to justify to-day.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have perhaps occupied the attention of the House long enough on a subject that has been thoroughly debated already. My excuse for doing so is that the subject is a serious one, and one in regard to which our decision to-day will be cited as a precedent. Whatever Governor General's warrants were issued by the late Government, they always attempted, at any rate, to justify them on the ground that the expenditure was unforeseen and had been left out of the Estimates, as was the case in regard to the amount asked for the Intercolonial Railway. But I have never heard an attempt made to justify the extraordinary conduct of this Government in the present instance. They say: "Oh, what harm is it. The people had earned the money, and the Government was morally bound to pay it." That is no justification at all of an infringement of the constitution and an overriding of the statute. There had been no necessity at all for such a course. These gentlemen ought to have followed the con-

stitutional course; they ought to have brought Parliament together and asked for a vote for a month or six weeks for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the country; or, if they had expended the amount—which the hon. member for Pictou has shown is an extraordinary course, and one which has been abandoned entirely in England—they should have come to this House and asked for a bill of indemnity. They have done neither of these things. On the contrary, they took upon themselves a direct violation of the law by advising His Excellency to sign warrants for expenditures for which there was no Appropriation Act at all; and the Auditor General signed the vouchers to the different bankers throughout the country, or cheques on the treasury, in direct violation of a clause of the statute which says that no sum of money shall be paid to any civil servant unless there is an appropriation for it. For these reasons, I hold that it is my duty to my country and in defence of what I regard as the constitutional rights of the electors of this country, to support the amendment of my hon. friend the member for York.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend at all to take up the time of the House on this question to-day, and I would not have done so were it not for the very extraordinary speech that has been delivered by the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). If there is any man in this House who should have hesitated to rise and deliver a speech of that kind, it is that hon. gentleman. He declared that under no circumstances should the Governor General be asked to issue his warrant for any sum that had not been previously voted for the purpose of meeting the ordinary expenditure, and in the face of Parliament meeting.

Mr. HAGGART. I never said anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman is putting words in my mouth which I never uttered.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman finds fault with the present Government for having asked a Governor General's warrant to meet current expenses immediately maturing, in the face of Parliament meeting, and without an Appropriation Bill having first been passed for these expenditures. Now, let us see what the hon. gentleman did in 1888. In that year Parliament met on the 23rd of February. On the 22nd of February, the day before Parliament met, the hon. gentleman obtained a Governor General's warrant for the sum of $477,000 to pay the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. There was no appropriation previously made for that sum; not a dollar of it had been voted. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman has to say about that. Then, in the year 1893, after the principle had been established that under no circumstances should Governor General's warrants be obtained for the purpose of meeting any expenditure, unless in a case entirely unforeseen, what did the hon. gentleman do in connection with the Curran Bridge? Why, Sir, Parliament was prorogued on the 1st of April, 1893. The hon. gentleman knew—because the printed documents laid before a committee of this House, and afterwards before this House, clearly and distinctly proved—that a very large sum in excess of the appropriation had been expended in the construction of that bridge. Did he take the House into his confidence, and ask by a supplementary estimate for an additional sum to meet that expenditure? No, Sir; he kept the secret to himself. On the 4th May, just one month after the House rose, he got a Governor General's warrant for $200,000. The hon. gentleman ventures to condemn the Government of the day for doing what was absolutely necessary, when he himself kept the whole of the facts in his own mind and did not divulge them to the House, and then when the House had risen and the people's representatives had gone to their homes, he went to the Governor General and secured a warrant for $200,000 to pay that extra expense. I must say that I felt not a little amused at the dexterously worked-up excitement of the hon. gentleman, as he wrought himself, by a very laboured effort, to a fever heat of apparent indignation and sincerity over this terrible act of this Government in procuring money to pay the Government employees their wages, when he himself, if he at all consulted his memory, should have been the last man to rise in this House and make the speech he delivered this afternoon. Now, I have collected quite a number of cases in which Governor General's warrants were obtained by the late Government, and in which the obtaining of these warrants was an abuse. We know perfectly well that in 1887 they were very anxious to avoid the appearance of any increase in the Estimates. They were about to go before the people, and were anxious to show that the dawn of the new era of reduction in our annual expenditure had made its appearance, and that the people might look with some little hope to seeing their expenditure decreased in the future. What did we find these hon. gentlemen then doing Why, Mr. Speaker, they kept in the background no less than sixteen items for which the House should have been asked for appropriations, and then, after the elections were over, they secured Governor General's warrants to pay these items. They got, by means of a Governor General's warrant, $125,000 to pay the costs of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. They got by the same means $46,000 to pay for walks and drives and bridges at the Banff Hot Springs. They got $32,000 to pay for rebellion losses. Surely these things were well known, and could have been provided for in the Estimates submitted to the House. They got by Governor General's warrant $20,000 to pay for the Royal Commission on Railways, and

$4,000 to pay the costs of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company's suit. They also got, on the 18th February, 1887, just four days before the elections, $85,000 to pay for rolling stock on the Intercolonial. This has a very peculiar look about it. It would be interesting to know how much of that amount went into the fund for the elections that were about to take place in a few days. They got on the same day, the 18th February, by Governor General's warrants, $72,000 to pay for land claims and damages on the St. Charles Branch, besides a previous amount of $150,000, raised in the same way, or an amount of $222,000, which disappeared into this veritable sink-hole. They also got by Governor General's warrant $264,000 for the Pictou Town Branch of the Intercolonial Railway. In all they got by means of Governor General's warrants, for those three items I have mentioned, which were all foreseen, concerning which these hon. gentlemen could not possibly have failed being in possession of all the facts to enable them to come before the House to ask for appropriations to meet them, $600,000, just four days before the elections. Every one of them must have been foreseen; there was nothing to prevent the late Government from submitting the various items to the House and obtaining an appropriation, but we find that, instead, they got $600,000 by Governor General's warrants just four days before the election, to cover those items. For the franchise they got by the same means $100,000. On the 14th April, just after the House met, they got by Governor General's warrants $25,000 for the Experimental Farm. On the 14th April, they got Governor General's warrants to the amount of $422,000 to meet twelve items, and the House met on the 13th April. We find these hon. gentlemen contending that whatever Governor General's warrants might be issued before the House met, it is an abuse of power to ask them after the meeting of the House. Well, on the 14th April, 1887, the day after the House met, they got a Governor General's warrant for $422,000. Could any one conceive it possible that these hon. gentlemen, who so flagrantly violated the constitution, would have the audacity to rise in their seats and indulge in declamations against the present Government because it obtained Governor General's warrants to pay the wages of the civil servants, who are depending on their daily earnings for their daily food? It is really most amusing to listen to these hon. gentlemen, particularly the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), declaim against the conduct of this Government under the circumstances. But I would ask these hon. gentlemen opposite what they would have done, if they had been placed in somewhat similar circumstances. Supposing at the late election a very considerable number of members of the late Cabinet had been defeated, but that a sufficient number of representatives on the Opposition side had been returned to give that party a majority, what would they have done? Would they not have adjourned Parliament for a month, in order to get their Cabinet Ministers elected? They could not have acted otherwise; and, had they done so, would they not have been obliged, by the necessities of the case, to have recourse to a Governor General's warrant in order to meet the ordinary expenditure of the country? No doubt they would. These hon. gentlemen, however, find fault with this side of the House for not having, during last session, granted a sufficient sum to carry on the business of the country for two or three months. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have already given our reasons why we felt it our duty not to take that course. We were fully convinced that the country had lost all confidence in the gentlemen then on the Treasury benches. We had ample evidence of that in the public press and in the expressions of opinion from public men on both sides, for the opinion was not confined to the one side. We had abundant evidence of the want of confidence in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite in these hon. gentlemen themselves. We believed that the people had lost all confidence in the late Government, and that, if we gave the Government license to hold power even for one month, we would be doing what the opinion of the people would not justify us in doing. The result of the general election proved that we were right. Hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to protract this session, no doubt, for a purpose. When Parliament met, it was believed that the Estimates would be got through in a few days, and the House could then prorogue and a considerable sum of money be saved the taxpayers; but hon. gentlemen opposite have talked by the hour, and that they have done for the evident purpose of lengthening out the session and increasing the expenditure, so as to throw difficulties in the way of the Minister of Finance in cutting down the annual sum which he will have to ask the House to vote for the next year. And, before they resigned office, they loaded up the civil service with every new appointment they could possibly make. Every place where there was room, wherever they could throw a man into a position, they made an appointment, in order to raise the annual expenditure. I am sorry these hon. gentlemen did not take a leaf out of the book of the late Sir John Macdonald, who, after the Mackenzie Government came into power, instead of offering a bitter and continuous opposition and thus wasting the valuable time of the House, said: You have the confidence of the country; I am not going to interfere with you, and we are going to allow you to carry on the affairs of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to be disposed to do that. They are going to fight from the very start. They are determined, in every possible shape and way they can to worry and annoy the Government in

their efforts to carry out what they believe to be the policy absolutely necessary in the interests of the country, and which we believe will tend to build up the Dominion. They are bound to fight against the Government from day to day and from session to session. We are quite prepared for reasonable and prudent criticism—that is all right. But hon. gentlemen are in a very awkward box in regard to criticising expenditure this session, because they are fighting against their own offspring, the Estimates which are before the House to-day, and to which the assent of hon. gentlemen is asked, being those prepared by themselves to be laid before this House. I do not mean to say that those Estimates are perfect; I never knew anything approaching perfection coming from the hands of the gentlemen who prepared them. But we know we now have a Government that will not spend a dollar voted or not voted that is not absolutely necessary. I am quite sure that the money is safe in their hands and that they will conduct the affairs of the country properly and prudently. It seemed to me that these hon. gentlemen did not require any reply after the clear exposition of the case made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I should not have taken up a moment had it not been for the tone of the speech made by the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). I was so struck with the contrast between that speech and the hon. gentleman's own record as a Minister of the Crown that I deemed it my duty to point out that he was fighting against principles that he himself had followed to suit his own convenience when he was a Minister. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made an elaborate speech on what he conceived to be a proper definition of the Audit Act. I shall not attempt to follow him because I do not claim to possess the legal knowledge to expound such an Act. But one thing is certain, in my humble opinion, and that is that the Audit Act should be carefully observed and respected by whatever Government is in power. And I think that the course adopted by the Government of the day in utilizing the powers given by that Act, as advised by the Minister of Justice, is one that will be endorsed by the electorate of this Dominion. It certainly would have reflected upon the people of Canada, not only among themselves, but in all parts of the Empire had we been obliged to let it become known that the Dominion had permitted its civil servants to wait month after month for the pay justly due them. In meeting the difficulty as they did, the Government pursued a prudent course. We know, at least rumour has told us, that a very peculiar use was made of Orders in Council during the late election. We heard that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), then the leader of the Government, expressed the opinion that it was quite right that the Government of the day should take the public into their confidence. And as leader of the Government he did take the people into his confidence to a very large extent. He told the people from Prince Edward Island to Vancouver what the Government were going to do if they were sustained. And I have been informed that Orders in Council for appropriations for railways and public works of one kind and another, amounting to about $12,000,000, were hawked about the country as arguments to the people in favour of keeping hon. gentlemen opposite in power. There are one or two other points to which I desire to draw the attention of the late Minister of Railways. I notice that in the year 1885-86 the amount appropriated under Governor General's warrants was $3,190,-243. I admit that in some cases they were used for reviving lapsed balances, but in many cases they were not used for that purpose. Now, with regard to the Government asking by Governor General's warrants for sums in excess of what was absolutely and immediately needed, concerning which a great deal was said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), we find that that hon. gentleman himself asked, on January 30th, 1888, for an appropriation of $305,000, the total being made up of some twelve items in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Only about half of these were for the revival of lapsed balances. When Parliament met the hon. gentleman had still unexpended $166,000 of the amount. This shows that while he advocates now the principle that Governor General's warrants should be used only for past expenditure and for what is immediately wanted, he himself did not act upon this principle when he was Minister of Railways. But it is needless to go over the whole list. I have here the returns laid before Parliament for several years, and I could quote dozens of cases in which this power of appropriating money by Governor General's warrant has been abused, and scandalously abused. But what Act is there on the statute-books that hon. gentlemen opposite have not used for political purposes that could possibly be so used? They abused the power of issuing Governor General's warrants in 1887. Then we had a scandalous abuse of that power in connection with the Curran Bridge. But it is not necessary further to dilate upon this question. Enough has been said already to show that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is not to try and fasten upon the Government an act for which they should be condemned, but merely to lengthen out the debate on this question from day to day, and thereby to increase the expenditure of this session, and to make it necessary for the Government next year to ask for increased estimates for the purpose of providing for this session, as well as for other expenses for which the new Government will have to provide, owing to the

course pursued by the late Government before they left office.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not my intention to pursue at any length the arguments advanced by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who has just taken his seat, and who has thought fit, in justification of the course the Government is now pursuing, to cite what he conceives to be similar cases that occurred during the regime of the Government that went out of power in July last. I think the hon. gentleman has been heard saying in this House on former occasions, that two wrongs do not make a right, and that it would be no justification for the action of the Government of which he is a supporter, simply to show that somebody else did the same thing. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman has made a complete somersault on this occasion. I think that if the celebrated Li Hung Chang, the Chinese envoy who was in Toronto yesterday, had been here, in all probability he would have listened with surprise to the arguments of the hon. member for North Wellington. No doubt he has heard of the reputation of the hon. gentleman, because it is world-wide; and it seems to me that questions like these would have been propounded by Li Hung to the hon. gentleman: "Do you approve of Governor General's warrants? How long have you approved of Governor General's warrants? How old are you?" Such questions as these, I think, would naturally have arisen in the mind of that gentleman, drawn forth by the surprise with which he would have heard the statements of the hon. member for North Wellington. I think it is scarcely necessary for me to refer to what was said by the hon. gentleman with regard to protracting the session. If I mistake not, that question was thoroughly settled and thrashed out in the Liberal caucus which was held in No. 16 the other day, where it was definitely laid down by a colleague of the hon. gentleman and a supporter of the Government, that it would be a most unfortunate thing for the pockets of the hon. members of this House, if the session did not extend beyond the 30 days. Now, having settled that question and they being the dominant party in this House, we would have nothing to do with it, and we are not in any way responsible for it. Now, it is not my intention, as I said, to follow the hon. gentleman in his arguments at any length; but a man who can argue along one line in one year, and then along a directly opposite line another year, I think, is not worthy of much attention. This session, I understand, was called chiefly for the purpose of voting supplies; and it does seem to me that for the Government of the day, with telegraphic despatch, before the House was called, to obtain by Governor General's warrant a large sum of money for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of the country, was showing scant courtesy to members on both sides of this House. What was the use of calling us together to vote supplies if the Government had made up their mind to take supplies, whether the House was willing to grant them or not? I do not purpose to discuss the legal aspects of this question; in fact, from what was said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce a few days ago, I think hon. gentlemen on that side do not intend to defend their action on legal grounds. In fact the Minister of Trade and Commerce abandoned the legal argument, and relied entirely upon what he called the common sense or business view of the question. But, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce tried to justify the Government by showing that they had not expended as much money in July and August as had been expended by the previous Government during the same two months in 1895. But I scarcely think the Minister of Trade and Commerce was fair, inasmuch as he neglected to tell the House that one very large item of the expenditure, namely, the payment of the indemnity to members in July, 1895, helped to increase the expenditure of that year, while nothing had been paid out on the same account in 1896; so that really there was nothing in the hon. gentleman's argument. He also claimed that unless a Governor General's warrant had been obtained, the whole postal service of the country would have come to a standstill. Now, I think it is pretty generally known that postmasters, carriers, and others who convey the mails, are only paid quarterly, and for that purpose no money is required from the first of July to the first of October; consequently he had no right to claim that that service would have come to a standstill unless the money had been obtained by a Governor General's warrant for the purpose of carrying it on. Then he asked, What could they do? Well, of course, it was for them to find out what they should do. They could certainly have called Parliament together two or three days sooner, or one day sooner would have been quite sufficient. If they had seen fit to call Parliament together at an earlier day to obtain supplies, it would not have been necessary for the hon. member for North Wellington to stand up in his place to-day and defend an action which he had condemned within the last 12 months, and over and over again during past years.

As the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has abandoned the legal aspect of this question, and as I have no pretension to discuss that aspect, I propose to look at this question for a short time from what we may call the business man's point of view. Let us look at it as an ordinary business transaction, and see what we can make out of it. Parliament has been given the control of the public purse of this country, no doubt, for a wise purpose, and I think it will be a sad day for this country when Parliament loses control of the public purse. I think

the nearer we can adhere to the law in that respect, the better. It seems to me that the first action of this new Government in evading that law, and spending millions of money without the sanction of Parliament, is something that the people of this country, the common sense business men of this country, will not justify. These safeguards contained in the Audit Act are thrown around the public chest for a good purpose. They are intended, no doubt, to prevent an improper and excessive expenditure; they are in fact intended to protect the public chest of this country. That the public chest requires protection, we have the best evidence, especially under a Liberal regime. I remember years ago reading a letter that was written by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, in which he pointed out clearly the difficulties that he had in protecting the public chest of this country. Now, we know what kind of a man the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was. He was hewn out of the flinty rock, a man who had risen from the people, a man who knew what it was to be poor, like many of us, and a man who had a good idea of the duties of a Minister to protect the finances of this country. I will read an extract from a letter of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, dated 27th April, 1875. He said:

> I would like much to be relieved of the Public Works Department, but I cannot see my way to that at present. It is the great spending department, the possible great jobbing department, the department that can make or ruin a government at such a time as this when $25,000,000 are in the power of its head to spend on public works. Friends (?) expect to be benefited by offices they are unfit for, by contracts they are not entitled to, by advances not earned. Enemies ally themselves with friends, and push the friends to the front. Some attempt to storm the office. Some dig trenches at a distance and approach in regular siege form I feel like the besieged lying on my arms night and day. I have offended at least twenty parliamentary friends by my defence of the citadel.

If with a man like Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, of long experience and sterling character, the protection of the public chest was such a source of trouble, why should we be so reckless to-day as to forego the safeguards with which it has been surrounded and permit the Government of the day to take at such times and in such sums as they require money without asking the assent of Parliament? We must look somewhat at the previous history of the hon. gentlemen who compose the present Administration if we are going to take a business-like view of this transaction. Where do they come from; what have they been doing before they came here? We find that the provincial governments throughout this country have not been very economical in their administration. In the province of Ontario we have had an extravagant government. In the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and Quebec there have been largely increased expenditures under Liberal regimes, and we have here to-day as members of the present Government men from those provinces who have been brought up in schools of extravagance and unwarranted expenditure, who have increased the annual expenditures of the different provinces; and it may fairly be asked, what are we to expect from those men in view of their former training? Simply an increase in the expenditures of the Dominion. For provincial purposes the revenues are largely derived from Dominion sources, the subsidies of the Dominion being the chief item in each case. The fact is that provincial governments are not called upon to exercise much ability in providing supplies, the moneys being chiefly handed over to them by the Dominion, and consequently they are not likely to be careful in their expenditures. We know how it is individually. If money is easily obtained, it is very likely to be liberally expended; if it is difficult to secure, we are more likely to hold on to it. In the province of Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat has been Prime Minister, unfortunately, for about twenty years past.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad to know that there is an hon. member on the other side of the House who agrees with me that it has been unfortunate for Ontario that Sir Oliver Mowat has been in power for the last twenty years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. HENDERSON. When he obtained power he found a full public chest; but a short time ago he left it absolutely empty, and he came here, for what purpose? To take charge of Dominion affairs, and, forsooth, he was called upon by the Prime Minister to advise him with respect to the legality of issuing Governor General's warrants. I think it is a fair criticism, because that is the kind of man on whose judgment the Government are to rely for justifying the issuing of those warrants. We are obliged to look into the hon. gentleman's previous history and see how he has conducted the affairs of his own province, and whether it is reasonable to expect as resulting from that gentleman's judgment an administration of public affairs that will be in the interest of Canada. When Sir Oliver Mowat came into power in Ontario, he found a cash surplus of $4,000,000 and also funds in trust to the amount of $3,000,000, they being in the hands of this Government bearing 5 per cent interest, which was paid every year to the province. Where are the $4,000,000? They have disappeared. Where are the $3,000,000 held in trust for them? Two million dollars have been drawn out in order to meet the exigencies of the provincial government, leaving but a small amount in the hands of the Dominion Government. Or to put it in another way, if the trust funds are intact, there are $2,000,000 due to the

Dominion, and the provincial interest in the fund is very small. In addition, the provincial government have borrowed to the extent of $3,000,000. That money has to be repaid, and by a system of manipulating the assets and by concealing the liabilities of the province, the Government are able to show a surplus; but if we investigate the accounts and remember the manner in which they are manipulated, and at the same time consider the debt of the province—which they leave out of the reckoning because it is not at present payable,—it will be found that instead of a surplus in the treasury, there is absolutely nothing, and even less than nothing. Yet the late head of that Government is called upon to advise the Dominion Government as to the propriety of sanctioning Governor General's warrants. In the province of Ontario—I ask the attention of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to this point—it is said that the provincial government has been a fair government and has administered the affairs of the province fairly. Many of us are too apt to think so, because we have not given that attention to the subject to which it is entitled. But as an illustration of the extravagant manner in which the Ontario government has administered provincial affairs and has not acted in the interests of the people, I will refer to only a single item, and that is the item of superannuations, which of itself should condemn that government. Under the system of superannuation, during a period of eight years from 1887 to 1895, the Ontario government paid out $555,000 and collected from the beneficiaries only $12,718. Yet the man who has administered the finances of Ontario in that reckless, unscrupulous and improper manner is here to advise the Prime Minister of the Dominion that he was perfectly right in asking the Governor General to send him by telegraph one or two millions of money, just as the First Minister may require, the Parliament of the Dominion having not a word to say about it. Let me look for a moment at what some other members of the Government have been doing in their respective provinces. While in Ontario the increase in liabilities from 1886 to 1892 was 20 per cent, during the same years the increase in the province of Quebec was actually 46 per cent under the Liberal regime. True, we have not, I believe, in this Government any hon. gentleman who was a member of a Liberal government of the province of Quebec during those celebrated years from 1886 to 1892; but if we have not, we have at least a close ally of those hon. gentlemen, one of the heroes of the Baie des Chaleurs escapade, and one who could tell us a great deal more than he will do during this session as to how there happened to be 46 per cent increase of liabilities in the province of Quebec during that period. Those are the gentlemen who are to expend the millions of money that had been obtained without the consent of Parliament. Would we on this side of the House be justified in sitting still in our seats and refraining to condemn this unwarranted attempt to procure public money? In the province of Nova Scotia they had a similar experience. In 1878 I remember reading a manifesto that was issued in order to show how the affairs of that province were conducted. I do not know who the author of it was, but it was a Liberal manifesto in the elections of that year, issued for the purpose of persuading the people of that province that the Liberal Government should be more acceptable to them than the Conservative Government. The manifesto reads thus:

> The Liberal candidates should be elected because they support a Government (the Liberal Government) which spent large sums of money on useful public works, because they support a Government which during five years have spent $1,877,794 upon public works in Nova Scotia, as against only $650,288 spent by the late Government in seven years. A Reform yearly expenditure of $375,559 against a Tory yearly expenditure of $92,890.

Now, Sir, let us compare that with something of the administration of affairs in Nova Scotia in later years. We find that from 1887 to 1892, the expenditure of Nova Scotia increased under the Liberal regime 24 per cent, and that the debt of Nova Scotia had increased from $1,012,000 in 1887 to $3,138,000 in 1892, or an increase of 200 per cent. And yet these gentlemen who have been administering the affairs of this province are to-day members of the Government of the Dominion of Canada. They are the men, forsooth, who are to expend these millions of money which have been obtained under Governor General's warrants without the consent of this Parliament and without consulting the people's representatives. Is it possible that we are going to hand over the control of the public purse of this country to men who have a history such as I have given you; men who have conducted the affairs of their own province in the manner which I have presented. And not only with regard to provincial affairs, but let us see how the Liberal regime in the Dominion compared with the Conservative regime? From 1872-73 to 1877-78 the increase in five years under Liberal regime was $4,329,000 in the ordinary expenditure, being an increase of 22 per cent for the five years, or 4 2-5ths per cent per annum. Now, in the seventeen years that followed under the Conservative regime—notwithstanding the immense works and improvements that were carried on in Canada—the increase per annum was only 3 2-5ths per annum as against 4 2-5ths under the Liberal Government. During the years 1888 to 1893 the ordinary expenditure in Ontario was increased 20 per cent under a Liberal regime; in Quebec it was increased 46 per

cent under a Liberal regime; in Nova Scotia it was increased 24 per cent under a Liberal regime; and in Prince Edward Island it increased 28 per cent under a Liberal regime, while actually in the Dominion of Canada during the same period it increased one-third of 1 per cent. Yet these gentlemen opposite claim to have superior virtue and superior honesty, and they claim that they can be trusted with two or three millions of dollars obtained under Governor General's warrants, when it would be an improper thing for the late Government to have taken even a small sum to provide for an unforeseen expenditure. I think, Sir, that the business men of the country will take a common sense view of this transaction. If the history of these men opposite tells us that they have been extravagant in the past, we have every reason to believe that they are extravagant still and will be extravagant in the future. If the history of these men tells us that they have in the past largely increased the expenditure of the various provinces, and they have depleted the provincial treasuries so that they are now at the foot of the Throne crying for more subsidies; if that is our experience in the past, will the business men of this country say that they are now to be entrusted with millions of money to expend as they see fit, and without giving any account of it to the people of this country? I believe that to be the view which the great thinking classes of the people of Canada will take. I believe that they will not look upon it simply as a sentimental question. I do not believe that they will say: Oh, you have not shown us that there is any improper expenditure, and so the matter is all right. Well, Sir, how could we show that there was any improper expenditure? We have no knowledge of how they expended this money. The Government tells us that it was obtained for the purpose of paying salaries, but I know from the figures that have been brought down that a portion of it was for dredging. Where was that dredging done? We have no knowledge of that. Was the dredging done down east, or, forsooth, was some of it done in Owen Sound harbour on that Sunday afternoon to which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) referred a few days ago. I question if ever the country will know what was done with that money. The Government will tell us that they were not obliged to ask us for it, that we had nothing to do with how they got the money, and so I expect that next time they will tell us that it is none of our business how they spent the money. They would be equally as much justified in taking the one course as the other. I believe that the common-sense people of Canada will demand from the Government a full statement of what has become of this money, and that they will not, under the circumstances, justify in any way whatever the action of the Government in obtaining Governor General's warrants for such a large sum of money.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend until an hour or so ago to participate in this debate. There were, however, some points made by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) which I consider worthy of notice, and I desire to crave the attention of the House for a few moments while I devote myself to the question under discussion. I was amazed at the accuracy of the knowledge of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) as to what transpires in Room 16. He took the House into his confidence and he informed us what decision was arrived at in the caucus of the Liberal party a few days ago. He informed us that it was decided upon that occasion that this session should be prolonged beyond a period of thirty days in order that the sessional allowance of $1,000 might be received by the faithful followers of the Ministry. Well, Sir, I happen to have been present at the deliberations of the caucus upon that occasion, and I beg to inform the House that the idea of prolonging the session was deprecated by all present. I say further that it was on that occasion lamented on the part of those who referred to the question, that there was an evident disposition, on the part of the Opposition, to prolong the session beyond the period of thirty days. The Government announced at the outset that its desire and design was to submit the Estimates to the House and to secure their passage in the shortest possible time, that it had summoned Parliament for the purpose of meeting an emergency, that emergency being the voting of supplies, and that when that emergency was met by the action of Parliament, the House would adjourn. Now, Sir, were any argument needed to show that the purpose of the Opposition is to prolong the session, I believe that argument is presented by the action of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Henderson). If anything in the shape of obstruction, pure and simple, could be imagined, it is the speech made by that hon. gentleman. He devoted a small portion of his time to the consideration of the question before the House; but the larger part of his speech was devoted to a review of the records of the various provincial governments of this country, as to their financial management, and to denunciations of the Liberal governments of the various provinces, especially that of Ontario. Well, Sir, I would like to know what the question of provincial management has to do with the question of Governor General's warrants in the Dominion Parliament. If the hon. member for Halton can point out to me the analogy that exists between the two questions, he will enlighten my mind very much, and I shall be under deep obligations to him. Perhaps I may say a word in defence of at least one of these governments. The pro-

vince where I live, a province which has, without doubt, the best government of any commonwealth on this continent, or on this planet, and which has had its affairs managed with rare economy, wisdom and efficiency, under the leadership of the hon. gentleman who is now the Minister of Justice in the present Administration. The government of Ontario has never asked the people of that province for a single cent. There never has been a provincial levy in that province. Whatever moneys have been raised or expended, they have been raised and expended without the contribution on the part of the people to the finances and resources of the province of one single cent.

Mr. SPROULE. They have been selling their notes in advance.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is said that the government of Ontario has no surplus. It has a surplus to-day of millions of dollars. That government has pursued the policy of liberality. It has created institutions for the amelioration of human misery in all parts of the province. It has the finest school system on this continent. It has subsidized railways where necessary; it has given of its generosity to all worthy objects, and it has not impaired its surplus or its financial condition; and I repeat, it has never taxed its people one cent. Sir, the record of the government of Ontario may challenge the admiration of all classes in this Dominion. The record of the government of Ontario will bear scrutiny, and the man must possess a good deal of hardihood who will rise before a body of intelligent men and take the position that has been taken by my hon. friend from Halton.

My hon. friend informs us that it was an act of courtesy on the part of the Government of the day to take the course they did—an act of discourtesy towards Parliament. Well, Sir, we will review that assertion a little later on. He says no money was wanted, indeed; it was then quite superfluous to ask the Governor General to issue warrants, because the need of the money was not apparent to the hon. gentleman at all. Why, all our expenses are paid quarterly, he says, and, as we commenced with July, we did not need a single cent until the 1st of October. I suppose we have no current expenses. I suppose the wages and salaries of all public employees are paid quarterly. Well, it seems to me that the records of our expenditures show monthly expenditures. We have a report of the expenditures month by month. We have labourers, engineers and conductors on the Government railways who are paid weekly; we have the employees of various departments who are paid either weekly or monthly. There is a very small proportion of the expenditure of this Dominion paid quarterly; and the argument advanced by my hon. friend from Halton, in this respect, was entirely destitute of foundation. Then, my hon. friend proceeds to take a business view of the case, and a most remarkable business view of the case it is. I think he has undoubtedly proved to the satisfaction of this House that he is a business man of rare ability; and, if he were on this side of the House, I should certainly favour having his distinguished services for one of the business departments of the Government. It is a pity to lose the services of a gentleman so distinguished in the business line. The public chest, he says, requires protection. I dare say the hon. gentleman may have learned that fact by observation, when he was a follower of the Government that has just gone out of power; and he proceeds to read a letter written by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie about standing guard over the public treasury, and about the necessity that existed in his day to keep at bay the cormorants who wanted to prey on the public treasury. There is, no doubt, truth in the statement, and Mr. Mackenzie succeeded most admirably in the efforts he made in that respect. He kept down the expenditure of this country to such an extent that, while he was obliged to add more than a million dollars a year to the interest charge to meet the obligations which the previous Government of Sir John Macdonald had placed upon the country, at the same time he actually diminished the expenditure by the sum of $1,400,000 between the year 1873 and the year 1878. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie carried the expenditure charged to consolidated fund from $23,316,000 in the first year of their administration, to $23,503,000 in the last year, or an increase of $186,000 during the five years. And yet we have an hon. gentleman rising in the House of Commons in this day of September, 1896, and attempting to cast aspersions upon the financial management of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and his colleagues in office during the period in which this country was blessed with their administration of public affairs. Now, I want to call my hon. friend's attention to some details. He has indulged in general assertions and general charges, and I want to call his attention to some details which will demonstrate more thoroughly the economy practised by the Mackenzie Administration during its term of office. I take the Public Accounts for the year 1895, and I take the table commencing on page liv., giving in detail the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund in the Dominion of Canada from the year 1867 to the year 1895; and I find that in the matter of administration of justice the expenditure was $564,000 when Mr. Mackenzie left office, whereas it was $755,000 last year. I find that in the matter of arts and agriculture the expenditure in Mr. Mackenzie's last year was $92,000, whereas in 1895 it was $216,000. I find that the expenditure chargeable to civil government was $823,000 in 1878, and $1,422,000 in 1895.

Mr. SPROULE. What has that to do with Governor General's warrants?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am answering specific charges made by an hon. member of this House against the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, of reckless extravagance and of having largely increased the cost of the government of Canada; and I am happy to see that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is a little restive under the statement of the facts; but, if he will possess his soul in patience, I will give him a few facts which will enlighten his mind.

Mr. SPROULE. I was amused at the way you were lecturing my hon. friend for wasting the time of the House, and then following the same course yourself.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend's friend did make a few statements which might influence a gentleman such as the hon. member for North Grey, and it is necessary to disabuse his mind of the wrong impression.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not the member for North Grey.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I ought not to have forgotten the constituency of a gentleman who has had the distinguished honour of being read out of his party.

	1878.	1895.
Fisheries	$ 73,000	$ 443,000

Nearly five-fold increase.

Indian Affairs.....	421,000	955,000

More than two-fold increase.

Mail subsidies	257,000	513,000
Militia and defence...	618,000	1,574,000
Mounted Police	334,000	646,000
Superannuation	106,000	265,000
Customs	714,000	917,000
Excise	215,000	471,000
Post Office	1,724,000	3,593,000

And so on through the list. Our hon. friends opposite succeeded in running up the expenditure, chargeable to the consolidated fund, from $25,000,000 in 1878 to nearly $40,000,000 in 1895. So that the charges made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) in this respect are totally without foundation, and I believe the House will agree with me in that conclusion.

Now, I wish to say a few words in reply to the statements made by the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). That hon. gentleman told us that Parliament should have the control of supplies. No one will dispute that assertion. Parliament has control of supplies, and the present Government has no intention to deprive Parliament of the power that it legitimately exercises in controlling the supplies. The hon. gentleman proceeded to attempt to show that there was no necessity for the course pursued by the Government. Now, I wish to review very briefly the peculiar circumstances that existed when this Government came into power—circumstances that have no parallel in the history of the Dominion at least, circumstances calling for measures which would never be called for under ordinary circumstances, and that amply justified the Government for taking the means they did to raise the money necessary to meet the current expenses of the Administration. Last session was a very peculiar one. It was wasted, at the outset, by the wrangling and the caballing, and the conspiring, and the knifing, and the stabbing in the dark among the members of the late Cabinet, which we all know of. Seven of the strikers went out, and the then leader of the Government (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) announced that he felt like Mary Magdalen when the seven devils were cast out of her. The condition of things that existed in the last session of the last Parliament was certainly anomalous, like to which nothing has ever existed before in the parliamentary history of Canada. Well, after wasting nearly a month in this wrangling, what was next done? If the Government then desired to secure supplies, why did they not get right down to business? They did nothing of the kind, but they held the House in session and frittered away the time that should have been devoted to legitimate business in the attempt to force through a measure which the public sentiment of the country did not demand, which should have been passed upon by the people before being introduced here, which the Government had no right to introduce, and which the Opposition determined should not become law. Then, within a few days of this Parliament ceasing to exist by efflux of time, the Government attempted to secure the passage of the Estimates. No objection was made to passing the Estimates for the current year, except in the case of items, such as that connected with the Soulanges Canal, where there were evidently jobs hidden under the vote. But the Government asked for more, they asked this House to vote the expenditure for 1896-97. The Opposition would not consent. The Opposition practically said to the Government: You have no right to be sitting here at all; this House should have been dissolved; this is the sixth session of Parliament and should never have been held, it is time this Parliament was dissolved and an appeal to the country taken, and we do not propose to place in your hands the funds that will enable you to hold on for twelve months longer. We do not propose to place it in your power to defer the holding of general elections for ten months from this time. We do not propose to place that power in your hands. We propose to refuse you the funds for the year beginning the 1st July, as security for good behaviour on your part and as security for an appeal to the people at the proper time. The late Government, therefore, did not get the money they demanded and should have held the elections immediately. When the last Parliament ceased to exist on the 23rd April, the writs should have been issued the 1st May and a new Parliament

elected, and that Parliament should have been convened in time to pass the supplies before the 1st July. Did the Government do that? No, they held on until at last the writs were issued, and the election took place on the 23rd of June, with the result that the Government was defeated. Did the Government then resign? No, they held on beyond the commencement of the next fiscal year; they held on until the Governor General refused to ratify 450 Orders in Council; and then, when they were kicked out of doors, they resigned at last. They resigned on the 10th or 12th July. The course which they should have pursued, when this Parliament refused supplies for the next year, was to issue their writs and have an election without delay, and there would then have been ample time for the new Parliament to have voted the funds to meet the expenditure of 1896-97. That is what should have been done, and it is what the late Government should be arraigned at the bar of public opinion for not having done. They did not do this, however, but at last they blessed the country by laying down the seals of office and went out. Of course a new Government was then formed. This new Government was not responsible for the condition of things that existed when it came into power. That was a condition which existed independent of any action of theirs. When they came into office they faced a difficult situation, and the question was, what remedy was to be applied. What, I repeat, were they to do? It must not be overlooked that the members of the new Ministry had to go back to their constituents, for this House could not be convened and go on with the transaction of business until it had constitutional leaders. Weeks must elapse before this necessity of the constitution could be complied with. But the House met at the earliest possible moment. It met so early that actually, there were two Ministers who had not met their constituents. And when it did meet, it proceeded at once, so far as the Government was able to control its action, to provide the necessary means for carrying on the affairs of the country. But before Parliament could meet, the advisers of His Excellency were confronted with difficulty, which, as I have stated, they had no hand in creating. It was absolutely necessary that something should be done immediately; the only question was how the difficulty should be met. It could not be met by calling Parliament together. I repeat that there would have been no difficulty if the hon. gentlemen opposite, when Ministers of the Crown, had issued the writs in time to elect the new Parliament and convene that Parliament before the necessity for action arose. But they failed to do that, and upon their heads must be the responsibility for everything that has followed in this connection. What was the law with reference to the action the new Government might take respecting the issue of Governor General's warrants? Why, Sir, this is an extract from the Act:

If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good——

Had these expenditures been provided for by Parliament? Had the money been provided by Parliament to pay the running expenses of the Government for July, for August or for September? Not a dollar had been provided. And the law clearly declares that in the emergency of Parliament not having provided the means to carry on the affairs of the Government for any purpose, whether it was putting in a new water spout on a public building or paying the entire expenses of the Government for one, two, or three months——

—then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required——

to tide over the difficulty. And when the First Minister, finding this difficulty confronting him, appealed to his legal adviser, the Minister of Justice, in what language did he put the case? He said:

It is suggested to me that unless the civil employees are paid their regular salaries, the public service will be subjected to very serious inconveniences.

No doubt about that.

These inconveniences would more particularly arise in the case of that class of employees who are wage-earners on railways, canals and other public works. I would ask you to look into the question and to give me your opinion as to whether a special warrant can be issued to provide for the payment of those servants of the Government.

And the Minister of Justice looked into the question, with characteristic caution and thoroughness, no doubt. He considered the question in all its bearings, and no man in this country was better able to do so. And having looked into the question, having considered it, he proceeded, as Minister of Justice, to give his views to the First Minister. This is what he said:

I think the payment of the employees mentioned in your letter is "urgently and immediately required" for the public good, within the meaning of the said enactment, and that under the circumstances which have occurred and the consequent present condition of public affairs, the Governor in Council may properly on the report mentioned, order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required.

Now the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) says that actually, on the 31st August there was $1,000,000 on hand—the Government had called for $1,000,000 more than they needed. Well, I suppose that in the estimation of the ex-Minister of Railways that would be a rather singular circumstance; it would be quite incomprehensible to him; and I guarantee that if he had been in office there would have been no million dollars left and no ground for criticism on the part of the Opposition in that respect. The truth is that the Government had called for the sum that they deemed necessary, on the report of their deputies; and it is greatly to their credit that they have kept the expenditure within a million dollars of the Estimates, and I take it, that that is an indication of what they intend to do and that this will be characteristic of the administration of affairs under these hon. gentlemen.

When we sweep aside all sophistries and special pleading the case resolves itself into a very simple one indeed. I shall have no hesitation—it may seem singular to my hon. friends opposite, but still it is the case—in voting to sustain the Government in pursuing what I believe was the only course that was open to them under the circumstances. No other course that I know of would have extricated them from the difficulties in which they had been placed, not, as I have said, by their own misconduct, but by the action of their predecessors. While an extensive knowledge of constitutional principles is a good thing and while the quoting of the law is a good thing, common sense is also a good thing. The verdict after a common sense examination will be, an acquittal of the Government, and not only that, but to give complete approbation of the course they have pursued. I think that under the circumstances the new Government have inaugurated their career most auspiciously in tiding over this difficulty in the admirable manner they have done. I regret the course the Opposition have taken, and taken for a two-fold purpose—first, to waste time in order to prolong the session beyond the limit of 30 days, and secondly, to endeavour unjustly to prejudice this Government in the eyes of the people. It has been shown by my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that gentlemen opposite, themselves are the greatest sinners imaginable, in this respect—that large sums were raised by them by Governor General's warrants even when Parliament was in session, or immediately after, the expenditures not having been provided for, not because they were not foreseen, but because they were of a suspicious character and would not bear discussion. I fully recognize the fact that two wrongs do not make a right. Still there is something in the preservation of an attitude of consistency; and a party that has been guilty of the most flagrant abuse of power does not show to good advantage in criticising its opponents for exercising the same power in a justifiable and proper manner. I repeat what I have already said, that this Government now in power found upon assuming the seals of office that a serious difficulty confronted them; that the difficulties that confronted them were not of thir own creation; that they had been created by their predecessors through mismanagement, through failure to discharge their duties; that their predecessors should have issued writs and have convened Parliament before the expiration of the last fiscal year, as they could have done, as they had ample time to do; that, if this had been done, the means of carrying on the Government would have been forthcoming in a constitutional and proper manner; that the fact that these means were not so provided is due, not to the action of the Government now in power, but to the action of the Government that was in power and, fortunately for the country, has resigned its office. When the Government now in power came to confront the difficulty created by their predecessors, they had but one of two courses to pursue: they must either secure the issuing of warrants by His Excellency, or they must convene the House. It is evident beyond doubt that the House could not have been convened in time to meet the emergency; it is evident by the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite that had it been convened, the time would have been wasted by the obstructive tactics now resorted to, and the difficulty made greater than it was at the commencement; and so, in pursuance of the course that was pursued, in meeting the emergency as it was met, the Government have done what they should have done; and they deserve the thanks of the country, and they deserve the approval of this House of Commons.

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

After Recess.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, just before recess I rose to address a few remarks to the House upon a subject which I consider of grave importance. At the outset I desire to say, in reply to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom I regret not to see in his seat, that I disclaim the slightest intention of prolonging this debate for the purpose of extending the session beyond thirty days, as the hon. gentleman charged the Opposition with doing. I think it is an unworthy charge to make on the part of the hon. gentleman against the members on this side of the House: and I think that it comes with very bad grace from the lips of an hon. gentleman who, within the recollection of the older members of this House, and under circumstances which will be remembered, to carry out obstruction such as this Parliament or any other parliament has never known, did not

hesitate to bring the Holy Book into requisition in order to prolong a discussion which led, probably, to the difficulty which we are called upon to discuss to-night. Sir, it is not the wish on this side of the House to prolong the debate or to extend the session; but we consider that, as representatives of the people, we have duties to perform, and that we would be recreant to those duties if, whether sitting on your right or sitting on your left, we did not stand up here to discuss, from our own standpoint and according to our own judgment, questions which we consider affect the interests of the people. Sir, it has been my high privilege to occupy a seat in this House of Commons, as a representative of the people, since 1873, and it is impossible for me to recollect during that time an occasion when, according to my judgment, a more violent attack has been made upon parliamentary institutions and the privileges of a people living under such a constitution as obtains in Canada. Let me say at once that my object in addressing these few remarks to the House was not so much to attack the Government as to vindicate the rights of Parliament, without which no Government could be of any use to the people of Canada. If there was any reason that could have induced me to overlook the action of the Government, it was that the money which was obtained by the warrants of the Governor General, was for the purpose of paying the civil servants what they had earned. Sir, I consider that we have in this country a civil service equal to that of any other country; and I would be prepared to go as far as possible to protect their interests, and to prevent them from suffering in the slightest degree from delay in paying them the amounts which are due them for the valuable services they render to the country. Let me say further, that in this case it is not the Conservative party which is responsible if the civil servants were kept waiting for the salaries which they were entitled to receive. On two different occasions the Conservative party when sitting on the Treasury benches during the last days of the session of an expiring Parliament, appealed to hon. gentlemen opposite to provide for these requirements, which they were in a position then to do, without making an attack such as has been made on the constitution. Hon. gentlemen know well that we asked them whether, if they were not prepared to vote the whole Estimates, they would not consent to vote whatever portion they thought desirable, but they refused, and subsequently when the responsibility of government was thrown upon their shoulders, they considered the payment of salaries to the civil servants was a matter of sufficient importance to justify them in breaking through constitutional precedents. Hon. gentlemen at that time would not agree to the proposition made from the then occupants of the Treasury benches; they were wholly unreasonable, they refused every proposal. At that time it would have been very easy for hon. gentlemen to impose such conditions on granting a portion of the Estimates that it would have been impossible for the Government to have utilized the money in a manner different from that provided by the constitution and approved by the people through their representatives in this House. The Government of that day did not, of course, expect the confidence of hon. gentlemen opposite; still those hon. gentlemen were well aware that there were constitutional rules which could not be broken and precedents which could not to be violated, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite so soon as they occupied the Treasury benches acted unconstitutionally, for after refusing last session to permit the granting of supplies for the payment of the civil service, they resorted to the issue of a Governor General's warrant for that purpose. I claim that English as well as Canadian precedents indicated to hon. gentlemen the course which they should have followed under the circumstances, admitting, as stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that hon. gentlemen opposite had not confidence in the then Government and were not prepared to confide into its hands money voted under the Estimates. Under constitutional precedents which cannot be controverted or ignored, hon. gentlemen opposite should have accepted the proposition made by the Government of that day, when it would not have been necessary so soon as they obtained possession of the Treasury benches to have applied to the Governor General to issue his warrant, even the very day before Parliament met. As regards the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite under English precedents, I refer the House to "Todd," vol. I, page 758, to show that when the last Government appealed to hon. gentlemen opposite to vote, if not the whole of the Estimates, that portion which was required to pay the civil service, the proprosition should have been accepted. That authority says:

> Votes "on account" were formerly restricted to occasions of unexpected emergency, arising out of ministerial changes, when it was desirable to place at the disposal of the Government funds for the public service without specifically appropriating the same to particular items of expenditure In such cases it is usual to grant a portion only of the yearly Estimates, and in the following session to inquire into the expenditure thereof, in order to ascertain that it was duly appropriated to legitimate purposes. When Parliament is about to be dissolved, upon a ministerial crisis, it is obviously improper to call upon the House of Commons to vote either the full amount or all the details of the proposed Estimates, and so commit the country to the financial policy of Ministers whose fate is about to be determined by the general election. The duty of finally deciding upon these Estimates should be reserved for the new House of Commons. Meanwhile the supply of credit should be restricted to such an amount as may be absolutely required for the public service, until the reassembling of

Parliament, and the vote "on account" should not be regarded as in any degree pledging the House to an approval of the entire Estimates.

I fully concur in that expression of opinion, but the case under discussion at the present time does not by any means fall under that head; it is one placed outside of those cases when the fate of outgoing ministries is about to be determined at the general elections. Todd continues:

Within the last few years, however, the practice of taking votes "on account" has become general. This is owing to the introduction of a new rule, making all grants in supply applicable only to "payments to be made within the financial year," and requiring the Government to surrender into the exchequer, at the end of the year, all unexpended balances.

This plainly indicates that without at all pledging themselves to the Estimates as prepared by the then Finance Minister, without in any way changing their views as to having confidence or want of confidence in the Government of the day, they could have consented, as we proposed to them privately across the House on more than one occasion, to have voted the Estimates required for the service for which they subsequently called upon His Excellency to issue a warrant. That is my contention, and that is the precedent which is being followed in England to-day. Further, it is the precedent which has been followed in Canada within my own recollection, for when during the time I occupied the position of Minister of Militia, the troubles in the North-west arose, Parliament voted $1,700,000 without pledging itself to approve of the expenditure or not, but it was an emergency for which Parliament considered a grant should be immediately made. A similar case could not arise in England for the reason that emergencies are there provided for in a different way, as I shall be able to show. In Canada it has been the custom for Parliament to vote money which was required to meet certain services which were not objected to by either party. The salaries of the civil servants are fixed by statute, and the Government of the day even if it chose to, could not divert the money voted by Parliament for that purpose towards any other channel. Hence it is that I charge the Opposition of last year with being responsible for all this difficulty on account of their unconstitutional action in refusing to vote supplies last year for the public service. I have quoted from Todd as to the English precedents, and in relation to the Canadian practice, Bourinot says:

Votes "on account of" particular services, now quite common in the English House, have only been necessary on one occasion from 1867 to 1891.

I think that is the instance to which I referred when I was acting as Minister of Militia, and when money was required for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the rebellion in the North-west.

On the eve of dissolution, in case of a ministerial crisis, or at other times in anticipation of particular grants or classes of service, the Imperial Parliament has allowed votes "on account." Such a course has now become necessary every session, "in consequence of the increased strictness in the audit of public accounts and the difficulty of securing the consideration of the estimates in due time." "It is an established rule," says a high authority, "that a vote on account should involve no new principle, but should merely provide for the continuation of services which had been sanctioned in the previous year; and it is the practice not to take more than two or three months' supplies, except in certain particular cases of public emergency."

The proposition submitted by the Government last year was that the Opposition should vote a sufficient sum of money to pay the civil service during the period of time between the elections and the meeting of the House again.

"So that the committee in agreeing to vote on account are not pledged to the estimates for the year in anticipation of the opportunity to be afterwards afforded of voting them in detail." In Canada, as the fiscal year ends on the 30th June, and Parliament generally assembles in the month of January, or, at least, months before the appropriations for public service are exhausted, the necessity for votes on account can only arise under exceptional conditions. In 1891, Parliament met on the 29th of April, and it became necessary when the first of July was passed to meet the exigencies of the public service. One-tenth of the annual Estimates was passed without discussion, and included with all the resolutions previously passed in an Appropriation Act, which immediately received the royal assent. Subsequently one-fifth was voted in the same way. Finally the sums necessary to complete the amounts required for the service of the year were voted after the usual full discussion.

Therefore the course followed by Her Majesty's loyal Opposition last year is in direct opposition to these precedents, and was, as I believe, an invasion of parliamentary rights. It is so serious an invasion of the constitution, that it is our duty to bring the question up in the House, even though we should meet with the censure of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who charges us with delaying the session. When the present Government came into power they were face to face with a great difficulty which they themselves had created by their unconstitutional course last year, and in order to overcome the difficulty they again had recourse to an unconstitutional practice to raise large sums of money which had not been provided for by a vote of Parliament. I must, at the risk of being tedious, read the statute which I contend that hon. gentlemen have misinterpreted, and I shall also read the opinions of eminent men upon that statute. I shall read the opinions of some whose absence we regret and who, from their constitutional knowledge and experience, have left on record their opinions, which hon. gentlemen who to-day for the first time in eighteen years occupy the Treasury benches, may well refer to, and learn,

and be guided by. The legal authority for the issue of Governor General's warrants is to be found in the Revised Statutes, chap. 29, sec. 32, and I shall read it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Dispense.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should like to oblige the hon. gentleman by dispensing. On one occasion when the present Prime Minister was leader of the Opposition, I tried to dispense with reading what I thought hon. gentlemen on both sides knew, but the present Prime Minister insisted upon my following the rule, and therefore I do not think I can oblige my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) who is sitting in the Prime Minister's seat, by dispensing with reading this clause of the Act.

Mr. LISTER. I did not ask you to dispense. I shall be glad to hear you read. Do not charge me with it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I thought you had said "dispense." The clause of the Audit Act to which I have referred, reads:

If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon the report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Governor General for the issue of the amount estimated to be required, which shall be placed by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General to a special account against which cheques may issue from time to time, in the usual form, as they are required.

Thus, in 1887, Sir Richard Cartwright admitted that the lapsed balances of votes that had been discussed in Parliament might be extended under a Governor General's warrant. Also that a legal award against the Government might be provided for in this manner. But he raised the point for discussion. The House met on April 13, 1887; and it appeared that nearly $500,000 had been paid by Governor General's warrant, bearing date 14th April, the day after the House met. He contended that the Governor General's warrant could only issue "when Parliament is not in session" as the language of the statute has it. Sir John Macdonald contended, in reply, that if the order for the money is given previous to the meeting of Parliament:

The fact that the warrant, the mere paper, is not signed until afterwards is a matter of no consequence whatever. It is like the appointment of a man to hold any office under the Crown. The moment the Order in Council says he is appointed, he holds his office, although the commission may not issue for twenty years afterwards.

Mr. Davies said:

The main objection which has been urged is not that the ministerial act of signing the warrant took place after the meeting of Parliament and after a proper Order in Council had been passed. That is a mere ancillary point, and may or may not be correct. I am disposed to think myself that if a proper Order in Council had been passed, the mere affixing of the signature of the Governor General while Parliament is in session might not invalidate it.

Mr. Blake pointed out that:

Urgency and the necessity for immediate action for the public good are the elements which give to the Administration power to act.

And as to the question of date of signing the warrant, he pointed out that:

The spirit of the Act is that of the public good imperatively requires money to be expended, in respect of which the condition of things renders it impossible that Parliament should be consulted and its consent obtained, the Government may issue special warrants for such expenditures during recess; but that cannot be said in reference to certain expenditures for which the Orders in Council were passed just before the 13th April, so late that the warrants could not be issued in time to have them out before Parliament.

In 1891, Sir Richard Cartwright laid down the general rule of interpretation thus:

It is scarcely necessary for me to point out that the obvious meaning of this clause is, that when an occasion arises when any expenditure which cannot fairly be foreseen by the department, or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required, then and then only, is it intended that such a warrant should be issued.

In the same debate, the Finance Minister, Mr. Foster, gave the statute the following interpretation:—

As to the general principle which the Government ought to pursue in regard to these expenditures, I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend. A Governor General's warrant ought not to be used except for an urgent and necessary purpose, but if an error occurs, and a branch of the public service must be stopped unless appropriations are made which Parliament would have given but for the error, there is no choice between the two alternatives. The warrant must be issued and the money must be made available.

It will be observed that although Mr. Foster alleges "perfect agreement" with Sir Richard Cartwright, his views are, like the views of Sir John Macdonald, totally opposed to those of Sir Richard, and of Mr. Davies, &c. There are in fact two separate and conflicting canons of criticism as to the meaning of the clause under which the warrants are issued. In England it is the practice to take grants on account for the civil service every year, and sometimes more than once during the session when the pressure of parliamentary affairs has prevented the passing of the whole Estimates. In urgent cases requiring immediate relief, or when, on grounds of public policy secrecy is advisable, the Government can have recourse in the first instance to the "civil contingen-

cies" or the "treasury chest funds." Todd states the practice as follows :—

If the Comptroller General is empowered, as we have seen, to interpose his authority, and forbid the issue of any money, except such as may be asked for by the Treasury under the express authority of Parliament, how is it that the Government are able to obtain possession of the means to incurr extraordinary expenditure, without a previous Act of appropriation ? The wisdom of Parliament has itself provided for this contingency. "The public interests require that the Government should possess the power of incurring expenses of indispensable necessity, although Parliament may not have previously provided for them. * * * * Unforeseen events may happen, and lead to an expenditure beyond the provision made by Parliament for the ordinary service of the year ; and it must be for the interest of the public, that no delay should occur in taking the necessary measures, and in defraying the expenses which such events may entail." There is, accordingly, a fund called the "Treasury Chest Fund," which is maintained for the purpose of supplying the specie required for the "Treasury Chest" in the several colonies, and for making the necessary advances for carrying on the public service at home and abroad. By the Act 40 and 41 Vict., c. 45, this fund, formerly £1,300,000, is now limited to £1,000,000. It is authorized to be employed by the Treasury in making temporary advances for any public service ; to be repaid out of money appropriated by Parliament to such service, or out of other money applicable thereto. The governors of colonies have authority, in cases of emergency, to pay advances out of the treasury chest, to be made good out of votes in supply. This unavoidably occasions an expenditure, in certain cases, which has not been authorized by Parliament, but the earliest opportunity is taken to explain the transaction to the House of Commons.

There is also another fund, which was created in 1862, pursuant to the recommendations of the Committee on Public Accounts, in the previous year. It is called the "Civil Contingencies Fund," and is limited to £120,000. The Treasury are empowered to draw on this fund from time to time, to defray new and unforeseen expenditure for civil services at home, for which no votes had been taken, or to meet unforeseen deficiencies on ordinary votes. But every advance made out of these funds must be repaid out of votes to be taken in Parliament, in the following year, on behalf of the service for which such advances had been made. No expenditure whatever is allowed to be finally charged against either of these funds. The "Civil Contingencies Fund" has been set apart by the Treasury as a substitute for the irregular items previously included in the estimates under the head of "Civil Contingencies," and which had frequently to be voted after the expenditure had been incurred. The creation of this fund has been formally approved of by the Committee on Public Accounts ; and there is no reason to doubt that the sanction of the legislature, which is certainly required to make it legally available for public purposes, would, if applied for, be readily granted.

I think it my duty further to refer to what seems to me to be the real key to the situtation, and what to my mind explains exactly the conditions under which these warrants may be issued :

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Or any other occasion arises when an expenditure not foreseen or provided for by Parliament is urgently and immediately required for the public good.

I know, and nobody who has followed this interesting discussion can ignore, that hon. gentlemen opposite, and some whose opinion is certainly entitled to great consideration and respect, have contended that in this case "or" does not mean "and." Well, Sir, if "or" does not mean "and" in this case, the constitution would be giving to the Government of the day a power which it could never have contemplated. It could never have contemplated to leave to the Executive the interpretation of what is provided for and what is not provided for. The representatives of the people might in their wisdom consider that certain expenditures should not be provided for ; and the Government of the day might, after the session, turn around and call upon His Excellency to issue his warrant for those expenditures assigning as a reason that they had not been provided for by the vote of Parliament. So that I cannot for one moment believe that there can be a difference of opinion that to justify the issue of a Governor General's warrant the expenditure must be not foreseen and not provided for by Parliament. This is according to my interpretation and reading, in the light in which I read the discussions contained in our Canadian "Hansard," giving the opinions of men whose opinions are deserving of great consideration and respect. If the interpretation were different from what I state, then it would be impossible for me to understand that the people, as represented by their representatives in Parliament, are the sole masters of the expenditure of public money. But, Sir, questions as to the interpretation of this clause have arisen on more than one occasion and in more than one debate. In the debates of 1887, volume 1, page 258, it will be found that in that year Sir Richard Cartwright admitted that the lapsed balances of votes of Parliament might be expended under a Governor General's warrant and that a legal award against the Government might be provided for in this manner ; but he raised this point, which is very close to the point under discussion to-day. The House met on April 13th, and it appeared that nearly $500,000 had been paid by Governor General's warrants, bearing date the 14th of April, the day after the House met. He contended that the Governor General's warrant could only issue when Parliament is not in session, as the language of the statute has it. The point made by Sir John Macdonald at the time will be remembered by hon. gentlemen. He agreed with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) upon the point that the warrants should not be issued except when Parliament was not sitting, that is, during the recess of Parliament ; but he said that the fact of the

Order in Council having been signed previous to the meeting of Parliament was quite sufficient. He assimilated this case to the case of a man who was appointed by Order in Council to a position under the Government, but who had not received his commission, saying that the moment the Order in Council passed, this person held office, although the commission might not issue for twenty years afterwards. Mr. Davies said :

> The main objection which has been urged is not that the ministerial act of signing the warrant took place after the meeting of Parliament and after a proper Order in Council had been passed. That is a mere ancillary point, and may or may not be correct. I am disposed to think myself that if a proper Order in Council had been passed, the mere affixing of the signature of the Governor General while Parliament is in session might not invalidate it.

Mr. Blake pointed out that "urgency and the necessity for immediate action for the public good are the elements which give to the Administration power to act."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hon. gentlemen say "Hear, hear." I want to know where is the urgency. If they would substitute for the word "urgency" the word "inconveniency," I would agree with them. But where was the urgency when the Government had already received a warrant from His Excellency and when, the day before Parliament met, and before they had expended the whole amount, they asked for a new warrant from the Governor General for a million dollars ? I do not think I am presuming when I say that if these hon. gentlemen had waited another day and asked this Parliament to vote this million dollars on the ground that it was required to pay the civil service, there would not have been a dissenting voice on this side to so reasonable a proposition. Let me say that I, probably from my long training as a Conservative, believe that encroachments upon the constitutional rights of the people should be guarded against in every way possible. If we look back to the noblest pages of our history, we find that men like Morin and Lafontaine, Baldwin and Howe, and the other fathers of constitutional government in Canada, made their names household words by the gallant and successful fight which they made against the encroachments of the Crown on the privileges of the people. Every student of our history knows of the difficulties that arose between the Governors of Canada under the old regime, who wished to expend the public money on what they would no doubt call their warrant, and the men whom I have mentioned who resisted these encroachments of the Crown on the privileges of the people. To-day it seems to me that we in Opposition are fighting against the encroachments of the advisers of the Crown on the rights and privileges of the people's representatives. I, for one, voicing my feelings and those, I believe, of the people of my province, declare that these great constitutional battles, which were fought upon constitutional grounds, are too fresh in the recollection of our people for us to allow this encroachment by the present Government on our constitutional rights to pass without most vigorous protest on our part. Sir, I hold that the practice which has been followed by this Government on this occasion is a most dangerous one ; and in raising my voice in protest I do not do so merely for the purpose of opposing the Government or of delay——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hon. gentlemen say "Hear, hear," but I do express my opinions frankly and honestly, and I say that my protest is not for the purpose so much of opposing the Government or of delaying, as we have been accused of delaying, the close of the session, but for the purpose of defending those rights which we hold sacred and which I, for one, will not allow to be interfered with if I can possibly prevent it. Could it be the intention of Parliament to allow the Executive to dispose of large sums of money which had not been provided for by Parliament ? If that were the case, any Government could, for the purpose of obstruction, nullify the wish of the people of this country. They could wait until Parliament was prorogued, and then, following out the contention of hon. gentlemen on the other side, ask for Governor General's warrants to meet the public expenditure on the ground that these expenses had not been provided for. They could thus call upon the Governor General to issue his warrant and dispose of the people's money without the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. GIBSON. How did you pay the $100,000 to the Curran Bridge after Parliament was over ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is more familiar with bridges than I am. I am talking of constitutional questions, and I can understand that the hon. gentleman could better discuss the bridge question than the constitutional point. I might tell the hon. gentleman something about the $100,000, but he seems to know all about it ; and when the hon. gentleman addresses himself to this Parliament to enlighten it upon this constitutional question, he might, as a diversion, slip in the question of the $100,000 for the bridge. I feel a good deal of sympathy for the supporters of the Government. Through the unconstitutional method which was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite last session, when they refused our reasonable proposition to vote a grant of money sufficient to meet the public expenditure until this House could be called together—which did not involve anything like the total estimates and did not commit

hon. gentlemen opposite to any policy—they have found themselves placed in a most disagreeable position. These hon. gentlemen supporting the Government found themselves called upon to justify the unconstitutional act of the Government in paying out large sums which were not voted by Parliament and in violating the undoubted privilege of Parliament by issuing Governor General's warrants, when there was no necessity or constitutional right for so doing. I have addressed myself to that branch of the subject already, and I will not take up the time of the House by going into that question again. If hon. gentlemen were not controlled by party allegiance—and who can blame them for being so controlled in a Parliament in which party government is recognized—there would not be found one hon. gentleman who would not vote against the issuing of warrants of the Governor General and in favour of the maintaining of the privileges of this House, as provided under the constitution, properly interpreted. The exclusive right of Parliament is to initiate these votes of money; and the cases when that exclusive right can be interfered with must be jealously guarded by those who represent the people, because the opposite course is subversive of the very principles of the constitution under which we live, and which has made Canada a free and happy country. Sir, the points which we have considered it our duty to submit to the House, involve one of the greatest questions which has ever been brought before Parliament. The great principle at stake, as I understand it, is the supremacy of Parliament, as against the usurpation of its powers by the Executive. I am prepared to defend any measure that can be constitutionally adopted for the purpose of protecting the civil service against any suffering or trouble by reason of the failure to pay their salaries at the proper moment, and to achieve that end I would be prepared to overlook, to a great extent, this action of the Government, if it were not that I believe that action to be absolutely unconstitutional. It would have been proper for hon. gentlemen opposite, when Parliament met, to ask us on your left, Mr. Speaker, to consent to a vote for the purpose of meeting this expenditure. Considering the battles that have been fought on this question, session after session, and considering the strong ground taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, when in opposition, against the issuance of Governor General's warrants except in cases of absolute necessity, it seems almost impossible to believe that on assuming office their very first act should be in direct opposition to all that they had professed, when sitting on this side. This will show the people of Canada more clearly than anything can do that these hon. gentlemen are not prepared to carry out on the Treasury benches what they advocated when in opposition. I regret to have taken up the time of the House, but I feel strongly and deeply upon this question of the rights and privileges of this House; and, though prepared to respect the Executive and the advice given by the officers of the Crown to the Crown, I am not prepared to yield a single inch on a question involving the rights of the people, in order to accommodate views that may be entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to be permitted to say a few words upon the subject now engaging the attention of the House. And when I do so, I hope I shall not be subject to the charge that has been levelled by the hon. member for North Wellington against hon. members on this side of the House. I hope I shall not be open to the charge that because I venture to rise in this House to say a word or two in reference to a matter of the greatest possible gravity, I do so for the purpose merely of taking up the time of the House and with the intention of increasing the public expenditure of this country. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the statement made by the hon. gentleman was most unparliamentary and most improper, and that it was in the option of any hon. member to rise at the time and call the hon. gentleman to order. I would not have risen to say one word in reference to this matter, were it not that the more I have considered this subject, the more I am impressed with its great importance and gravity; and I think the time of this House has been well occupied with a discussion which must have the effect of directing the attention of the people to a matter of so great moment. Before dealing further with the matter, I cannot but express my astonishment at the hon. member for North Wellington saying that he is prepared to endorse the conduct of the Government in this matter upon no other ground than that they are acting as badly as he said hon. gentlemen on this side of the House acted, when they were in power. I shall not pursue the argument further than to express the astonishment I feel at such a statement coming from an hon. gentleman of any standing on the floor of Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the nature of one of the precedents which is being established, to some of the arguments which have been adduced in support of it, and to some of the precedents which have crept in, so to speak, by stealth, under the shadow of the great wrong precedent which, on the strength of an opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat, the Government are setting up. And here I wish to protest very strongly against the doctrine which we have heard during this debate, emanating, I must confess, from very unexpected quarters, namely, that the Government are to be held blameless of unconstitutional action if only one of their own members, an eminent legal authority who is himself under trial before this House,

can be induced, it may be by pressure from his colleagues, it may be by pressure of party exigencies, to give an opinion in favour of a course which he and his colleagues desired to pursue. That is a doctrine which I have heard with considerable surprise advanced in this House, and more especially have I been surprised at the quarters from which I have heard it promulgated. Sir, I have a very great respect for Sir Oliver Mowat, both as a lawyer and as a politician; but I venture, with all gentleness, to whisper in the ears of hon. gentlemen that it is just possible that even in the case of a lawyer, and in the case of a politician, the wish might be father to the thought. But there is another doctrine which has been promulgated, another idea which has been put forward to-day to which I utterly object—and I will refer to that now as I am on the subject of Sir Oliver Mowat. I object to the attempt which has been made during the course of this debate to hedge about the authority of his opinion with an awe and a majesty which are to dominate all legal and lay opinion in this House. I venture to say that if it were not eminently ridiculous, it would be exceedingly insulting to this House to assume that the opinion of the present Minister of Justice is not only to be held to overbear the opinion of one of the most eminent parliamentarians that has been known to Canada since this Act under discussion was placed upon the statute-book, but that it is to be held superior in authority to the united opinion, to the consensus of opinion, of all these eminent parliamentarians put together. But that is the suggestion which has been made here during the course of this debate, and, Sir, I protest against it.

Now, what is the first precedent to which I wish to call the attention of hon. members—and I especially beg the hon. members who are here for the first time to be kind enough to lend me their attention for a moment or two. What is the first precedent which we are establishing, if we do not call in question the conduct of the Government? The precedent is this, that the Executive can take power to themselves to expend public money even though Parliament has deliberately refused to grant this money. Parliament has deliberately refused to make the appropriation, and yet hon. gentlemen come down here and tell us that they have procured a Governor General's warrant for the express purpose of overriding the decision of this House with regard to the expenditure of public money. That, Sir, is what we are face to face with to-day; and I venture to say that, notwithstanding the weighty opinion to the contrary of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), it is a subject somewhat worthy of the consideration of this House, and somewhat worthy of the consideration of the people of this country. Now, we are told that the circumstances are peculiar, we are told that the circumstances are exceptional, and that that is a reason why this thing should be done. Sir, I venture to say that what we are doing is opening wide the door to abuse. The precedent we are establishing is that the Executive can sit in judgment upon the decisions of the House of Commons in reference to the expenditure of public money, can determine that this House has improperly withheld suplies, and can then vote to themselves the supplies in the Council Chamber, and with a strong hand, by means of Governor General's warrants, can take money which this House has refused. That is what we are discussing here to-night. Exceptional, hon. gentleman say, the circumstances are. The circumstances may be exceptional, but I say we are opening wide the door to abuse, and abuses will always be ingenious to frame excuses, and to say that the circumstances are exceptional. The member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who made such an interesting and such an able speech from the ministerial side, told us that in his opinion saving common sense would be sufficient to guard the door which we are leaving open, that saving common sense would take care that no abuses enter. Ah, but, Mr. Speaker, supposing that a stronger than saving common sense comes along; supposing that party allegiance, with his heart aglow with party loyalty, comes along and brings with him saving party discipline with his cat-o'-nine tails, and drives away Mr. Saving Common Sense from the gate, what then becomes of my hon. friend's safeguard? That, I am afraid, is what is being done here this night. I am afraid that party discipline and party allegiance are being brought forward to overbear saving common sense, and that if this measure is carried it will only be carried by calling in the assistance of those two powers. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that since I have had the honour of a seat in Parliament, in my opinion, I have never heard a graver question considered by this House.

Let us realize what we are doing, let us distinctly understand what we are about. If we agree to what has been done, if we allow this course which the Government has pursued to pass unchallenged and uncensured we are deliberately saying that the Government can take the money which the representatives of the people in Parliament, the custodians of the money of the people have refused to vote and can behind the back of the people's representatives appropriate it to uses they think best. Now we are told that the money has been honestly applied. I have no desire to weary hon. gentlemen, who no doubt are somewhat wearied already with this debate. While I have the authority here I am willing to leave it unread. But I will simply refer hon. gentlemen who use that argument to the words Hon. Edward Blake employed in this House in regard to such an argument,

and they will find how shortly he dealt with that kind of argument. Why, Sir, it is as though some one came along and took possession of the home of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during his absence, and by his strong hand kept it, saying he had a right to it, and when my hon. friend objected to this high-handed course of procedure it is as if the trespasser were to make excuse that he had not stolen any of his silver spoons. I ask whether my hon. friend thinks that would be a reasonable reply to his complaints that the man had been trespassing upon his estate and taking possession of his property. As the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), with his usual lucidity put the matter, two arguments have been advanced in defence of the course of the Government, one on political grounds and the other on legal grounds. I do not intend to weary the House by discussing this matter at length. I only wish to say a word so far as the political reason is concerned. It must on the face of it commend itself strongly to the approval of any fair-minded man. As I understand the contention of the Government it is this, that there being no provision made, and certain civil servants and employees of the Government being not only greatly in need of the payment of their salaries and wages but in almost dire distress and straits for the want of the necessary funds, the Government determined to pursue the course which they have pursued and to take the money out of the public treasury. Their argument is: We had to choose the lesser of two evils, and we considered that this was the lesser of the two and we adopted this procedure. That might be a very fair argument if the facts were exactly on all fours with the statement I have made, but in a moment I shall show that this is not the case. That argument proceeds on the assumption that there was no other way out of the difficulty than taking the money out of the public chest. I do not intend to elaborate this matter at length, for it has already been referred to. I say, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite have caused the difficulty, and if they caused the difficulty—where was their excuse? It seems to me that the simple truth is that the whole difficulty is caused by the conduct of hon. gentlemen themselves. I am not prepared to say that the late Government were not largely responsible for the Estimates not having been passed last session; on the contrary, I did not hesitate to say at the time that I thought they were largely responsible, I have not in any degree altered my opinion. But I say that in my opinion it is beyond the reach of controversy that hon. gentlemen opposite are solely responsible for this difficulty, inasmuch as they deliberately refused the ordinary vote of credit to be passed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). We may be jointly responsible with the hon. gentlemen, but we are not solely responsible.

Mr. McNEILL. I certainly objected to no such vote as that to which I have referred, but, on the contrary, I always held that such a vote of credit should be passed. Furthermore, I stated that the ordinary Estimates should be allowed to pass with as little difficulty as possible. But I said then, and I say now, that owing to the course the Government pursued, I did not hold the Opposition mainly responsible for the fact that the Estimates were not passed as a whole, but I hold them responsible for the fact that a vote of credit was not granted. No fair-minded man can hold hon. gentlemen opposite anything else than responsible for the failure to allow a vote of credit to pass through this House last session. If that vote had passed, all this difficulty would have been avoided, so they are responsible for the difficulty with which we are now face to face. Further, I say that even when that difficulty arose they did not pursue the course which we should have followed in order to get rid of it. There was a constitutional course open to them—it was to meet Parliament. I am aware the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has stated that we have no right to refer to what occurred during last Parliament. The hon. gentleman gets rid of the difficulty with a simple wave of his hand, and his doing so is only a further evidence of that magnificent courage which he possesses in debate and which has contributed so much to make him one of the foremost intellectual gladiators of our time. But I venture to say that it will be impossible for the hon. member for North Simcoe to find anywhere a dictum bearing out the statement he made in that regard; and if he were here I should like to ask him, what he would think if it were suggested provided certain eventualities had occurred, which might very well occur, that we were to be precluded from making any reference whatever to the debate on the Manitoba school question and the opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen during last Parliament. But hon. gentlemen who have been told they have no right to refer to what occurred during the last Parliament will become somewhat surprised when I tell them that on the last two occasions this question was before the House the subject was brought up by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he introduced his remarks by references to what had occurred during the last Parliament, and he founded his argument upon those events, to which the hon. member for North Simcoe says we have no right whatever to refer. But I say to the Prime Minister that he had a constitutional remedy and he ought to have adopted it; he ought to have met Parliament and he ought to have asked Parliament for this money which instead of obtaining from Parliament in a constitutional manner, he abstracted by Governor General's warrants from the

public treasury. I know it would have been inconvenient, that it might even have been dangerous from a party point of view; but party convenience and party exigency form no excuse for unconstitutional procedure. I am now speaking merely upon the political aspect of the case. This precedent which has been set up would be serious and grave enough if it rested just there. We have, however, not yet reached the most grave aspect of it. If the Government had come down to this House, and said that they were in straits; if they had explained the circumstances, if they had said that they regretted the course that they had been obliged to pursue, and had thrown themselves upon the generosity of this House, I could understand that the supporters of the Liberal Government, accepting the facts as stated, might have been willing to condone what they had done, and to support them in their course. But, Mr. Speaker, what I want to say is that the case does not rest there. What I want to call the attention of the House to, as the grave matter in connection with the subject, is this, that hon. gentlemen justify what they have done, that they say what they have done is constitutional, that they say what they have done is regular.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I say we are establishing a precedent which we may be very sure hon. gentlemen who advance that argument—and I see it is cheered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—will be quite ready to adopt in future, when their party exigencies require it. This House may mark the demeanour of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. the Finance Minister in reference to that very matter. Sir Oliver Mowat has stated, in answer to the letter of the Prime Minister, that he holds that these funds may be taken for the payment of certain civil servants, in conformity with the section of the statute, and hon. gentlemen opposite act upon that, and cheer the statement that their course is constitutional. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he laboured, as I never saw him labour in this House before, to justify the course of the Government, was so oppressed with the gravity of the circumstance that he endeavoured to say that what his Government had done would not be a precedent. But other hon. gentlemen opposite cheered the statement that it was regular and constitutional, and I say therefore that we are establishing precedents with a vengeance, and nailing them up, and clinching them, at that. One of the precedents is, as I have already said, that the Executive can take the money which Parliament has refused, and appropriate it themselves by Governor General's warrants. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the conduct of the Government with regard to this first Governor General's warrant. The opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat was that money could be taken for the payment of those employees, and the first warrant brought down seemed carefully to go upon the lines of that opinion, and was confined exclusively to the payment of those employees. But what do we find the Government did afterwards? We find that they took money for the payment of "contingencies" to the extent of $29,239, which they were not justified under the warrant to expend, and they took for "miscellaneous expenditure" to the tune of $20,300. If you add to that the expenditure in connection with the Lieutenant-Governor's office in the North-west Territories—to which I specially wish to call the attention of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), if he is in the House—if you add to that this expenditure of $790, you will find that under this warrant they have expended over $50,000 of the people's money, without any warrant whatever. And yet they come here and ask that their course should be supported, because of the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat that they might use certain moneys for the payment of certain employees. So much for the first warrant. Now let us come to the warrant of the 18th of August, and what do we find? You know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen had by this time become a little more accustomed to their position. They felt themselves a little more secure in their saddles. They had actually been in office somewhat over a month. They found it very convenient, by means of Governor General's warrant, to get hold of the public money and spend it in the way they thought best; but it strikes me they had some little trouble with our old friend the Auditor General. I do not know for certain, but I think there was a little trouble of that kind, and the hon. gentlemen found that they had been just a little too restricted in the terms of the first warrant they brought down. It did not give them quite scope enough. The great Liberal party was not to be cabinned, cribbed and confined in this sort of way. They wanted more scope, and they took it. We find, therefore, that the second warrant is not by any means confined, as the first was, to the payment of employees. Sir Oliver Mowat's opinion was certainly confined to that, but the hon. gentlemen were able to enlarge it a little, and able to regard it as giving them somewhat wider power. They read it more liberally, and they put a very liberal construction upon it, and so we find that the Governor General's warrant of the 18th of August goes very much beyond the payment of employees. We know that they had already paid away the people's money for "contingencies" and "miscellaneous expenditure," which they had no right to do, and what did they do next? They introduced into the second warrant the power to pay contingencies, in express terms, and they said:

Also for the payment of pensions, superannuation allowance, contingencies and other expenditures.

They were not to be cabinned, cribbed and confined. They were going to have free scope and I say again they took it. "Other expenditures"—what did that cover? Anything that any member of the Government was prepared to say was urgent; because they dropped the "immediate necessity." All they say is that it was urgent; that is a sufficient excuse. Any expenditure of any kind or description that any hon. Minister chose to consider as urgent they took leave and power under this warrant to cover with the people's money. I want to know if there is a single member of this House who lives by the waters of the great lakes or by the seaboard who has not some public work in his constituency that he considers urgent? I venture to think there is not one. If my memory does not deceive me, if it is not a blank, I have heard my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) declare in this House that a tunnel under the ocean between Prince Edward Island and the mainland was urgently required; and I say with all gravity that under this Governor General's warrant my hon. friend and his colleagues took power to themselves to expend all the millions of money necessary for the construction of that work, if only the hon. Minister of Public Works declared it to be urgent.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). With all gravity, the hon. member says that.

Mr. McNEILL. I say with all gravity that they took the power, and I say it is impossible for any person to controvert the statement. I am glad to find that the hon. First Minister is somewhat shocked to discover what his Government has really being doing. They did not take the money, but they took the power to take it if they liked, and they have established a precedent which would enable any Government, less honest than themselves, in the future to appropriate the people's money by Governor General's warrants for any purpose they pleased, provided a Minister were found prepared to say that the expenditure was urgent. Now, I want this House seriously to consider whether, in the presence of these facts, which are incontrovertible, it is prepared to endorse the conduct which has been pursued by this Government. We have been told that this expenditure was simply for the purpose of paying employees who were in distress and required the money. Is it so? Is that the only expenditure which the Government took power under Governor General's warrant to make? I ask any independent member of this House if it be so; and if it be not so, I want to ask the independent members of this House to condemn the course that has been pursued, as I most certainly will condemn it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are Liberals. I am a Tory—I always was—I could not be anything else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. And I am not prepared, although the Liberals may be prepared, to endorse or condone the course of the Government, who have made most dangerous inroads upon ancient privileges of the House of Commons, that lie at the very roots of our parliamentary institutions.

Now, I want just for a moment to recapitulate. I want to call attention to the expenditures which the Government took power to make under this last warrant: Salaries and contingencies; salaries, &c.: charges of management; maintenance of grounds; dredging, $14,900; Rideau Hall, $770; surveys and inspections; telegraph lines; canals, including construction, $62,100; penitentiaries, pay-list and maintenance; Dominion police; North-west Mounted police, maintenance, $10,000. And now I want to call the attention of the House for a moment to what we find has been done by this Government. We find that under cover of the warrants of the 16th of July they have taken money to defray expenditures which were not covered by these warrants—that they have taken as much as $50,000 in this way out of the public treasury. I do not charge corruption at all. I repeat, however, that they had no more right to take this money under these warrants than any hon. member of this House, or than the felon who prowls the streets. Further, we find that after they had been only a little over a month in office, they boldly threw off the mask, and took to themselves power, not only to pay the salaries and wages referred to in the Premier's letter and in the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat, but to make any other expenditure that any Minister might consider to be urgently required. We find proof of the liberality applied to the construction of the term "urgent" in the fact that on the 18th of August—(Parliament meeting on the 19th, remember)—$7,000 are declared to be urgently required to meet payments which are not only unblushingly admitted not to have fallen due, but the services for which apparently had not even commenced at that time, and not until thirteen days after Parliament had assembled. We find that a new departure has been made, and a new construction has been placed by this Government upon the clause of the statute which gives authority to issue Governor General's warrants. Hitherto it has always been admitted that the warrant cannot be issued unless the expenditure has been unforeseen and unprovided for, and is urgently and immediately required. This Government holds that it need not be unforeseen and that it need not be immediately required. They consider themselves justified in bringing down a Governor General's warrant if only the hon. Minister of Public Works or the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will certify that the expenditure is urgent. They hold this to be in accordance with the law and the constitution.

Now, I have purposely avoided quoting from "Hansard" to show the opinion entertained on this subject by Sir John Macdonald, who said that the whole meaning of the clause was that the expenditure was unforeseen; the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake, who called attention to the fact that the marginal explanatory note referred to accidents; the words of the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who sits opposite me, who said that it must be both unforeseen and immediately urgent; the statement of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to the same effect; the statement of the Hon. Mr. Mills, and the statement on two occasions made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to the same effect. I have not wearied the House with any of these quotations, which are all to be found in "Hansard" where hon. gentlemen can find them for themselves. Further, I say, we find—and this is the most menacing of all—that this Government consider themselves justified under the constitution in taking these moneys in this way for the payment of foreseen expenditures, even in cases where Parliament after consideration has refused to make the appropriations. These are the circumstances with which this House is face to face to-night; and I would ask hon. members who have any regard for precedents or for the public weal, to allow their minds and memories to travel back for only a short way over the history of parliamentary institutions in this country, and just to recall what took place in the province of Quebec a very few years ago; and I would ask them to consider earnestly and dispassionately whether, remembering those circumstnces, they are prepared to endorse the course which this Government has already thought fit to pursue. For my own part, I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, no precedents more ominous than those that have been established could well be imagined. No precedents could well be imagined that are more heavily laden with possibilities disastrous to this commonwealth.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I trust to be able, in a few words, at this advanced stage of the debate to give some reason for expressing the motives which lead me to vote, as I intend to do, upon the question now submitted to the consideration of this House. It is a strange spectacle, Mr. Speaker, for one new to an assemblage of this kind to see what I have seen to-day. We are sent here—at least, that was our impression—to defend the interests of the people. We are sent here to see to the maintenance of the great principles which are at the basis of our political institutions; but, Sir, when, upon the very first matter which is presented for our consideration, we happen to differ among ourselves, we are told, as I have heard it said this afternoon by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that we have entered upon a systematic course of obstruction. We are told that very far from having any intention to serve the interests of our constituents and the country at large, we are, at the very inception of this Parliament, obstructing the Government and preventing the proper administration of the affairs of this country. We are told, on the other hand, as I have heard it said repeatedly to-day, that that violation—for I will use no other expression—of a great constitutional principle, which, to my mind, has taken place, has met with the approval of both sides of this House. We are told that it has met with the approval of former Governments, just as it has, in this instance, of the present Administration. Well, for my part, I have no hesitation in saying that I disclaim—and I am sure that in so disclaiming I am but the echo of many gentlemen who sit on this side of the House—any intention of thwarting or embarrassing the Government. There is no such intention in me; but I claim the right, as a representative of the people, sitting in this House, to call in question any act of the Government which may be an infringement of those very principles in virtue of which we are sitting here to-day. Now, has there been any violation of those great principles which it is our duty to safeguard and protect? I say that there has been. There may have been in the past, there have been, to my knowledge, in the past, if not here, in some of the provinces; and there has been, in this instance, a flagrant violation of one of the most important principles of our constitution—that principle which proclaims that the people only, through their representatives, shall control and supervise the expenditure of public funds. This is no new principle. I shall not take up the attention of the members of this House by mentioning under what circumstances that principle has been affirmed and is in existence to-day in England, as it is here, but I am only stating what is well known to every student of constitutional history, when I say that the consecration of that principle has been obtained by perhaps the greatest struggle ever witnessed in the establishment of the British constitution. It is a long time ago since the principle was established in England that no tax could be levied without the consent of the people; but after that principle had been established, it took over five centuries for the people of England to have it declared by the Crown and by the Executive that the people alone, through its representatives, should, in every detail and in every respect, control the expenditure of public money. Sir, I shall not, as I said a moment ago, take up the time of the House in mentioning the incidents of that struggle; but I think every hon. gentleman here will admit that it is one of the most interesting chapters of the constitutional history of England. Sir, in Canada that struggle was, considering the change of time and

change of country, as great a struggle almost as it was in England; and if we make allowance for the advanced ideas of a later period, we must recognize that, strange as it may appear, the principle then contended for has been one of the most difficult principles for the Crown to concede, and one of the principles at all times, in England as well as here, most jealously guarded by the people who had obtained the recognition of it. Why, up to 1791, we were unable to carry out that principle; and in 1791 we were only able to carry it out to this extent, that the people were able to control, through their representatives, those moneys only which were collected in virtue of statutes passed by the people's representatives themselves, and at that time the Crown remained in possession of two sources of revenue, which enabled the Crown and the Executive to defy the wishes of the representatives of the people, and delayed here for a considerable time, as was delayed in England for many centuries, the establishment of parliamentary government in the practical and real sense of the word. It was only in 1831 that we succeeded in wresting from the Crown—and the struggle was a most arduous one, particularly in that province from which I come, and one of whose constituencies I have the honour to represent—the control of those revenues which were derived under the old Stamp or Fiscal Act of 1874, and which had, during that long period, remained entirely under the control of the Crown. And even then, when we had these two sources of revenue under the control of the representatives of the people, the Crown remained independent of the people, having still a third source of revenue which enabled it to defy the wishes of the people's representatives, and delay for a considerable time, the establishment of parliamentary government. I refer to the hereditary territorial and casual revenues of the Crown, which only a few years ago—speaking from memory, I may say about 1847, but at no very distant period—were obtained control of by the people through their representatives, and complete parliamentary control of the revenue established. Now, Sir, we, in Canada, act, so far as the question which at present occupies us is concerned, under special legislative enactment. There is, strange to say, an exceptional disposition in our law which enables the Executive, under peculiar circumstances, which are mentioned in that section 32 of that chapter of our revised statutes already referred to, and which I shall not speak of further, because we know it almost by heart, to dispose of certain sums of money without the previous sanction of the representatives of the people. But what I contend is, that this disposition of the statute being exceptional—and I am not able to account for that statutory disposition, except that in its origin it was brought about by the shortness of the sessions of Parliament and the difficulty which possibly at that time existed of proceeding here as they do in England under similar circumstances—it should be interpreted with the greatest strictness, for the simple reason that it is an exceptional disposition, and, as every legal gentleman in this House knows, dispositions which establish exceptions or exemptions, are liable to the strictest interpretations, and should not be interpreted in a wide, or large, or generous sense, but should be interpreted in a strict sense only. Because, also—and I think we have an example of it in this instance—the application of that exception is liable to give rise to dangerous precedents. Difficult has been the struggle, Sir, by which we have obtained control of our revenues. Reluctantly have the Crown and the Executive given way to the people in this respect, and there is danger of sacrificing the principle for which we have contended so long, if we enter upon a course of analogy or precedent. Further, there is no principle more liable to abuse than that which is contained in the exceptional disposition of section 32 of the statute just referred to. What do we find in the present instance? I listened with the greatest attention to what seemed to me a very able argument in support of the position taken by the Government on this question—that presented by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount). That was, to my mind, the best that could be said in favour of the course taken by the Government. For my part, speaking independently, had we been confined to a consideration of the warrant of the 16th July, I should have felt disposed to take the view of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. But we have the warrant of the 18th August, and it seems to me that the issuing of that warrant is an entirely unjustifiable act, and one which we cannot condone. That warrant, Sir, was not issued for expenditures which were unforeseen. They had been foreseen. As has been properly pointed out, this warrant was for expenditures which had been before the previous Parliament and had been practically refused by the representatives of the people a few weeks before the warrant was issued. Therefore, it was doubly incumbent upon the Government not to have issued that warrant, but to have awaited the meeting of the representatives of the people, then arrived here for the most part, and many of them on their way to the seat of government. But was that expenditure, whether foreseen or not, whether disposed of by Parliament or not, urgently and immediately required? I find satisfactory proof of the contrary: in the first place, in the fact that there could be no urgency on the 18th of August, just a few hours previous to the assembling of the representatives of the people, and in the further fact that a great part of that sum is still in the coffers of the Government, not having been expended. The money is there, but we are

unable to deal with it. We are told, Sir, that Parliament could not assemble in time to vote these moneys. That may apply to the expenditures under the warrant of the 16th July, but certainly it does not apply to those under the warrant which issued the 18th of August, a few hours before the assembling of Parliament. We are told—and it is a very strange argument, Mr. Speaker, —that unquestionably there would have been obstruction here, had these appropriations been asked for. Speaking for myself, if these expenses, the necessity for which I do not doubt, had been set before us as soon as practicable after our meeting, I would have offered no obstruction. There is no desire for obstruction on this side of the House. For my own part, whatever may be the causes which have contributed to bring about this unusual session, I wish to say at once that I am anxious to expedite its business ; and, if we cannot obtain from the Government a declaration of its policy on some of the most important questions which have been before the people during the past few weeks, if it is impossible for the Government at this stage to give us its views, why then, making allowance for them, I wish to dispose as soon as possible of the business we have come here to transact, and let the Government bring us together as early as possible next year to tell us that policy, for we require to know it. I will not deal with the argument I heard this afternoon, to the effect that, inasmuch as, under section 32, warrants may be issued for expenditures not provided for by Parliament, and as there was no provision for these expenditures, therefore the warrants could legally issue. I will not stop to consider that, because, as everybody is aware, there are conditions laid down in the section other than that of provision not having been made by Parliament. We are told that this was a special case. Sir, I put this argument side by side with the argument of an hon. member who said that we must proceed by analogy, and if this, although not a case such as provided for by section 32, is an analogous case, then we must bring it within the purview of that section. But this is not a special case, this is a case which, no doubt, has occurred before, if not here, then in some other dependency of the Empire. It is in no sense a special case, nor can we proceed by analogy. This disposition of section 32 is an exceptional one, and we cannot proceed by analogy. We were told, too, that Parliament had not lost control over the expenditure. But it has lost control, it has lost effective control, and with regard to that expenditure we, who represent the people and who have a right to control every cent of expenditure, are reduced to the role of critics, we can do no more than criticise that expenditure, find fault with it, but we cannot command it any further. Therefore, speaking for myself, I believe there is here a business principle, a principle which might guide a mandatory—to apply that argument to the warrant of the 18th of August—if he expected within a few hours the arrival of the mandator, and if, in spite of that he should undertake to provide sums not immediately and urgently necessary. Taking a business view of it, he should await the arrival of the mandator, and defer any action until the mandator had arrived. Now, viewing it from a constitutional standpoint, I think this a great question. Whatever has been done in the past, I think we should not proceed any further to sanction an expenditure of this kind unless it comes legally within the provisions set down in this section 32 of chapter 29 of our Revised Statutes. There is no doubt in my mind that if the Government provided for the issue of this warrant a few hours before the meeting of Parliament, it did so because it distrusted Parliament, and I believe it is the duty of this House to frown down such distrust. For my part, I would not have hesitated, as I said before, to give every assistance to the Government in providing for expenditures which were immediately necessary ; but I object to the violation of the principle, and upon that ground alone I would vote in favour of the amendment. Sir, I think we should as far as possible proceed cautiously in spending money which has not been provided for expressly by this House. We cannot do better in a country which is governed by the same principles as those which obtain in England, than to follow the rule which they follow there, and they have no such disposition there. It is needless for me to enter into details, but there is an easy manner there, when Parliament meets, of passing measures which are called Consolidated Bills Fund No. 1, No. 2, &c., by which cases of this kind are provided for. Never in England would they admit of such an expenditure as has been made in this case by an Executive, a few hours before the meeting of Parliament, taking upon itself to dispose in this way of public money. Well, Sir, that principle to which I have just referred with regard to the issuing of warrants, has been violated in the province of Quebec more than once. I believe that it has been violated in this instance, and I think under these circumstances the sooner we modify the disposition of this section 32 or repeal it altogether, the better for the interests of the people whom we represent.

Mr. OSLER. I did not intend, nor did I wish to make, any remarks upon this question until a very recent period of this debate. When I came here as a new member I was entirely ignorant of the procedure, and entirely ignorant of the laws and the customs governing the expenditure of public money in such cases as the one we are now discussing. Had I been called upon to vote upon the question of issuing these warrants before I had heard this discussion, I think I may say without hesitation that I should have voted with the Government. The dis-

cussion, it strikes me, is very much of a legal nature, so much so that the legal members of this House have devoted two or three days to giving their views upon it, although they differ from each other. I do not understand the technical point involved as a lawyer would do, but I do not hesitate to say that had I been called upon to raise the money under the circumstances, I should have raised what was absolutely necessary in some way or another, and in the best way possible. I dare say that the issuing of the warrant in the first place was the best thing to do under the circumstances. I may here remark, Mr. Speaker, that I have been a Conservative but not an active politician. Many of my friends, my best friends, perhaps, belong to the other side of politics. For years past I have usually taken it for granted that everything the Conservatives did was wrong, and had a Conservative Government been in power and had they issued these warrants under the same circumstances, I should not have been surprised, I should have expected it as a matter of course. But my hon. friends opposite have for so long proclaimed themselves to be the righteous men, and that the Liberal-Conservatives were the men who always did wrong, that I must say it comes to me as a shock to find the first act of a Reform Government after they get into power is to issue Governor General's warrants for a sum far and away beyond all the requirements of the time and of the occasion. I understand that the money raised by the first warrant has not all been expended; and I believe that of the money raised by the second warrant, there is a large amount still in hand. It appears to me that there must be some defect in the constitution when we are confronted with a case such as the one before us, when a Government of neither party can properly raise money when Parliament is not in session. It strikes me that if we were raising money as individuals for our own purposes under such circumstances, we would raise the least amount that was absolutely necessary for the occasion. I, for one, would put aside a great many of the fine constitutional points if it came to a question of pure and simple business, and I would say, as we do in business: we must risk this, and raise a certain amount of money; but we would raise always the smallest amount absolutely necessary. It appears to me that the Government have not followed that plan, that they have gone in wholesale, asking for enormous sums which were not necessary and the payment of which, up to this date, has not been required. I can say without hesitation that if on the day Parliament met the leader of the Government had stated that money was required to pay wages and the running expenses of the country, I would by my voice, influence and vote have aided him in obtaining that money, if I had to vote against my party and every member of it. Supporters of the party in power have, from time to time, in their speeches claimed that they were the party of purity, that the money had been entrusted to them, and because it has been entrusted to them it was all right. I am very glad to be able to say that the members on the opposite side of the House in their speeches to-day have not put forward that claim; but up to to-day almost every speaker in closing his address declared: it does not matter whether we have exceeded our powers, whether we have broken the law or not, the country trusts us, we are the honest people, and the public money is all right with us. If that principle is to be adopted in this House, the members of the present Government had better stay there, pass all the laws they require, and on the last day of Parliament call the Opposition together to ratify them. In one speech after another they have assumed that the people were at their back, that they had turned out the wicked and corrupt Conservatives, and they had a mandate from the people to spend their money without being questioned by anybody. It was almost resented that a member of the Conservative party should question the expendiutre, or their action in asking the Governor General to give them warrants for $1,000,000 long before that money was required. If they could properly ask for $1,000,000, there is no reason why they should not ask for $10,000,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where is the Governor General in these matters?

Mr. OSLER. If you place the responsibility on the Governor General, I will absolve the Government. If the Governor General signed the warrants against the wishes and advice of the leader of the Government, then I will take my seat and say no more. But I affirm that if the first act of the Government which came into power a few weeks ago was to bite off an enormous sum of money for their expenditure without the consent of Parliament, if the position they take is that they are not responsible to Parliament, and whatever money they ask is considered to be rightly granted and rightly expended, then hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have nothing to say. I would very much rather have cast my first vote in this House on a more important question than this one; but the question has grown in importance to me as I have heard it discussed. I believe the discussion has been drawn out to a much greater length than was necessary, and I distinctly state that if by any means I can aid the members of the Government in closing this session before the end of thirty or thirty-one days, I will do all in my power to aid them to do so and to save the country the extra expenditure. We all know how easy it is to make promises and to make statements when we are not responsible for them. Members on the Government side of the House seem to me to have assumed that they have a holy mission from

the country to protect the country's interests, that the country has looked to them for long years to protect the people and keep them from the grasping corruption of the Tory party. I have not been a politician, but it seems to me that for eighteen long and weary years hon. gentlemen opposite have put their policy before the country and the country has repudiated it time and again. I hardly remember the facts, because I am sorry to say I took little interest in politics as far back as 1873——

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you had taken more interest, you would have been on this side.

Mr. OSLER. But if I am right in my judgment, when the Liberal-Conservatives were turned out in 1873, and the party of hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, they did not come into power on their own virtues, but on the faults and failings of the other side. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not hesitate to say it—that they have not come into power to-day on their own virtues, or their own policy, or from any advocacy of a policy put forward for the benefit of Canada, but they have come into power because of the weaknesses and the failings of the Conservative party. I do not mind making that statement. I have been a Conservative all my life, and I have often told my Conservative friends that they have been wrong in many cases; but I should be very sorry to come into power not on my own virtues, not on any thing I have done, but because my opponents on the other side of the House were so weak that they were not to be trusted with the Government any longer. Every hon. gentleman whom I have heard up to-day—barring the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—ended his defence of the action of the Government with some such words as these; No matter whether right or wrong we are honest, and whatever we do will be sustained by the country. One member after another has risen in his place and stated: we are honest at all events, and that atones for every sin in the calendar. I think we all know that when a lady professes that she is virtuous, so virtuous, there is very good ground for doubting her virtue; and I for one have been very strongly influenced in the vote I am about to give to-night by the fact that one and all of the members on the Government benches have not defended the action of the Government because it was constitutional, and they have not taken the position which they should have taken and which they have always stated they would take, that they were so guarded in everything they did that they would not go beyond any solitary law of the constitution. They had not taken that ground at all, but they have all sat silent in their places, supposing that the country will think that they are honest, and so trust them. Well, the country have trusted you hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but they have trusted you, not for your own virtues, but because the Conservatives were not so good as they ought to be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. I do not hesitate to say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. I believe that it is going to do the Conservative party a great deal of good that they are in opposition, and I believe that it is going to do the country a great deal of good.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, it will do the country a great deal of good, if the members of the Government and the Liberal party give up all the cranks and the quibbles that they have been advocating for the past eighteen or twenty years, and if they honestly come forward and say that the good of Canada is the first object they have in view; and that Canada, and Canada alone, is what they will look to.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear; Canada first.

Mr. OSLER. But the Liberal party have gone from one point of the political compass to the other. They have adopted unrestricted reciprocity and every other policy that it is possible to imagine, and time and again the people of Canada refused to trust them, no matter how bad the Conservative party were. However, the Liberals went to the country this time adopting the main plank of the Conservative platform. They told the people from one end of the country to the other: We are not going to interfere with your trade nor with your industries. I say, for one, that if they swallow all of their talk for the last twenty years, if they now adopt what they condemned as evil, and if they say they will protect Canadian industries and advocate interests of Canada, I, for one, will vote for them on every occasion they do that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear. We will have your vote every time.

Mr. OSLER. I hope so. But, following out by analogy as to what is thought of the woman who protests that her virtue is so good, seeing that hon. gentlemen have protested so much that they are absolutely honest, I, for one, believe that they require to be most carefully watched from morning until night. I will do my little part to watch them. I say, Sir, without hesitation, that if hon. gentlemen opposite carry out what is for the best interests of the country, and bring in a policy that is for the advancement of Canada, I will not obstruct nor object to them.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Foster)—page 637 :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	Klock,
Bell (Addington),	Kloepfer,
Bell (Pictou),	LaRivière,
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bethune,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Blanchard,	Maclean,
Boisvert,	McAlister,
Borden (Halifax),	McCleary,
Broder,	McCormick,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McDougall,
Carscallen,	McInerney,
Casgrain,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Chauvin,	McNeill,
Clancy,	Marcotte,
Clarke,	Martin,
Cochrane,	Mills,
Craig,	Monk,
Davin,	Moore,
Dimock,	Morin,
Dupont,	Osler,
Earle,	Poupore,
Foster,	Powell,
Gillies,	Prior,
Gilmour,	Quinn,
Guillet,	Reid,
Hackett,	Roche,
Haggart,	Rosamond,
Hale,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Henry,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hodgins,	Tyrwhitt,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Ingram,	Wilson,
Ives,	Wood (Brockville).—69.
Kaulbach,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Legris,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Beausoleil,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Lister,
Bernier,	Livingston,
Blair,	Logan,
Borden (King's),	Lount,
Bostock,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bourassa,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Bourbonnais,	Mackie,
Britton,	MacPherson,
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown,	McGugan,
Bruneau,	McHugh,
Calvert,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	McLennan (Inverness),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMillan,
Casey,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Madore,
Choquette,	Maxwell,
Christie,	Meigs,
Copp,	Migneault,
Dechene,	Monet,
Desmarais,	Morrison,
Devlin,	Mulock,
Dobell,	Oliver,
Domville,	Parmalee,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dupré,	Penny,
Dyment,	Pettet,
Edwards,	Préfontaine,
Ellis,	Proulx,
Fauvel,	Ratz,
Featherston,	Richardson,
Fielding,	Rinfret,
Fitzpatrick,	Robertson,
Flint,	Rogers,
Fortin,	Russell,
Fraser (Guysboro'),	Savard,
Fraser (Lambton),	Scriver,
Frost,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Stenson,
Godbout,	Stubbs,
Haley,	Sutherland,
Harwood,	Talbot,
Hurley,	Tarte,
Landerkin,	Tolmie,
Lang,	Tucker,
Langelier,	Turcot,
Laurier,	Yeo.—103.
Lavergne,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Burnett,	Montague,
Cameron,	Tisdale,
Beith,	Cargill.
Erb,	Bennett,
Joly de Lotbinière,	Ganong,
McCarthy,	Seagram,
Fisher,	Roddick,
Gibson,	Corby,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Wood (Hamilton),	Bergin,
Hutchison,	Boyd,
Cowan,	MacLaren,
Pouliot,	Costigan,
McInnes,	Ferguson,
Guay,	Dugas,
Davies,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, before you declare the vote, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) was not in the Chamber when the question was put.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member for Two Mountains in the Chamber when the question was put ?

Mr. ETHIER. Yes, but I only heard a portion of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish also to call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Montague), the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Bennett), the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Kendry) and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren), have not voted, and are in the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was paired with the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Burnett), or I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. I was paired with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Erb), otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MacLAREN. I was paired with the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan), otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KENDRY. I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) has not voted.

Mr. GUAY. I was paired with the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas); otherwise I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) are not voting.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I am paired with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong).

Mr. GIBSON. I am paired with the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am paired with the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), or I would have voted nay.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), or I would have voted against the amendment.

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada $31,885

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This item was allowed to stand for the purpose of obtaining information as to the reorganization of the office, which the Minister of Finance stated had caused the reduction.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The cause of the reduction in the vote is this. First of all, the chief clerk, who was in office last year, Mr. Pope, has been transferred to the Department of Secretary of State. The office is still vacant. Mr. Pope's salary was $2,400, and it is proposed to reduce it to $1,800. A first-class clerkship has been dropped, effecting a saving of $1,400; a third-class clerkship has also been dropped, effecting a reduction of $400; one messenger has also been dropped, effecting a saving of $500; making a total saving of $2,900. Against this are the statutory increases, amounting to $930; making a total reduction of $1,970. These are the Estimates, as they have been prepared by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves when in office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is aware that the late Government made a recommendation to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Pope's transfer to the Department of Secretary of State and his appointment as a deputy Minister. The late Government recommended that that vacancy should be filled by the appointment of Mr. Payne, who had filled the position of private secretary to Sir Mackenzie Bowell when Prime Minister and also to myself. The hon. gentleman is aware that there has been some correspondence on this subject. I would like to know whether my hon. friend is in a position to say what is proposed to be done with reference to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am aware that it was the intention of the late Government to promote Mr. Payne to the chief clerkship. I know nothing of that personally. I simply gather, from what correspondence has been exchanged and what knowledge I have been able to obtain in the department, that Mr. Payne, who is in many respects well qualified, had to undergo some special examination to qualify himself, and that he failed in the technical knowledge which was required in order to obtain the necessary qualification. Under such circumstances his promotion could not be effected under the law as it exists.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am extremely sorry to hear the statement made by the hon. First Minister, because I do not agree with his statement of the facts of the case. I think it would be better to allow this item to stand, and I would ask the hon. First Minister to have laid on the Table the recommendation of Council and all the correspondence connected with the proposed appointment of Mr. Payne. If the hon. gentleman will look carefully into the subject, I have no hesitation in saying that he will find that there has been no violation of the law in any particular, but that everything that has been done has been done exactly in accordance with established precedent. Mr. Payne was appointed to a position subject to his passing the examination, and that examination he submitted himself to, with the result that he passed on all the subjects with very much higher marks than were required in order to pass. I think the average was, if I remember correctly, something like 90 on all the subjects. On the technical paper, which was prepared by the Clerk of the Privy Council, as I understand it, very extraordinary questions were asked. I can only say that I applied myself to the Clerk of the Privy Council for a copy of the questions which he, as head of the department, had submitted for Mr. Payne's examination, but was never able to obtain them. I endeavoured to obtain them because, so far as I was informed, they were of an extremely unusual character. A large number of questions were asked of a highly technical and extraordinary character, so far as my information

goes, but I was unable to obtain a copy of those questions, although they certainly should have been available. I regard this as a matter of very great importance. What took place was this. When it was found that Mr. Payne had passed a highly satisfactory examination and had shown his thorough fitness for the position, with the exception of answering these very unusual and extraordinary questions, as I am informed they were, an Order in Council was passed remedying that defect and giving a sufficient number of marks for the purpose of enabling the examination to be completed. This course had been, I am instructed, pursued on several occasions, and there can be no question of law about it, as the hon. gentleman must see, because, under the Act, the Governor General in Council has the power to alter, from time to time, the questions that are submitted by the board of examiners for these examinations. Therefore it is not a matter of statute but regulated absolutely by the Governor General in Council, and as they have the power to arrange the questions in the first instance, so they have the power, from time to time, to modify and alter these questions. Therefore it was within the power and province of the Governor General in Council to make such a modification as would enable Mr. Payne to pass satisfactorily the examination required. That was done, and a Minute in Council was prepared, setting forth the facts in general terms as I have stated them, and asking that the examination should be held, as it was held by the committee of the Privy Council, to be a satisfactory examination and to entitle the person examined to hold office. Some question of legality, as the hon. gentleman is aware from the correspondence that has already been submitted, was raised, and the Minister of Justice gave his written statement that the appointment of Mr. Payne was entirely legal, and he did this after communicating with the department. There was no legal objection to Mr. Payne's receiving the promotion to which he was recommended. Under these circumstances, it would be better for the hon. gentleman to allow this question to stand and lay upon the Table all the correspondence connected with this matter in order that it may be fairly placed before the House. I may say that I would have had some additional information here, but I was glad to learn from Mr. Payne that he had reason to believe it was decided he was to receive the appointment. I did not propose to raise the question at all. It was only in consequence of the statement made by the hon. First Minister that I felt obliged to ask him to allow this item to stand and have the correspondence down before the matter was disposed of.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I certainly have no objections at all to bring down for the information of the House all the information that is in the department. I would, however, ask my hon. friend to reconsider his demand about having the item stand. There is no reason why it should stand. The information can be brought down and the subject taken up again, either on concurrence or any other occasion. There is no desire at all on my part to keep any thing back. I would not have the hon. gentleman understand that it is my intention to give the appointment to Mr. Payne. All I can say is that there is no desire but to treat Mr. Payne with every justice and even liberality, but at the same time I must disclaim a good deal of what has been said by the hon. gentleman. It was the intention of the late Government to appoint Mr. Payne to the vacant position of chief clerk. In order to do that, Mr. Payne was required to pass the examination for the civil service. He passed his examination on general branches with credit. This is undoubted. At the same time, upon the technical subjects on which he was examined he failed. My hon. friend says that the questions put to him were unduly severe. As to that I have no information at all. I never looked at the questions. All that I know is that they were prepared by Mr. McGee, who is an old, well tried, efficient officer of the Government, and I cannot, while I have no other intention but to do justice to Mr. Payne, allow any reflection of that kind on Mr. McGee to pass unchallenged. The better way of setting the matter at rest is to have all the papers brought down, and I will see that they are laid on the Table the first opportunity. In the meantime, I would ask my hon. friend to let the item pass, and either on concurrence or on some other occasion we can discuss the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My only object was to have a discussion of the matter when the papers are on the Table, but I accept the statement of my hon. friend that ample opportunity will be given to discuss it, and under those circumstances it can be taken up when the papers are on the Table. I would ask that as little time as possible be lost in laying the papers on the Table. And I may say that I felt it right, when Mr. Payne made the statement to me that he did, as to the character of the questions that a candidate was called upon to answer, I called upon Mr. McGee to ask him for copies of the papers which he had set, and the questions which had been answered, and I have never been able to obtain them. Mr. McGee said he could not find them, and subsequently he said they were in the hands of Dr. Thorburn. But Dr. Thorburn had not them in his possession, and I have not been able to get them. Mr. Payne, from recollection, has given me a statement of what these questions were, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) would be as much astonished as I was to find what a person going up for examination as a clerk in the Privy Council Office was called upon to an-

swer—questions which, I am inclined to think, would puzzle any member of this House to answer. However, I will accept the statement of my hon. friend that he will lay the whole of the papers upon the Table of the House, with an understanding that an early opportunity will be given to discuss the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all the third-class clerkships estimated for—twelve in number—filled ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, one is vacant.

Mr. FOSTER. I would say to my hon. friend that there is no use in estimating for that position, because the law does not allow it to be filled. A good rule is not to ask for a salary for a position which cannot be filled.

The PRIME MINISTER. The criticism is a just one, but it is a criticism of the hon. gentleman's own estimate. I took it as it was.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help that : those making up this portion of the Estimates should have struck it out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask whether the statement made in the public press concerning the intention of the Government to revive third-class clerkships is true ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The matter has not been discussed, and the Government cannot be said to have arrived at any intention with regard to them.

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask my hon. friend if he does not think it is right to strike out this salary for the unfilled position.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think not.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the hon. gentleman will not say that it is right to estimate for a position which, under the law, he cannot possibly fill ? Surely the hon. gentleman does not set that up as a rule ? If so, I do not see why we are here at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. I had taken the Estimates as prepared by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). Whether the office should remain vacant or be filled is a question as to which I have arrived at no opinion whatever. It may be filled or it may not. At the same time, I propose to take the opportunity to fill it, if advisable.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is not within the hon. gentleman's power to fill it. If it were, I would not object. Of course, it is quite in order to estimate for an office which you propose to fill. But under the law, as it is at present, the hon. gentleman cannot appoint a third-class clerk. Therefore, this estimate will be perfectly useless.

The PRIME MINISTER. When was the law altered ?

Mr. FOSTER. The session before last.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. the leader of the Government is incorrect in saying that the estimate is just as prepared by his predecessor. I have here the Estimates as first issued, and I notice there has been considerable change. But surely the hon. gentleman remembers that, the session before last, we passed an Act which abolished the third-class clerkships and authorized the Government to do the work by employing sessional writers, who were not permanent officers of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. But, as I understand the law, it applies to future cases, and not to existing cases. The intention was not to abolish third-class clerkships, but not to appoint any more third-class clerks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is quite correct. The law passed the session before last did not interfere with third-class clerks who had already received their appointment, but it specifically states that hereafter third-class clerkships are abolished, and, of course, no such appointments can be made while that statute is on the books. Therefore, the proposal before us is one to provide for a third-class clerk who, under the law, no Minister of Government can appoint.

Mr. FOSTER. Drop the salary.

The PRIME MINISTER. No ; the salary is dropped on the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to understand. The hon. gentleman said the salary was not dropped ; now he says it was.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, no.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman a list of the officers of his department at his hand ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It seems there has been a misapprehension between hon. gentlemen and myself. This is the statement that is placed in my hand : One third-class clerkship was provided for the appointment of a temporary clerk, who afterwards did not present himself, and the clerkship was dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has twelve third-class clerks in the department.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, in consequence of this having been dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say something quite different from that.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was where the misapprehension between us lay.

Department of Militia and Defence.... $45,515

Mr. FOSTER. We would like an explanation with regard to this.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The increases, amounting to $640, are statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman a list of the third-class clerks? Are there five third-class clerks now appointed in the Militia department?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. This proposes to make a reduction of the number of third-class clerks by one, and a corresponding increase in the second-class clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question, if he will be kind enough to answer it, on this vote. I would like to know whether he has come to a decision upon a request which, I understand, has been made to cancel the appointment of the caretaker on the military grounds at Sussex. This caretaker is an old soldier who has a very honourable record, and is thoroughly capable. I shall be sorry to hear that he is to be dispensed with as caretaker. Can the Minister say whether any decision has been come to with regard to this matter or not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the case of Mackenzie?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is hardly a proper item on which to discuss such a subject; but I may say to the hon. gentleman that I am considering the subject and have not come to any decision yet.

Mr. DOMVILLE. This is not the time for the hon. gentleman to bring this up.

Mr. FOSTER. In the judgment of the hon. gentleman.

Department of the Secretary of State.... $37,412

Mr. FOSTER. Who answers for the Secretary of State?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There are twenty separate increases, making a total of $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows whether there are seven third-class clerks now actually employed in the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Office of the Auditor General..... $27,870

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The statutory increases and one promotion amount to $1,130.

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me there is one more first-class clerk than was estimated for in the Estimates I brought down. My Estimates provided for three first-class clerks and ten second-class clerks; the hon. gentleman provides for four first-class clerks and four second-class.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a promotion from the second to the first-class, Mr. Kearns. It does not affect the Estimates for the current year, but it gives him the rank. I understand that he is at the maximum of a second-class clerk, and is now promoted, with a salary of $1,400.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you certain that he is at the maximum of his class?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the information I have, I believe it is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I am inclined to think that he is not at the maximum of the class. If he is not at the maximum of the class, this is a promotion of a person who has been a less time in office over the head of one who has been longer in office. There may be circumstances which render that best to be done, but it is not in accordance with the general rule.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that he was at the maximum of his class, but I will make inquiry, and give the information on concurrence.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman make the reduction if he is not at the maximum of this class, and promise that he will not give him the promotion?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will ascertain the facts, and then we will see what is best to be done under the circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that after we have passed the item, it would be awkward to re-arrange it. We had better allow the item to stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not object.

Department of Customs $39,987.50

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved to amend so as to include $1,650 which may be paid to R. R. Farrow, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. Since we are on the Department of Customs I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that Mr. O'Hara, assistant collector of customs at Montreal, has been acting as collector for three or four years. I think that Mr. O'Hara is entitled to remuneration for his services as collector during those years, and I think he has made a demand on the department for payment. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to put anything in the Estimates towards paying Mr. O'Hara what I think has been paid in the past to other officials in the same position. I think it would be only an act of justice.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Controller is absent from his seat at the present time; but I apprehend that this question will more properly come up when we enter upon the consideration of the Customs vote. It has nothing to do with the inside department. No doubt some of the gentleman's friends on the Opposition benches will explain why this recommendation has been so long delayed.

Mr. BERGERON. I ask the question because I might be absent when the matter again comes up.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will take a note of it, and call the attention of the Controller to it.

Mr. BRITTON. I desire the Minister of Trade and Commerce at the same time to call the attention of the Controller to the fact that there is an officer in Kingston who has been doing work which should entitle him to a large salary, and yet he only receives $400 a year. The late Government recommended an increase, and a provision should be made in the Estimates to give him the salary to which his rank would entitle him and what was promised him by the late Government. The gentleman's name is Deoghal.

Mr. QUINN. I am very glad to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has taken a note of Mr. O'Hara's case, and I hope it will receive the favourable consideration of the Controller of Customs. Mr. O'Hara did the work of collector at Montreal, although he only held the position of assistant collector. He performed these duties for over two years, during which time all the responsibility connected with the position rested upon him. I understand that the salary for a collector was voted each year by Parliament, so that the country will not suffer by the payment to Mr. O'Hara of the collector's salary between the time of the death of the late collector and the appointment of his successor.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the practice has become nearly obsolete of officers occupying temporarily the position Mr. O'Hara occupied receiving an increase of salary equal to that of the officer appointed by statute. In my opinion and from my knowledge of officer O'Hara he was very amply paid for his services at $2,800, which he received.

Mr. QUINN. I think the salary of the deputy collector was only $2,400.

Mr. FOSTER. I observe that an extra first-class clerk at $1,700 is entered under this head; and no explanation has been given. The Estimates, as submitted, were for five first-class clerks, and now six are asked. I should like an explanation in regard to the extra first-class clerk and a statement of the salary he was receiving previously.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand he is a transfer from the Post Office Department, and so there is really no increased expenditure involved.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has been transferred?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Blakeney.

Mr. GIBSON. I almost expected that some hon. gentleman opposite in looking after their friends might have brought up the case of Hugh Murray, of Hamilton, acting collector of customs for a long period in that city to suit the convenience of the Government. He is in receipt of a very small salary, and it suited the late Government to call the collector down to Ottawa to act as commissioner here, leaving Mr. Murray to perform, not only his own duties, but those of collector. In this connection I might mention another gentleman, Mr. Bartle, of Niagara Falls. The office of collector at Niagara was kept dangling before the eyes of applicants for a long time, and meanwhile this gentleman discharged the duties of collector not only to the satisfaction of the Government but to the public as well. I hope the claims of both those gentlemen will be considered as well as those of Mr. O'Hara, whose claims have been ably brought before the House by the member for Centre Montreal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If these claims are to be dealt with, they should be all put on the same footing. I know of the two cases to which the hon. member for Lincoln and Welland (Mr. Gibson) has referred as being equally deserving of consideration with the case brought to the attention of the committee by the hon. member for Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is a sound one, that this discussion would more properly come up at a later stage, when the Customs vote is under consideration.

Department of Inland Revenue $37,150

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). There has unfortuately been a mistake in preparing this estimate. Last year's estimate show 11 second-class clerks. When Mr. Clemow joined the department as private secretary, he had a right to a second-class clerkship, and I asked that the Estimates should therefore show 12 second-class clerks. It was decided, however, to take the Estimates prepared by the late Government, and accordingly the number is reduced to 11. I find, however, that one clerk has been struck out, and the number reduced to 10. I call attention to this matter and I hope in the Supplementary Estimates this matter will be corrected and another second-class clerk added.

Post Office Department $199,120

Mr. FOSTER. It is nearly half-past twelve, and after such a long debate, perhaps my hon. friend would not insist upon going any further.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is the objection to the Post Office vote because we are asking $5,000 less than you did ?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that there was one second-class clerk dropped, but it appears to me that there is an increase of one.

THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There are four employees less in the department and there is a reduction of between five and six thousand dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. When we were discussing the Customs estimates the hon. gentleman said that the reason why there were 13 clerks instead of 12, was that one was transferred from the Post Office Department, but it now appears as if there was one added.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand the transfer was made by the late Government and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would know more about it than I do.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot remember, and I am not Minister of Finance at present.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There has been no addition to the staff of the Post Office Department under the new Government. The present estimates are some $6,000 less than the estimates presented in June last by the hon. gentleman himself. There are actually $4,385 less than the expenditure ending June 30th, 1895. That deduction is made up by vacancies caused by death, resignations, promotion, superannuations and transfers.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister must see that there is an actual increase in the expenditure of the Post Office Department. He cannot appoint any third-class clerks under the new law, and therefore there is an apparent reduction, but it will be made up in another way by appointing writers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has not been a single appointment to the staff since I took office.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to appoint occasional writers under the present statute ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not in a position to state at this moment what I contemplate. I intend to know as much as I can about the department before I come to any conclusion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought perhaps the hon. gentleman had made up his mind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not made up my mind as to what is to be done until I know more about the strength of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has made provision for an extra messenger.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I made no appointment since I took charge of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Some of the papers in the western portion of the province have reported that there is an intention to change the deputy head of the department and the name of Inspector Spry of the London division has been mentioned in connection with the office. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to take Mr. Spry as his deputy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have had that matter called to my attention, but it is in no way authoritative. I have never contemplated any change in the deputy who appears to me, so far as I can judge, to be eminently satisfactory. I have found him thus far able to give me most efficient and loyal service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Estimates that I brought down last year there were six messengers estimated for, and it has been generally thought that these were enough to do the work. Has my hon. friend got a private messenger of his own, or how is it ? Surely my hon. friend is not going to inaugurate his economical reign by increasing the number of messengers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There were seven messengers provided for in the Estimates of 1895-96, and there are seven messengers provided for in the Estimates for 1896-97.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very true, but I will give the hon. gentleman another fact. There were six messengers provided for in the Estimates I brought down for 1896-97, and the hon. Minister of Finance has prayed grace for these Estimates on the ground that they were the ones I brought down. This number my hon. friend has increased to seven. Does he need one more, or is this a new appointment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no appointment made in my department since I assumed office, except my private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give my hon. friend another fact. I find that there were only twenty-three packers estimated for in my estimate, while he has twenty-four. We must also have an explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ? Did he estimate for the number of officials he actually had in the department

at the time, or did his estimate represent that he had six messengers when in reality he had seven ?

Mr. FOSTER. I was estimating for 1896-97. If I only estimated for six, we only had six, and only six were necessary. But here is the professor of economy, and he wants another messenger and another packer, and he will not explain why.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the real explanation is that the hon. gentleman, on the eve of the election, thought that he would show a little economy, and he presented those Estimates, but never passed them in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. And the difference between my hon. friend and myself is that I practiced the economy which he had been preaching for eighteen years, and when he comes in he puts on an extra packer and an extra messenger, and he will not explain why he does so. If the Minister does not understand his own department, it is not our fault.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is not correct in saying that there is an increase. There is no increase. He left in the department that number of officers. They are there now. I have not taken upon myself to remove or dismiss any. That is the state of affairs. The hon. gentleman is not fair when he talks about an increase. He says that last session it was proposed to do with six out of seven packers. Whatever he proposed to do, that is not the strength of the staff as he left it. I have taken the staff as I found it, and am asking for a reduction. Perhaps I may have to, but I do not want to do anything unkind or unnecessarily harsh, and am simply asking for estimates to carry on the staff as it is. It will be my duty to learn all about the requirements of the service and perhaps to reduce the staff.

Mr. WALLACE. There is, apparently, a new man as messenger and another as packer, because these two men are down at the salary of $300, and if they were beginning the second year of their service, they would be entitled to the statutory increase of $40.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It may be that in the estimates of last July the ex-Finance Minister provided only for six messengers and three packers, and I am quite prepared to give him the credit of being economical in the matter of messengers and packers. My hon. colleague, however, has simply taken the estimates of last year, and there is no increase.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Postmaster General is taking the department as he found it, how is it he is appointing two new men ? If these men had been here before, they would be entitled to $340, instead of $300.

Mr. SPROULE. The Postmaster General ought to let this stand, for his statements do not agree with what is in the Estimates. He is providing for two additional clerks over last year, and he frankly admits that he has not been long enough in the department to know anything about it. It would be only reasonable for him to let the item stand until he gets the information required.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman really make the appropriation ? Under the law passed the session before last, messengers come under the class of writers, and should come under contingencies. He is estimating for men he cannot appoint. He takes great credit for economy, but in the contingencies he is asking for $3,800 more for clerical assistance than was asked last year. He must drop these two men at $300, because, under the law, he cannot appoint them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not propose making any new appointments.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, explain to the Committee how the hon. gentleman is taking the minimum salary, if these men had been there before.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If these men had been temporarily employed and were in the department when he came there, he cannot estimate for them as permanent employees, but should estimate for them under contingencies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have simply taken the staff as I found it, and am asking Parliament to carry it on at its present strength until I deem it advisable to make some changes. Last year, seven messengers were paid for and twenty-four packers.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Estimates passed last year, I estimated simply for six messengers and twenty-three packers. I am certain that I did not intend, neither did the Postmaster General of that time intend to strike off the list any one who was in the permanent service. Therefore he could only have provided for those who were eligible for permanent appointment under the law—those that were permanent before. That is carried out by the statement of the present Postmaster General when he asks provision for seven messengers and 24 packers—one extra in each case. I say that under the law you cannot make permanent appointments to the writer's class, and therefore you are putting into the Estimates a clear impossibility.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There can be no doubt of the accuracy of the statement of the Postmaster General when he says that these parties are there. At the same time it is quite obvious that the appointment cannot be made in this way, but if it is desired to provide for one more packer and one more messenger that can be done out of the

contingent vote. The hon. gentleman can retain them if he desires to do so. We are losing time in this discussion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall this item be adopted ?

Mr. FOSTER. No, Mr. Chairman ; we cannot pass an estimate for an appointment that simply cannot be made.

The PRIME MINISTER. Here are the Estimates for the previous year and I find that they cover seven messengers and 24 packers. Therefore the only argument made by the ex-Minister of Finance is that this was the law and the officers were there, but in the Estimates brought down by him last winter, he contemplated the appropriation not for seven messengers but for six and not for 24 packers but for 23. Evidently the late Postmaster General contemplated dropping one. The previous year there were 25 packers, but one was dropped. The only point the hon. gentleman can make is that the new Postmaster General is not so economical as he intended to be.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; that is not it, and when the hon. gentleman is more used to the working of the department he will see that his theory is not in accord with the facts. There is another explanation which I think the Postmaster General will find is the correct one. During the year one of these messengers may have been promoted to the position of a third-class clerk, thus leaving a vacancy. When the Postmaster General of that day and I went over the Estimates, we found only six messengers. As under the law it is impossible to appoint a messenger on the former basis, we estimated, not for seven but for six. If there was another he would come in the writer class and would be provided for in the contingencies. My memory cannot hold all these things, but I think this was exactly the case—that one messenger and one packer were promoted.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be the explanation ; but the other may be the explanation also.

Mr. FOSTER. Let that item stand. There will be nothing so far as I am concerned argued except these two points alone, and when the item comes up again we can get the information.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will give it on concurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; that will be too late.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You have often asked us to wait for information until concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The point the hon. gentleman makes is that this is in a form contrary to law. If so, I do not see why the item should not be allowed to stand until the Postmaster General learns the facts about it, as he can do in five minutes on communicating with the department, or else provide for these two, one packer and one messenger, out of contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is another proof of what I have stated. In the last Civil Service report—that of 1895—there are actually six messengers and twenty-three packers, the names being all given.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see that this is conclusive ; but we will let the item stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is the whole item open ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but I do not intend to raise any point except with regard to these two.

The PRIME MINISTER. The whole discussion is to be confined to these.

Department of Agriculture $49,282

The PRIME MINISTER. Let that stand ; the Minister is not here. We can take up the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. I have always seen it in the committee that when we have had a long debate and the committee has sat late and made good progress with the Estimates, it is usual for the committee to rise.

The PRIME MINISTER. Pass Marine and Fisheries and then we will rise.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not ready to discuss Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Take the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; the Minister is not here. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The PRIME MINISTER. The ex-Minister of Agriculture suggests that we should pass the item for the Department of Agriculture. I do not see why we should not do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With regard to that, I want to say that the saving—something like $6,000—is due to the late Government and not to the present Government. The whole saving was effected under the late Administration, except $500, and that was effected by transferring a messenger, who had been in the Secretary of State's Department, but was transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and has now returned.

Resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Georgian Bay Ship Canal and Power Aqueduct Company.—(Mr. Maclean.)

Bill (No. 20) to change the name of the Hull Electric Company to the Hull and Aylmer Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Act incorporating the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax.)

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden) moved:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the Commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston for the year ending 30th June, 1896, and a letter from the commandant dated 15th August, 1896, and also a copy of a letter from the Board of Visitors of the Royal Military College dated the 18th of Sept., 1895.

He said: These papers were asked for informally by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who was the Minister of Militia in the late Government, and I laid them on the Table last night; but I am advised that this formality is necessary in order to bring them properly before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. Minister if he would be good enough to lay on the Table the letter addressed to the commandant of the Royal Military College, which led to his resignation. I would ask also if he would be good enough to have these papers printed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. With regard to the letter to which the hon. gentleman refers, I may say that it is a private letter addressed by Major-General Gascoigne to Major-General Cameron, and after consulting my colleagues, I considered it not necessary to bring that letter down. There is nothing in it but what is implied in the reply. It is a private letter, and so stated in the letter itself, and I do not think it would be advisable to lay it on the Table. As to the papers being printed, the Government desire that they should be printed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the House will at once perceive that a letter addressed by an official of the Government to another high official, informing the latter that it is necessary for him to tender his resignation, cannot be considered as a private letter, and should be laid on the Table. It is impossible that the House should have a question of that kind before it with so important a document missing. That letter is a notification to a high official that his services are to terminate within fifteen days, and the hon. leader of the Government must see at once that such a letter ought to be produced.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The question would rest with the General himself. Surely if he wrote a private letter, it must be considered private. The character which the General gave the letter is that which must be accepted by this House, as far as I can see.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will at once see that if that letter be a communication from the Government of which he is the head to a high official informing him that his services are to terminate within a few days, it is impossible that it can be made a private communication by the writer marking it as such. If it be necessary to ask General Gascoigne to remove the privacy of the communication, I trust my hon. friend will do that, but certainly the record is not complete without that letter.

The PRIME MINISTER. With due deference to my hon. friend, if the General, in writing this letter, made it private, the intention of the gentleman who wrote it ought to be consulted. I do not know that it may be of such a character after all that it might not be brought down, but the only thing which impresses me at this moment is that the General who wrote it considered it private, and its privacy ought to be respected by the House, unless there are good reasons to the contrary.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. First Minister ought to consider the request of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I may say that I made the motion at the request of General Cameron, a gentleman that I have not the honour of being acquainted with. He telegraphed me, however, and asked that these papers should be moved for, because he wished to have the whole record before the House. He reiterated this wish to me after I had had a conversation with the hon. Minister of Militia, when the latter suggested that perhaps, under all the circumstances, it would not be well to press for the papers, and I repeated my request, and the hon. gentleman promised to bring the papers down. There is an important principle involved in this of serious and far-reaching consequen-

ces to members of the militia force. In my opinion, it is the contents of a letter, and not the fact that it is marked private, that should have weight with the Minister in deciding whether to lay it before the House or not. Any statement made by the commanding officer or any other gentleman of a nature that required official action could not become a private communication simply by having the word "private" written across it. It is essentially an official communication and not private by its nature. I quite agree with the hon. Prime Minister this far—that it is very desrable that private letters shall not be brought down, unless there is a reason for it. But I do not agree that all letters are private because you write "Private" on them ; if their contents are such that upon them official action is based, in what position would it put militia officers, were the mere writing of the word "Private" on the letters to be a bar against those letters being laid before Parliament ? A letter may be sent containing a charge or a criticism intended to be the basis of official action, and yet by writing "Private" upon it the basis of the action taken is withheld from Parliament. I do not know that that is the case in this instance, because, as I say, I know nothing of the correspondence in question. But I rise simply to call the attention of the Government to the principle involved. I submit that the leader of the Government, or his Minister, can judge as to the nature of the contents of the letter, and if the hon. gentleman and his colleagues say that the letter is private and that no official action was taken upon it, and that action was taken upon wholly different papers, I think there could be no objection raised to the refusal to bring the letter down, because we must be very careful about violating private confidence. But I think, on reflection, the hon. gentleman will agree with me that even though a letter has written across the face of it the word "Private," if it contains information for the guidance of the Administration, upon which official action is taken, it would be an intolerable doctrine that such a letter should be withheld. It would mean that an officer might be condemned without his having an opportunity of knowing the nature of the charges against him. It cannot be contended that a document is private, when it is intended as a basis for departmental action, and when action is taken upon it. But by keeping its contents private, the person interested is deprived of answering. I would suggest that unless the Government can say that this letter of criticism, information or whatever it may have been, was not the basis of action, it should be treated as a public document.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the result of the letter marked "Private" and written by the Major General commanding the forces in Canada, was the resignation of General Cameron. I understand also that it was stated in that letter that within fifteen days General Cameron should send in his resignation. Now, Sir, I venture to express the opinion that the Imperial Government would never have permitted a proceeding whereby a person accused could be prevented from knowing the charges brought against him, by marking the letter so charging him and written to him "Private." I go so far as any gentleman in this House in favour of maintaining as absolutely sacred the privacy of private correspondence. But I also venture the opinion that if that letter was considered by the Minister in charge of that department as a private letter, then, as Minister, he should not have acted upon it nor have permitted the resignation upon a letter which could not be brought down and placed upon the Table to enlighten Parliament, as Parliament has the right to be enlightened upon the circumstances which led to the resignation of the commandant of the Royal Military College. I know not whether charges were brought or were not brought ; it is sufficient for me to know that a high official in the service of the Government, an official in charge of one of the greatest institutions in the country—for I claim the Royal Military College to be such—has felt it advisable to send in his resignation. I claim that upon a letter marked "Private," it was not within the authority of the Minister to permit the resignation to take place without being prepared, upon his responsibility, to enlighten Parliament upon the reason which induced the Major General commanding the forces to write that letter, and the reasons which, upon that letter, induced the commandant of the Royal Military College to resign. If it be necessary to obtain from the Major General commanding leave to remove from that letter the expressions that confined it to privacy, that should be done immediately. For I think it places the Department in a very false position to permit a man who has occupied the position that General Cameron has occupied during so many years, to leave the service, when the only reason that can be given for his leaving the service is that a letter was written to him by the officer commanding the forces, which letter cannot be produced because the Major General commanding considered that, for his own purposes, or for any purposes, it would be better to mark that letter "Private." It is not within the scope of the departmental officials to act in that way and to use their own judgment in withholding from Parliament information which is indispensable to enable Parliament to form an opinion upon what has taken place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I should have hoped that there would be no difference of opinion across the floor of the House on a matter of this kind. I think it is well understood that it is competent for one gentleman to write

to another in a manner which absolutely precludes the letter being made public, and the mode of doing so is well understood, as between gentlemen. If an official in the military service was complained of, and if the question of his leaving his office was under discussion—the facts of this case I know very little about—I should not assume it to be a very great crime for an officer of the department to write to a friend a communication and mark it "Private and confidential." The friend to whom the letter is written, I understand, can accept it as such and treat it as such, if he chooses. He can, on the contrary, decline to accept it as such, and in doing so he can make his wishes known, in which case an official letter can be sent in the usual way. I know nothing of the facts, but I should regret extremely if the rule is laid down that no gentleman in one of the great departments could write a private and confidential letter and mark it such, without danger of having it published in Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 23) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to relieve from an inconvenient position a number of persons in the North-west Territories and elsewhere, who are known there as ranchers. These gentlemen have cattle and horses, and they are generally located in parts of the North-west Territories unsuitable for agriculture, but suitable for ranching; nevertheless they claim that under the Dominion Lands Act they cannot get a homestead unless they perform what is called cultivation duties. I am able to say authoritatively that in some instances to ask them to go into arable cultivation would be simply a futility. Now, it is to enable such persons having a sufficient number of cattle and horses, and having a certain amount of fencing, and having erected habitable houses, with stables and outhouses capable of housing a certain number of cattle, and who have lived the prescribed three years upon their homestead—this is to enable such persons to get a homestead. I may say that I think myself that under the Act as it is now, the Minister of the Interior could probably give such persons a homestead, but as a fact these gentlemen claim that the Act had not been read in that way, and that the homestead is only given them as a matter of grace. In going over my constituency at the last election I found large numbers of men, men with hundreds of cattle, and having regular barracks in the way of outhouses, men with large properties, and yet they could not get a homestead. I said to them: If you had brought the matter to the Minister's attention, or brought it to my attention and allowed me to press it on the Minister, the chances are that you could have got a homestead under the Act; but they claimed they could not. Any way, there can be no harm in placing them in the position in which they think they are entitled to be placed. Then there is another clause in the Bill providing that in the case of a homesteader who had served in the Mounted Police for five years or more, that time should be counted as one year in performing his duties. That would not be a very large concession, either, because, owing to the arrangements that exist at present, and during the last six months, a constable is allowed to make an entry, and the six months is allowed to count; so that a further concession would be given to them under this Bill, of six months in regard to time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

"LA CANADIENNE."

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

Whether the Government are aware that the cruiser "La Canadienne" was placed at the disposal of the Conservative candidate in the county of Gaspé, at the late general election?

Who gave instructions to Commander Wakeham of "La Canadienne" to convey the Conservative candidate, Dr. Ennis, to the Magdalen Islands?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. No. 2. No instructions are to be found in the department, but Commander Wakeham has been written to and instructed to send a report on the facts, and by whose authority he acted. His report has not yet been received.

RAILWAY RATES COMMISSION.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Has the evidence taken by the Railway Rates Commission been published? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The report of the commission, together with the evidence, was laid on the Table of the House. The report was ordered to be published, but the evidence was not published, because, as I understand, the question of the publication rests with the Committee on Printing, and the evidence was not ordered to be printed by them.

POSTMASTER AT WARDSVILLE.

Mr. CALVERT asked:

Who is the postmaster at Wardsville, Ont.? When was he appointed, and what is his salary?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster is D. A. Simpson. He was appointed on the 3rd July, 1896. His salary is $270 a year.

CAPT. FAGES, OF BATTERY "B."

Mr. LANGELIER asked :

Did Captain Fages of Battery B, in garrison at Quebec, receive instructions from the Militia Department, requiring him to have entered, on the electoral lists of Quebec Centre for the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, the names of more than eighty militiamen forming part of the said battery ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). There is no record in the department referring to the subject.

PUBLIC WORKS IN GASPE.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

Whether the following letter is to be found in the archives of the Department of Public Works :—

Public Works Department,
Ottawa, Canada, May 11, 1896.

Dear Mr. Joncas,—In your letter of May 5, you ask me to send you a list of the petitions for public works in the county of Gaspé, made by or through you during last session, and in reply I beg to say that the records of the department show that you made application on behalf of the following works, for the sums set down opposite each item :—

Grand Pabos—Removal of boulders in harbour	$ 500
Grand Pabos—Repairs to wharf..	800
Ste. Anne des Monts—Addition to pier	12,000
Barachois de Malbaie—Construction of breakwater	16,000
Percé—New wharf	35,000
St. Adelaide de Pabos—Extension of wharf	6,000
Grande Rivière—Shed on wharf....	1,000

These several items were to be submitted to Council before the presentation of the Supplementary Estimates to the House, but, as you know, the obstruction offered by our opponents to the progress of all Government measures prevented the presenting of the said estimates and the consideration of the items providing for the several works in which you take an interest, and the execution of which you have represented to the Government as a matter of urgency in the interests of your constituents.

Believe me, dear Mr. Joncas,
Yours truly,
(Signed) ALPH. DESJARDINS.

L. Z. Joncas, M.P.,
Gaspé, Q.

2. At what dates has Mr. Joncas, ex-M.P., made the above-mentioned demands ?

3. Have these demands been made in writing, and can they be traced in the archives of the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. No. There is no copy of that letter in the department. 2. Application for Pabos was made by letter of 23rd March, 1896, No. 170003 departmental files. That for Ste. Anne des Monts was first made in February, 1892, and renewed on the 22nd February, 1893—10th April, 1894—14th April, 1895—and 18th January, 1896. The applications for Barachois de Malbaie were made by Mr. Joncas on the 17th April, 1895, and 25th October of the same year. Applications for wharf at Percé were made on the 16th March, 1894—the 6th May, 1895—and 18th January, 1896. The application for shed on Grande Rivière wharf is of the 23rd March, 1896. 3. The applications in question are in writing and are filed in the archives of the department.

FISHERY OFFICER AT PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Whether William C. Hobkirk, of Charlottetown, P.E.I., has been appointed to any office in the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the 11th day of July last ?

2. And if so, has he been appointed by Order in Council ?

3. Has the appointment been made to fill a vacancy or has a new office been created ? What is the nature of the said office and the salary attached ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. Mr. Hobkirk has been appointed overseer for Queen's County, and discharges the duties of such officer as well as those formerly discharged by some special guardians in Queen's County. Fishery Overseer, $200 per annum.

INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

Mr. OLIVER asked :

How many Indian industrial schools are there in Manitoba and the North-west, established and supported by the state ? What are their names and locations ? What did they cost to build and establish ? How many pupils are there in total attendance ?

Mr. DOBELL. In Manitoba and the North-west there are ten Indian industrial schools, established and supported by the state. Their names and locations are as follows :—Brandon, two miles north of the town of Brandon ; Elkhorn, in the town of Elkhorn, Man.; St. Boniface, one mile from the town of St. Boniface and two miles from Winnipeg ; St. Paul's, at Middlechurch, Man., six miles from Winnipeg ; Battleford, one and one-half miles from town of Battleford ; Qu'Appelle, four miles east of Fort Qu'Appelle and twenty-four miles from the town of Qu'Appelle ; Red Deer, Sec. 14, Tp. 39, R. 29, on Red Deer River ; Regina, four miles from town of Regina ; St. Joseph's, twenty-four miles from town of Calgary, at the mouth of High River. The cost of building and establishing these schools is as follows :—Brandon, $30,943.40 ; High River and Qu'Appelle, $42,500.44 ; Red Deer, $41,396.49 ; Regina, $46,986.40 ; Elkhorn, $19,432.66 ; Rupert's Land, $34,990.87 ; St. Boniface, $20,052.80 ; Battleford, $6,023.38 ; Calgary, $10,203.00. In the case of the Battle-

ford school, it should be explained that the building was transferred to the Department of Indian Affairs from the Public Works Department; and in the case of the Calgary school, that it is now in course of construction, and the amount stated is the cost up to date. The cost of the High River and Qu'Appelle schools is given in one item, as the outlay on the building is so shown by the Public Works Department. For the purposes of this reply, the cost of building and establishing is made to include the cost of building and equipping, and the salaries paid the staff of each school for the first year of operation. The total number of pupils enrolled at the schools is 985.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION OF 1894.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Has the evidence taken by the Railway Commission of 1894 been published by the Government? If not, will it be, and when?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I judge by the answer I gave to a previous question on the same subject it would perhaps have met this inquiry. I supplement my previous answer by stating that I am advised this matter is in the hands of the Printing Committee.

CUSTOMS SERVICE AT KING'S COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked:

When was Mr. Francis Gordon Forbes appointed sub-collector of Customs at Annandale or Grand River, King's County, P.E.I.? Has he since been performing the duties of that office? What salary is due him, or had it yet been paid?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Francis Gordon Forbes was appointed sub-collector of Customs for the outport of Grand River, by Order in Council, dated 15th July, 1896. He has not been paid any salary as yet.

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates, or Supplementary Estimates, a sum for the construction of a lock or locks at St. Andrew's Rapids on the Red River of the North?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The matter is one which concerns the expenditure of too large a sum of money to be considered for the present session, but will be looked into with attention during the recess.

GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to revise and improve the grain standards for the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories during the present session?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Does the hon. member mean to ask whether the Government intend to revise and improve the classification of grain or revise and improve the manner of selecting the standards, interpreting the existing classification. If the former, then it may be stated that there has been no urgent request from those interested to change the present classification. If the latter, it is not deemed wise to change the manner heretofore in vogue on the eve of the marketing of a new crop, whatever course may be deemed expedient thereafter. As to "revising and improving the standards"—as the question stands—the Government has no powers, the standards should be fairly representative of the crop, and it is the business of the board appointed under the Act to see that they do fairly represent it.

POSTMASTER OF ST. JOHN'S SUBURB.

Mr. LANGELIER asked:

Is the Government aware that Sylvio Demers, postmaster of St. John's Suburb, Quebec, took from the said office a letter which had been mailed there addressed to Lefebvre & Co., of Montreal, by Flood & Gelly, of Quebec, and gave the same to a citizen of Quebec; if so, is it the intention of the Government to take proceedings against the said Sylvio Demers, and if so, what proceedings?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). On the hon. gentleman's question appearing on the Notice paper, prior to which time the Government had no knowledge of the matter referred to, inquiry was made, and the Government learned that on the 18th December last, one Mr. L. Bertrand wrote a letter, signed by himself, at the office of Messrs. Flood & Gelly, and handed it to Mr. Flood to be posted at the St. John Suburb post office, as the above mentioned firm of Flood & Gelly were interested in the subject of the letter. A few minutes after Mr. Flood had posted the letter, Mr. Bertrand went alone to the St. John Suburb post office, and on representing to the postmaster of the office in question he had made a mistake in mailing his letter to Lefebvre & Co., Montreal, which he minutely described to the postmaster, the latter handed it back to its author, Mr. Bertrand. The postmaster at St. John's Suburb, when called upon to explain his action, stated he did not think he was acting contrary to the regulations of the department, and he was of course severely reprimanded for his breach

of duty in the matter. As to what action may be taken the same is under consideration of the Government.

"LE COURRIER DU CANADA."

Mr. LANGELIER asked :

1. Is the Government aware that during the late elections a large number of copies of "Le Courrier du Canada" were sent from the Quebec post office to persons who were not subscribers to the said paper, without any postage having been paid on the said paper ?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to take steps to mete out punishment for this abuse ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The Post Office Department has been informed that copies of "Le Courrier du Canada" were sent from Quebec post office to non-subscribers free of postage, and is making inquiries into the correctness of the statement.

POSTAL FACILITIES AT BRANTFORD.

Mr. HENRY asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to consider the advisability of establishing free postal delivery in Brantford or in cities of over 14,000 inhabitants this session ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT BRANTFORD.

Mr. HENRY asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Estimates, this session, a sum of money sufficient for the renovation and the making the needed improvements to the Government buildings at Brantford ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The matter is under the serious consideration of the Government.

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL.

Mr. HENRY asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Estimates a sufficient sum of money for the building of a granolithic sidewalk around the Brantford drill hall, as arranged by the Militia Department under the late Administration ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I submit that the question is not in order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. It contains an assertion as to a statement of fact which the Minister need not admit in answering it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman will amend his question by leaving out the concluding words "as arranged by the Militia Department under the late Administration" I will reply to it.

Mr. HENRY. Very well ; I will ask the question without those words in it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I beg to say that the matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation respecting insolvency, during the present or next session ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation respecting insolvency during the present session. The question of what legislation it will be expendient to bring down next session has not yet been considered.

SOULANGES CANAL—BRIDGES.

Mr. LANGELIER asked :

1. Whether tenders were asked for more than once, for the construction of the bridges on the Soulanges Canal ?
2. What are the names of the parties who tendered and the amount of each tender each time that tenders were asked for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, tenders were asked twice for bridges on the Soulanges Canal. The following are the names of parties tendering the first time with the amount of each tender :—

The Central Bridge and Engineering Company	$33,355 60
Robert Weddell	33,000 00
Imperial Bridge and Iron Works (A. Rousseau)	48,160 00
The Hamilton Bridge Works, "A"	50,000 00
" " "B"	41,688 00
Canadian Bridge and Iron Company	36,576 00
Dominion Bridge Company—	
Superstructure, design 1 and turn table "A"	32,974 00
Superstructure, design 2 and turn table "A"	37,306 00
Superstructure, design 3 and turn table "A"	35,790 00
Superstructure, design 4 and turn table "A"	35,070 00

The following are the names of parties tendering the second time with the amount of each tender :—

Imperial Bridge and Iron Works	$48,157 00
Dominion Bridge Company	33,700 00
Canadian Bridge and Iron Company.	36,397 00
The Hamilton Bridge Works	49,655 00
The Central Bridge and Engineering Company	36,664 00

CONSOLIDATED FUND, 1896.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amounts have been received and paid respectively on account of Consolidated Fund for the year 1895-96, as ascertained up to September 1st, 1896?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Amount received from 1st July, 1895, to 31st August, 1896, $36,509,712.60. Amount paid from 1st July, 1895 to 31st August, 1896, $36,713,549.19. These figures are necessarily incomplete and represent what has gone through the books of the Finance Department up to and including 31st August, 1896.

RAILWAYS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Is the Government aware that the fact of the Calgary and Edmonton and other North-west railways not having completed the selection and registration of the lands they have earned, enables them to escape school and statute labour taxation, although no such exemption was contemplated when the grant was made to them? Is it the intention of the Government to compel these companies to complete the selection of their lands forthwith, so that they shall be compelled to bear their fair share of the burdens of education and public improvements in the Territories?

Mr. DOBELL. The Government has recently become aware that several of the North-west railways have not yet completed the selection and registration of the lands they have earned. The Government proposes very carefully to consider this question with a view of determining how far the public interest justifies the early application of the principle of compulsory selection.

Mr. OLIVER also asked:

When will the exemption from taxation on Canadian Pacific lands in the Territories expire?

Mr. DOBELL. Clause 16 of the contract between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, executed at Ottawa on the 21st October, 1880, and confirmed by the Act 44 Victoria, Chapter 1, contains a specific provision as to the period of time during which the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which are not either sold or occupied shall be free from taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

Mr. OLIVER also asked:

Is the Government aware that the fact of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company holding in reserve a right of selection of public lands on account of grant enables that company to block land grants in the Territories to any railway company to which it is opposed and to practically block construction by such railway companies unless it receives a cash subsidy? When does the Government intend to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to complete their selection of lands on account of grant?

Mr. DOBELL. The Government is not aware of the fact of the Canadian Pacific Railway holding in reserve a right of selection of public lands, or that the company was blocking land grants to other companies to which it might be opposed, but the Government will make inquiry into the subject. The selection of the company's land grant is being rapidly proceeded with.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS LOBSTER HATCHERY.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a lobster hatchery on the Magadalen Islands?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Not at present.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

1. Whether the Government is aware that a shipwreck has recently taken place on the Magdalen Islands?
2. Is the Government aware that the lighthouse service on the Magdalen Islands is entirely insufficient?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to improve the service and to provide in addition thereto a life-saving station?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes. The British barkentine "William Geake," 277 tons, from Barbadoes to Montreal, with a cargo of molasses went on shore at Bull Rock, Bryon Island, on the 2nd of August last, and was reported a total loss. The master reported that the vessel became disabled and drove ashore. No lives were lost. 2. No. The Government is aware that the lighthouse on Entry Island is not located where it can be seen to the eastward, but proposes to remove it to a new site next season. 3. Yes, by the change referred to. The subject of establishing a life-saving station at Magdalen Islands has not received consideration, as no representations have been made as to its necessity.

GASPE COAST ROAD.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

1. What sums have been expended by the Dominion Government since 1891 for the maintenance of the coast road in the county of Gaspé?
2. Is the Government aware that the said road, which serves also as a mail route, is in a dangerous condition in many places?
3. What sum do the Government purpose to expend this year for the maintenance of this road?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. For a number of years past a grant of $300 has been made by this department towards keeping up the

Maritime road in the county of Gaspé, the grant being conditional on the voting of a similar sum by the province of Quebec. The following sums have been paid since 1891, viz :—$1,285. 2. No representations have been made to this department as to the dangerous condition of the road. 3. No application has been made for any grant and consequently no decision has been made to expend any sum, nor will be until the department is assured that the Quebec government will contribute its quota.

THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL.

Mr. DYMENT asked :

1. Is the Government aware that Mr. Boyd, superintendent of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, was away from his duties for a month just previous to the late elections ?
2. If so, was he away with the consent of the Government ?
3. Did his salary go on while absent ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government is now aware that Superintendent Boyd of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was given leave of absence during June last by authority of the late Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Haggart. He was away with the consent of the late Minister of Railways and Canals. His salary did go on while absent.

THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION—MONUMENT AT TORONTO.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the Minister of Militia received a memorial from the executive committee of the North-west Monument Committee asking for a grant to aid in liquidating the debt now remaining on the monument recently erected in Queen's Park, Toronto, to the memory of the volunteers who fell in the North-west Rebellion of 1885 ?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to comply with the memorial of the committee, and to make provision in the Supplementary Estimates for a grant ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Yes. The sum of $1,000 was voted for this purpose last year, and this amount was paid on the 29th June, 1895. 2. The memorial of the committee is now under consideration by the Government.

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

Would the Government be disposed to aid, in a substantial manner, any persons or company who would undertake the construction of a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). When any responsible persons or company submit to the Government that they are prepared to undertake the construction of a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec, the Government will be disposed favourably to consider the project, with the view of determining how far it should receive material assistance.

MANUFACTURERS AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. McCLEARY asked :

Has the Government, or any member thereof, issued a circular letter to the manufacturers of Canada asking for information in reference to the tariff ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No circular letter to the manufacturers of Canada asking for information in reference to the tariff has been issued, but I believe that certain information has been asked for from some of them with respect to what products they manufacture.

THE POST OFFICE AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. FISET asked :

Has Gideon Beaulieu, contractor for the post office at Rimouski, notified the Government that he was unable to complete his contract at the original price ?

If so, when did the Government take possession of the work done, and what was the value at that time ?

What amount has been paid to the said Beaulieu on this contract ?

Has the Government retained from the amount due the said Beaulieu a sufficient sum to meet the claims of the workmen and supplies unpaid by him ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. No. But the difficulties he had in carrying on the work and the fact that he left a large amount of wages unpaid which had to be settled by the department out of the amount due to him satisfied the department that he could not get the work done for the amount of his tender. 2. The department notified Mr. Beaulieu on the 13th May, 1896. At that time the value of the work done was $3,651.53. 3. The total amount paid to Mr. Beaulieu in connection with that contract is $3,290. 4. The department has paid out of the balance due to Mr. Beaulieu and the security deposited by him the wages due with the exception of those due to his clerk Mr. Boissinot. It is not the practice of the department to undertake the payment of the supplies purchased and left unpaid by the contractor. Only the wages are looked after.

MR. J. J. CAMPBELL IN NORTH ONTARIO.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked :

Why was Mr. J. J. Campbell, of the Indian Department, sent up to North Ontario during the by-election there, which preceded the general election ? By whose authority was he sent, and from what fund were his travelling expenses paid ?

Mr. DOBELL. The records of the office show that Mr. Campbell was sent on departmental business by direction of the then Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and his travelling expenses were paid from the appropriation for contingencies.

BREAKWATER AT CHAPEL COVE, N.S.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide, in the Supplementary Estimates during the present session, for the construction of a breakwater at Chapel Cove, L'Ardoise, Richmond County ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is not the intention of the Government this session.

PORT CREDIT HARBOUR.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked :

Has the attention of the Government been called to the following article in the "Conservator," published in Brampton, county of Peel :—

No longer in the hands of a Company.—Given to the Government, who will turn it into a Harbour of Refuge and make necessary improvements.—Welcome news for the people of Port Credit.

Toronto, June 19.—It is learned to-day that Port Credit harbour which has been owned and controlled by a private company, has been handed over to the Government, and that needed improvements will be made at once. Port Credit will in future become a harbour of refuge, a fact which will be learned with pleasure by the people of that village and district. Frequent applications have been made to the Government for assistance in repairing and maintaining the harbour, but without success. The reason given by the Government for its stand in this regard, was the fact the harbour was owned by a private company. Now that it is public property reasonable outlay can be made.

Is there any truth in this report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The attention of the Government had not previously been called to that article. The harbour of Port Credit has not been transferred to the Government.

HARBOUR OF REFUGE AT LITTLE METIS.

Mr. FISET asked :

Is the Government aware that, two or three weeks before polling day in the county of Rimouski, explorations were made with a view to construct a harbour of refuge at Little Métis, and a branch line of railway to connect the harbour with the Intercolonial ?

If so, by whom were these orders given ? How many engineers were employed ? Has a report been made on this matter, and what did the explorations cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Desjardins, then Minister of Public Works, issued an order for the execution of a survey at Little Métis on the 25th May, 1896, the survey being for the purpose of obtaining an idea about the possibility of establishing at that point a harbour of refuge. The survey was under the direction of Mr. Eugene Lafleur, one of the engineers of this department, who had as assistants Mr. T. J. Charbonneau and Mr. Ed. Labelle as chainman. Mr. Lafleur has not yet sent his report, as the survey is not yet completed. It is the intention of the department to have that survey completed. The total amount expended on that survey was $456.15.

PORT STANLEY, ONT., HARBOUR.

Mr. BEATTIE asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates to be brought down this session for the dredging and improvement of the harbour at Port Stanley, Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The question is under consideration.

THE SUPERANNUATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to have an Act passed at the present session, or at the next session, to abolish the superannuation of civil servants and abolish the fund ? 2. If not, is it their intention to pass such legislation, either at the present or at the next session of Parliament, that will make the superannuation fund self-sustaining ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation at the present session on the subject of superannuation. The whole matter is receiving careful consideration.

GALOPS CANAL.

Mr. WOOD (for Mr. Reid) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the enlargement of the Galops Canal at once ? Have the contracts been let, and to whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The matter of when further contracts for the enlargement of the Galops Canal will be let, is under consideration. No new contracts have been let for this work.

ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PRIVATE LEGISLATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to make provision that all advertisements for private leg-

islation for the present session of Parliament shall stand good for the next session ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is not the intention of the Government to depart from the existing rules in that manner.

PORT ALBERT HARBOUR.

Mr. CAMERON moved for :

1. A copy of all reports of the engineers of the Department of Public Works as to the conditions and requirements of the Port Albert harbour made within the last ten years.

2. A statement in detail, with dates, showing all amounts voted by Parliament for the improvement of said harbour.

3. A statement showing how much of said sums were expended under contract, and how much otherwise and how, when expended and to whom paid.

He said : I desire specially to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to this important public work. I am aware that the hon. Minister knows a little of everything, and a good deal of most things, but I am afraid he does not know very much about Port Albert harbour. Now, I wish to inform him that Port Albert harbour is situated twelve miles north of the important city of Goderich. It is a very important place. It is twelve miles to the nearest railway station, and it is the outlet to one of the very best sections of the Dominion—one of the very best farming sections, composed of a population of thrifty and large farmers, and, I am glad to say, prosperous and progressive farmers. It is the only outlet they have, except by driving over fairly good roads, a distance of twelve miles to reach the market. Port Albert harbour was not very long ago the outlet for that section of the country. There were small vessels plying through the lower lakes, and these vessels could enter the harbour. Of late years, however, they cannot do so. The hon. Minister knows that the Dominion Government assumed this harbour as a public work, and he knows that the Dominion Government, on more than one occasion, by a vote of Parliament, appropriated certain sums for the improvement of Port Albert harbour. He knows—or if he does not, I know—that upon the eve of every general election for the last ten years the chief engineer of the department was sent in hot haste to the harbour, and was in a position to assure, or, at all events, did assure, the farmers of the locality that, if they would only return a Conservative candidate, the Port Albert harbour would be improved. Almost every session preceding any election, there was something in the Supplementary Estimates for the improvement of that harbour, and just, I think, before the election of 1891 and the by-election of 1892, the same thing was repeated, just as it has been on the eve of every election for the last ten or fifteen years. Well, that would be all well enough, if the sums voted by Parliament were properly expended in the improvement of the harbour, but they were not. Sometimes the work was let by tender, and sometimes it was done by the day, and the hon. Minister knows how the public money, as a general rule, is absolutely wasted, when expended in the latter way. The last appropriation made by the Government was in the neighbourhood of $10,000, which, it was supposed, would have effected the complete restoration of Port Albert, and so it would, had the money been properly applied. A man by the name of Nevin was the contractor. The works failed, not, I am bound to say, through any fault of Mr. Nevin, because when he had a portion of the pier ready to sink, a terrific north-west storm arose, and his cribwork was all carried away. He had to abandon the contract, and a considerable portion of the appropriation made by Parliament was expended by the Government in this work, with the result that the recommendation of the engineer of the department entirely failed. The engineer recommended that the department should extend the north pier a distance of 200 feet and the south pier the same distance, and dredge out the harbour to a depth of 12 feet. The north pier was successfully constructed, but the south pier was not constructed at all. What the people desire, and what they expect the progressive Minister of Public Works to do, is to extend the south pier the same distance as the north pier and complete the dredging of the harbour. If the hon. Minister of Public Works will undertake to do that, there will be no applications during the next twenty years to Parliament for any further expenditure of money to improve the harbour. This may be looked upon as a work of trifling importance, and possibly in a Dominion and national sense it may be, but from a local point of view it is a work of the greatest possible importance. It is the desire, not only of friends of the Administration, but of supporters of the Opposition, who, however, if the Government behave themselves rightly, will be no longer their enemies, to have this work done. I have letters from the strongest Conservatives in that district, all of whom are of the opinion that it is the bounden duty of the Government to complete what the late Government undertook, but ineffectively carried out. I am told by competent authority that $5,000 will complete the cribwork, and a few weeks dredging will give 12 feet of water, which is sufficient for all purposes. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works, as a public-spirited man who does not desire to favour one locality more than another, not to forget the important harbour of Port Albert.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The papers asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) will be brought down. I thank him for the very valuable information which he has conveyed to me

and to the House. I recognize completely the importance of the ports he has mentioned. A pretty large sum of money has been expended at Port Albert, as the hon. gentleman has said. As far as I have been able to ascertain, $28,000 has been expended there. My hon. friend has stated that pilgrimages to Port Albert took place on many occasions on the eve of general elections. Well, the general elections are over; but I may tell him that I have made up my mind to visit every public work in Canada, as far as I am able to do so, so that when I rise in my place to speak about these works I may know what I am talking about. As soon as time will permit, I will accept the kind invitation my hon. friend has extended to me, and will visit Port Albert. I know that the port of Goderich also requires repairs. I know that public money has been wasted there also. My hon. friend has spoken about dredging. Perhaps the House would allow me to say that my department is very short of dredges. There are calls upon me every day for dredging, because the water is falling in our lakes and rivers. I am perfectly ready to carry on dredging, but to do so we must have dredges; and when my Estimates come before the House, perhaps, if I am supported by the House, I may get an appropriation for more dredges. I fully realize the importance of making and repairing ports and harbours. My hon. friend has said that a large sum of money has been wasted. Well, time will prove if his assertion is altogether right. I am very much afraid it is right. I may take this opportunity to state to the House that when I was sworn in I called my chief engineer into my office and asked for a statement about our wharfs and breakwaters. The statement he submitted to me was to this effect, that to put these works into a good state of repair would require about a million dollars. Works which, if they had been repaired in time, would have cost not more than $2,000 or $3,000, will cost now from $10,000 to $50,000. Perhaps I might have waited for another occasion to make that statement, but perhaps it is as well that the House should know that many of these works are in a dilapidated condition. We must do one of two things—either let a great many public works that we count as our assets be destroyed or else repair them. If you do not spend the money which is necessary to preserve these works against the storms of the fall, I am very much afraid that next year you will have to spend a very much larger amount. Had I had money, I certainly would have begun work before now.

Mr. McNEILL. As the hon. Minister has referred to dredging, I would just like to call attention here to a matter that perhaps he has already heard of, the great need for dredging at the very important port of Southampton. I would not refer to this were it not for the fact that life is in danger owing to the condition of things existing there now. There is a very considerable fleet of fishing boats at Southampton, and a large number of people employed in fishing operations. Owing to the fall that has occurred in the waters of our great lakes, the water on the bar in the harbour at the mouth of the Saugeen River has become so shallow that it is only with the greatest risk to life that the fishermen carry on their vocation. When a gale of wind, or even any considerable wind is blowing there from a certain quarter, the sea rises upon the bar and it is impossible to come in without risk to life.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the House will allow me a word in reference to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has said. A deputation called upon me a few days ago about the work referred to, and I told them I would have a survey made. It is a great pity that in years past my hon. friend did not insist a little more upon this work being done. I am very glad indeed that he has given me the information, and I can only say to him that the survey of the harbour will be made.

Mr. McNEILL. Perhaps I may be allowed a word of personal explanation. I do not think I can blame myself for not having been insistent in this matter in times past. And I may say, in justice to the late Government, that they sent a dredge there, but the dredge was not able to do the work. The nature of the material to be removed was such that the dredge was not powerful enough for the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And it stopped.

Mr. McNEILL. It stopped. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), as I asked his predecessor, to send a more powerful dredge.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say a word with regard to Bayfield harbour. I importuned the late Government for five or six years to attend to this work. I got promises every year, but the work did not receive the necessary attention. This is a very important harbour, especially to a number of fishermen who ply their vocation from the Bayfield River. Seven or eight years ago there was a breach made in the North pier. It was repaired, but in a very inferior manner. It was repaired by means of piles, instead of by building on top of the old wall, which was perfectly good. The first storm that came up drove the piles across the river. Let me say that this is a very important harbour, but at present a large number of fishermen are not able to enter it. In rough weather, instead of going to their own harbour, they have to put in to the harbour of

Goderich. I hope, when the Minister of Public Works comes up and views Goderich and Port Albert harbour, he will also come down and see Bayfield harbour, and I will accompany him, if he will let me know when he is coming. I may mention that before the last election a letter went up there from the Department of Public Works, promising the people that $12,000 would be spent on that harbour. The election has passed, and the harbour has not been repaired, nor have any steps been taken to that end. I hope, therefore, that the Minister of Public Works will consider Bayfield harbour along with the others.

Motion agreed to.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY.

Mr. FAUVEL moved for :

Copy of the correspondence between Hon. E. J. Flynn, Premier of Quebec, and Sir Charles Tupper regarding the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway ; also copy of correspondence between the said Hon. E. J. Flynn and the present Administration regarding the same railway.

He said : I desire to say a few words in support of this motion. The population of the united counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure is 47,710. The late Administration gave as a bonus to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, amalgamated with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, the sum of $620,000. Prince Edward Island has 210 miles of railway, costing $3,750,565, and the province has only a population of 108,891. Now, Sir, we demand equality in this country, we demand to be treated in the same manner as other portions of the country. It has been part of the financial policy of the Government to construct railways for the general benefit of the country ; but I may say that in many instances large subsidies have been granted to various railways, and the money has been spent in a reckless and a shameful manner. The history of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway affords a glaring proof of such waste of money. On the 29th April, 1884, this House, led by the late Administration, voted a sum of $300,000, not for the construction of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, not for the construction of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, but for the construction of a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, starting from Matapedia, in the county of Bonaventure, and running toward Paspebiac, a distance of 100 miles. Now, I say that if the late Administration had had at heart the interests of the population of Gaspesia, one of the oldest counties in Quebec, indeed of the whole Dominion, they would have spent the money on that railway as a Government work, instead of handing it over to speculators, who were then members of this House of Commons. $300,000 was a handsome vote, and they should have continued it the following year with another subsidy to be spent in constructing a branch of the Intercolonial Railway. Then, I may mention the railway from Truro to Sydney, I believe a part of the Eastern Extension, which is 217 miles long, and passes through the counties of Antigonish, Richmond, Cape Breton and Victoria, having a population of 77,000 only —210 miles of railway built at a large expense to the country for that small population. In the last election, my opponent received a promise, in the shape of a letter from the late Administration, and I believe the ex-Minister of Railways himself gave that letter, stating that the department would run trains on the Caraquette and on the Atlantic and Lake Superior branches at the expense of the Government. It was merely a political dodge, I am sorry to say.

Mr. HAGGART. I will correct the hon. gentleman at once. There is no such letter in existence, sent by the ex-Minister.

Mr. FAUVEL. Does the hon. member mean to say that there is no letter from the Hon. E. J. Flynn to the late Premier of Canada, asking that the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway should not be taken over by the late Government ? The public press has so stated on more than one occasion, and it has never been denied by the late Administration. The inhabitants of that portion of the country have a right to redress. We do not wish for more than our share of the public money, we do not wish to get what is not our own. Large sums of money are spent on canals in the western portions of this Dominion, but in the province of Quebec we have no canals except in the western portion of the province, while in the eastern portion of Quebec there is not a single mile of canal in existence built by public money. Therefore, I say that a population of 47,000 are deprived of their quota of the public money that is spent on public works ; and I now rise in my seat, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of that population, to protest against the injustice. I say that, following out what was said in this House a few days ago by the hon. member for Pictou, the Government should take over these railways that are now in a state of bankruptcy, and run them as a part of the Intercolonial Railway. I admit that what the hon. member for Pictou said the other day is the right thing to do with these existing lines, which are manipulated by companies who are virtually in a state of bankruptcy, such as the Caraquette Railway, and the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway—I do not know anything about the Temiscouata Railway, which he mentioned—but these should be taken over by the present Administration and run as part and parcel of the great Intercolonial Railway trunk line. It will be remembered that last session, or the session before, a request was made by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, asking that a certain amount of bonds, which were then being floated on the London market, with the in-

terest thereon, should be guaranteed by the late Administration; and I believe there was a promise to that effect. It was a mere wildcat scheme, got up for the purpose of duplicating another line of railway, which to-day does not pay expenses, much less a dividend. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway pass through the granary of Canada, and see how their shares are quoted on the market to-day. For a number of years the company has paid no dividend, and, although the road is in fair condition, it appears impossible for the company to pay any dividend, the reason for which I do not know. But I hold that any company coming here and asking a subsidy from Parliament and that the Government should guarantee interest on the bonds to be sold in the market, should not receive favourable consideration for their application.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to call the attention of the House to a remark made by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Fauvel), who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman alluded to Prince Edward Island. He stated that there had been spent on the Island over $3,000,000 for the construction of 211 miles of railway. I am aware that some hon. gentlemen are under a misapprehension as to the amount of money that was spent by the Dominion Government on the construction of those railways in the Island. I may say that it is true we have 211 miles of railway on the Island, but of that number the Dominion Government constructed a very small number indeed—if my memory serves me right, less than 10 miles—the remainder, about 200 miles, having been under construction by that little province before it entered confederation, and paid for entirely out of the resources of that province. If the hon. gentleman only wishes this House and the Government to do for his people what has been done by the Government for Prince Edward Island, I must say he asks for very little indeed, he asks for less than nothing. I do not wish to detract from the arguments which the hon. gentleman used in support of the enterprise which he so ably advocated, but it is time that the minds of members of this House should be disabused of the idea that the Dominion built the railways in Prince Edward Island. When the motion which I have on the paper is reached, I shall have an opportunity to refer to this matter, and I shall deal with it in such a way that hon. members will no longer be under their present delusion in regard to this railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. MAXWELL moved for:

Copies of all petitions or memorials presented to the Government on the subject of Chinese immigration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that my first venture in addressing this House should be in connection with such a subject as this, but as I have received a mandate from my constituents I feel under obligation to bring it before this House for consideration and to press it as plainly and yet as strongly as I possibly can on the attention of the Government. One circumstance makes this question a little peculiar, and that is that it particularly belongs to the province of British Columbia. I wish in some measure there were Chinese in all the provinces, because I am sure I would then speak to a more sympathetic audience than I do to-day, hon. members generally not knowing very much about this question. But in spite of this fact, though there is not a Chinese question in Ontario, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or even in Quebec, though I notice from the Montreal "Gazette" a few days ago a great many of the citizens of that important city have begun to be alive to the fact that they have more than enough of those distinguished gentlemen and that some restrictive measure must be brought into existence or there will be another British Columbia practically in the province of Quebec. In spite of that fact, I think I may appeal to members of the House, and especially to members of the Government, not to look at this question from their point of view, but from the point of view of those concerned. We the citizens of that western province, notwithstanding our province is rich and fertile, perhaps far beyond the wildest dream of the wildest imagination, yet hope you will regard us out there as you are regarded, namely, that we are striving to the best of our efforts to make that portion of Canada a place that will be a home for a happy, contented and prosperous class of people. Sir, one thing encourages me in bringing this question before the House, and that is that it is not a party question: that is to say, there is nothing of the Conservative or what you may call the Liberal element in it whatever, but it is simply a question on which the large majority of the people of British Columbia are agreed. During the late contest both Conservative and Liberal candidates were pledged up to the hilt so far as this question is concerned, and I believe if my opponent had been elected in my place, he would have done to-day what I am trying to do, and perhaps with more ability. However, I am also encouraged with regard to this question by the favourable consideration which the Premier has promised me for this question, and I hope that what I may say will strike a responsive chord in his generous heart, and that, together with his Government, he will do something towards helping the people of British Columbia to free themselves from what may be called a growing evil. If my opponent in the late election said what was true—and I have no reason what-

ever to doubt his word—then the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is likewise pledged to the consideration of this question. In fact, it was stated upon the public platform during the last election that the then Premier was prepared to deal with this question in sympathy with the wishes of the people of British Columbia. I may then take it, Mr. Speaker, that so far as this House is concerned, there is nothing of a party nature in the question, and that as we try to solve what may be regarded as a knotty, delicate subject we will approach it simply from the standpoint of citizens interested in the development and in the prosperity of the people of Canada. To some, my position on this question may seem a little strange ; that is to say, most people today who take a broad view of things are in deep sympathy with what is called the brotherhood of man. I do not for a moment deny that doctrine on the floor of this House. I assent to it with all my heart. I believe that the time is coming, it is now on the wing though it is yet far distant, of which our Scottish bard has so sweetly sung :

> When man to man the world o'er
> Shall brithers be and a' that.

But, I hold that the claim which the people of British Columbia make through their representatives does not in any way clash with what is now justly regarded as one of the noblest dreams ever conceived by the mind of man. I may say, that when I went to British Columbia six years ago, I went there prejudiced against the Chinese agitation. In the sincerity of my heart I believed the opinions of some of the distinguished men in this country, who thought that Chinese immigration would give a glorious opportunity to the church to christianize them. I was kindly disposed towards them. I have no ill-feeling towards them yet, but when I began to come in contact with the trouble—because there is a very serious trouble in connection with the matter—when I began to realize how these Chinese gentlemen affected the moral and material interests of our own Canadian people, then, I found that it was our self interest to do all the justice to our own people that we possibly could. I unhesitatingly say, from observation and contact, that as things have been going on and as they are going on at the present time, we are doing a positive injustice to those who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. I heard the Premier say not long ago—and, Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate him on obtaining his present honourable position, and on the high vantage ground which he now holds in our political life. I am glad that after breasting the blows of circumstance he now "can shape the whisper of a Throne and mould a mighty State's decrees." I heard from his lips not long ago the statement : that self preservation was the law that we are bound to observe. I assent to that doctrine. It is only through self preservation that any one of us can attempt to feel and act the impulses of what is called altruism or the higher life. We must protect our own people. The land is theirs—I do not think that is a strange doctrine to preach on the floor of this House—the mines are theirs, the fisheries are theirs, the opportunities are theirs, and I do not think it is a wise policy, yea, I think it is a narrow-minded policy to fill the land with semi-barbarians, and to drive out our own people who ought to possess these things, and who if they possessed these things, would make both themselves and Canada the pride of the whole earth.

Now, I want to state very briefly what has been done in regard to this Chinese question. This House of Commons is exceptional because of the greatness of the number of new members, and I therefore wish to remind hon. gentlemen that this is not the first time that the question has been brought before this honourable House. As far back as 1884 a commission was appointed by the then Government. That commission was composed of the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, the Hon. Mr. Gray, Judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, and the secretary of the commission was the distinguished and poetical member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). Previous to that a motion had been made in the House to the following effect :—

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to enact a law prohibiting the incoming of Chinese to that portion of Canada known as British Columbia.

That motion was withdrawn on a promise being given by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, on behalf of the Government that a commission should be issued to inquire into and report upon the whole subject of Chinese immigration. It may not be amiss to state that one of these things which brought this question to the crucial point, was the unfortunate compact that was made by the then Government with Mr. Onderdonk who built what was called the Onderdonk section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He represented that it was absolutely necessary to import Chinese in order to construct that portion of the railway. It was likewise a part of the compact that after the railway had been constructed, these Chinese should be sent back again to China, but unfortunately the promises both of the Government and of the contractor were not carried out, and instead of being sent back to China as they ought to have been, they were let loose upon British Columbia, and to that we may trace a great deal of the trouble that has arisen in our province in regard to this Chinese question. At the opening of the commission to which I refer, the Hon. Mr. Chapleau (the Chairman) said :

> British Columbia has repeatedly by her local legislature and by her representatives in Parliament, solicited the executive of Parliament of Canada to enact a law prohibiting the incoming of Chinese to British Columbia.

Now, I want to say that the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in making that statement, said the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. That is still the opinion of a large majority of the people of British Columbia. But what I want to say is this: that commission brought in a report. I have read that report and it is to my mind one of the most outrageous reports that ever was presented to this honourable House. Our local legislature and the federal members from British Columbia, had represented what the people wanted, and yet this commission—on the strength of what evidence, I cannot possibly make out—bring in a report almost to the effect that the Chinese were a blessing to British Columbia and that the more they had of them the better it would be. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that that report in no way voices the sentiment of British Columbia. While there is a great deal of evidence in that report the greater portion of it is simply the evidence of men who were interested in having the Chinese there, and so far as the mass of the people were concerned, they were not represented on the commission as they ought to have been. If they had been properly represented, the evidence would have been so overwhelming that the commission would have reported in favour of what had been demanded by the representatives of British Columbia.

Now, I just want very briefly to state some of the arguments with regard to the Chinese. There is what is called the moral argument. I do not want to bring this question up in the House in this public way, nor would I pretend to say that the whites are altogether clean and pure. I know that we have our vices as well as the Chinese, but there is this difference: that while our vices, so to speak, are controlled, and moulded, and influenced to some extent by the higher forces of civilization, not to mention Christianity; the vices of the Chinese are dominated and influenced by the lower forces of barbarism. I need not tell this House that the Chinese are universally addicted to opium; that they are inveterate gamblers; that they are grossly immoral. These things are so well known and authenticated that I do not wish to dwell upon them in this Chamber. I might mention also, that according to the evidence which has been produced in several countries, the Chinese are mostly members of secret societies, and that the law of these societies is the law which they are compelled to obey. We have leprosy out on the coast in connection with the Chinese. How it came we do not know; but at considerable cost to this country we have had to get hold of these lepers, we have had to transport them to an island, and at the present moment, I understand, they are being supported by the Dominion Government.

From the Chinese we are in constant dread of a return of what may be called the small-pox scare. A few years ago, the small-pox cost the city of Vancouver, the city of Victoria and the provincial government each thousands of dollars, and paralyzed the whole trade of the country as long as it lasted.

It may be true that the Chinese are not as bad as they are represented to be; but no self-respecting people care to have the scum of Chinese life dumped right into their midst. It may be hard for me to tell what influence these Chinese may have upon the moral life of the people. But I ask hon. gentlemen to think of the lowest classes of Chinese being dumped in tens, fifties, hundreds, or thousands, into their midst, and doing such things as we know they do, and then to say that they will not affect the moral life of the people. For us to imagine that these people have not a deleterious effect upon the people among whom they live, would be to imagine something not true to common experience. Our children to-day are becoming familiar with their gambling dens, their opium-smoking, and their filth; and I ask you, should not the higher moral concerns of the people take precedence of all monetary considerations? We white people may not be perfect; I agree that we are not; but when you have a stream whose source is filth, and which flows over beds of long accumulated filth, flowing into the moral life of our people, it stands to common sense that our moral life will become more and more contaminated.

It may be true that the Chinese are industrious. I will grant that for the time being. It may be that they perform services which are useful. But I ask you this: Will it pay Canada to fill British Columbia with thousands of men who are the off-scourings of the jails and the lowest life of the Chinese? What will Canada gain, if she accomplishes the lowering of the moral tone of her own citizens? I say we ought to face this question; and if I were not what I am, I would press it home with still more earnestness than I am doing to-day. But I ask you to say, with the people of British Columbia, that moral considerations are of more concern to the people of Canada than a mere question of dollars and cents.

There is another aspect of this question, that is, the labour aspect. This is the essence of the whole question. Put in common language, the question of the Chinese is the question of bread and butter. If you feed three Chinamen, you take the bread out of a white man's mouth; you close up a home; most likely you drive a family out of the province altogether. I have read very carefully the evidence that has been adduced on this subject, and the gist of that evidence is this. British Columbia wants cheap labour; Chinese labour is cheap labour; therefore, the more Chinese cheap labour we have in British Columbia, the better it will be for the development of that province. Now, there is no more reason why we should have Chinese cheap labour in British Columbia than there is

that we should have it in any other part of Canada. Our mines, our forests and our waters are surely rich enough to pay white men white men's wages in British Columbia as well as in any other part of Canada. Some men who are in favour of having the Chinese in British Columbia, talk as if our necessities were exceptional. They are no more so than those of any other part of Canada. You have your public works in different parts of Canada; but who raises the cry that you must have Chinese labour to build those public works? You have accomplished things in other parts of Canada such as we have never attempted in British Columbia, and yet you are always able to employ white men and pay them white men's wages: and I say that British Columbia is far more able, according to her recognized wealth, to employ white men and to give them such wages as will enable them to live in comfort, peace and plenty in a glorious province, which God has wonderfully endowed. Sometimes in this evidence you will read that one of the reasons some men have for favouring the Chinese is that they are so docile, that is to say, they think there is something advantageous about a Chinaman because he just does what he is told to do. Now, I know that there is a great difference between the docility of a Chinese slave and the docility of a free white man. The difference is that some of those people want men to work for them whom they can swear at, and, if their temper be at the boiling point, whom they can kick. Thank goodness, no white man will ever stand such treatment; and it augurs a very low standard of morality and of humanity, when a master makes it a boast that he likes men whom he can kick, better than those whom he cannot; and that is practically the case with the Chinese. You also hear it remarked that there are no strikes among Chinese workmen. No; and why? Because the Chinaman is simply a machine in the hands of the boss, who can do with him just what he pleases. I do not want to go into the question of strikes; but this I will say: Why make a distinction in favour of British Columbia? Masters and men have their strikes in Ottawa, in Montreal, and in Toronto; but, after they have fought the question out, they agree to begin again on quite harmonious terms; and I can assure you that the men who have made England, Scotland, Ireland and different parts of Canada, are quite good enough to make British Columbia all she ever hopes to be. Sometimes you hear, as I have heard over and over again from the employers of labour out there, "Oh, the white men are so bad and discontented that we cannot get on with them; and the Chinese are so good, and contented, and happy, and they just do what we want them to do." Now, I would not malign any class. The white man may be bad enough: he may have his mistakes, his vices and his faults; but, bad as he is, he is a thousand miles ahead of the Chinaman who comes from the jails of China. Hence I say: like master, like servant: where you have a bad master, you will have a bad servant. Let our capitalists be good men, and let them treat their employees kindly and sympathetically, and in British Columbia, as everywhere else, these men will do their best in the interest of their masters and their country.

We object to these Chinese because they do not become citizens among us. I do not know that we want them to become citizens; but they, on their part, do not evince any desire to become citizens, either. They leave China for the purpose of making a little money, and, after they make it, they desire to return to China. If they should die before they can return to China, their bones are sent back to the homes of their forefathers. They object to paying taxes. We have in British Columbia a poll tax of $3 per head for educational purposes, and the Chinese, to escape that tax, will lie like troopers. Our chief objection, however, to the Chinese is that they take away the bread out of the mouths of the white population. Sometimes it is represented that three Chinamen make work for one white man. The very opposite is the case. Take the question of servants. It is the desire of every city no doubt to have capable, fine-looking servants, and I suppose you all know that the Chinaman takes the place of the servant girl. It stands to common sense that if he is employed, she cannot be; and where one Chinaman is employed, it means that a servant girl is out of employment, and to be out of employment means for that girl poverty, perhaps starvation, and worse than all it may mean that she may be driven to a life of shame in our great cities. Think what servant girls mean to the community. They patronize the stores, they help to fill the churches, and from this class a great many young men obtain the wives that are to sweeten and brighten their homes. What then does the employment of a Chinaman signify in the community? It means nothing, absolutely nothing. He is what we, out in British Columbia call a "sucker," taking in all he can get and giving out nothing or as little as possible. It is not difficult to see which of these classes is the best for British Columbia.

Then look at our fisheries. Take, for example, our canneries. I do not want to say a single hard word so far as this question is concerned, and you will get to know by and by of the immense importance of these canneries and the immense amount of money which is going into the pockets of a great many people in British Columbia from our fisheries. Go into these canneries, and you will find that every man employed there is a Chinaman. You will find hundreds of thousands of them swarming up and down during the fishing season. Will any sensible man tell me that the employment of so many Chinese does not keep white men out

of work, yet that is what we are asked to believe by those who are in favour of the admission of Chinamen. It stands to reason that if thousands of Chinamen are employed in our province, white men cannot be getting the employment which they have the right to expect and which they ought to demand.

Go to our mines, and see the immense riches there, and you will find hundreds and hundreds of Chinamen employed in these mines. In some of the pits, you will find more Chinamen than whites.

Take our market gardeners. In market gardening the Chinese are a great success, but what does this mean? It means either that the white gardener has been driven out or that he is bordering on starvation. Why? Because the Chinaman can live like a hog, on the swill of the hotels. It means that what is a profit to Chinamen would be death to the whites; they live on the refuse, on the swill, and they grow rich on what would be starvation to a white gardener's family, so that there is no class in British Columbia to-day more opposed to Chinamen than our market gardeners.

Civilization and christianity have taught man to take a higher level in this life. They have taught him to have a home for himself, to have a wife who will brighten his struggle for existence, to have children perhaps who will fill his home with their merry prattle and songs, and wherever you have these, you have what indicates prosperity. The more white men are employed, the more white homes are in existence, the more is every industry benefited; and the fewer of these you have, the more will all legitimate business suffer. On the other hand, the more Chinamen you have, the less stores and industries will flourish; and the more you introduce those barbarians, the more you introduce barbarianism and drive out christianity and civilization. And so, in the name of my fellow citizens I appeal to this House that you, in your wisdom and righteousness, may help us in some way to get rid of this great evil, and that you will by your actions proclaim, so far as the future is concerned, that you are on the side of your Canadian brethren and are determined to give them all the facilities and advantages which this magnificent country can furnish them.

Just one word more, and I have done. The United States have had to deal with this question. The legislatures of that country poohpoohed the agitation and the desire of the working classes, but riots broke out in Nevada and Oregon and different other states and at last as the culminating act of the efforts of these statesmen the Geary Act was passed, which is simply an act of prohibition. I may also refer to the struggle which took place in New South Wales on this question. But instead of wearying you with the Act which has been passed in connection with that struggle, I will simply say that the law is there that each Chinaman entering New South Wales has to pay a per capita tax of $500. So far as British Columbia is concerned that is the demand that I have to make to-day, namely, that the per capita tax be raised from $50 to $500. With all due respect to Li Hung Chang that is our opinion, and we ought to know the conditions of the country a great deal better than that distinguished gentleman. You may ask why do we demand an increase of this per capita tax. We ask it in the first place because the $50 tax has proved insufficient to prevent this immigration and the influx of Chinese is going on as fast and furious to-day as it ever did in the history of the country. The cause of this is chiefly, first, Tyhees or Chinese bosses. These men are comparatively rich, and they make a profit on importing their fellow countrymen into this Dominion. They pay the $50 tax and furnish all the necessaries required to these men, and then they become their slaves until they have paid out in toil what has been advanced. Any legislation, so far as the imposition of a per capita tax is concerned, must be legislation which will prevent these Tyhees bringing in their countrymen in order to make them slaves and at the same time fill up this country. Another thing which has been against us in this matter is the Canadian Pacific Railway line of steamships. I do not want to say a word derogatory to that company or to their steamers. I feel as proud of their magnificent vessels as any man in this Dominion. Their vessels are indeed a credit both to this country and to the company that owns them. But we must speak the truth with frankness and soberness. You know, Sir, that that company receives an annual subsidy of $60,000, and from the province of British Columbia an annual subsidy of $14,000. I do not object to that, but to this I do object. If you go on board any one of these steamers, you will find them manned by Chinese sailors, and filled with Chinese firemen, waiters and cooks and other servants. In fact you would almost fancy you were in a Chinese town. Now, I put this question to hon. members. Is it fair that the people of Canada should contribute from their substance to the support of a magnificent line of steamers in order to enable this company to employ Chinamen to run these ships? I think the people who man these ships should be taken from the people who contribute the money. Should not these positions be given to Canadians? I know that there are many who would be glad to fill them, and I think we are making a modest demand when we ask that these steamers should be utilized for the benefit of the people whose money is subsidizing them. But I may be asked will not this mean total prohibition. I cannot say whether it will or not, but I tell you sincerely I hope it will. I hope sincerely that this tax will have the

desired effect of preventing any more Chinamen from coming into British Columbia or Canada.

I now want to answer those men who cry out for cheap labour.

Now, I grant that we must have cheap labour of some kind; but I hold that there are enough white men in Canada to do this labour and they can do it as well and as cheaply as any body of Chinamen possibly can. What number of Chinamen have you in British Columbia? According to the last census we had 10,000 Chinamen there. But I suppose hon. gentlemen are aware that census returns are not to be depended upon. In the course of the investigations of the commission of 1884, it was admitted that there were 18,000 Chinamen in British Columbia. During 1892, 3,278 came into the province. Altogether, I believe I am well within the mark when I say that there must be in British Columbia at the present time about 20,000 Chinamen—one-fifth of the whole population. Suppose we grant that cheap labour is absolutely indispensable, and even that Chinamen are needed to do it—have we not enough Chinamen in the country already for this service? Are not 20,000 enough to do all the cheap labour necessary for the development of the province of British Columbia? There may be objections to expelling those that we have among us, and I do not press that point. But I say, knowing the facts of the case and anxious to do justice to all interests that are concerned, we have enough and more than enough Chinamen for all the industries of British Columbia that many require their services.

Now, let me say in conclusion that this is a burning question. The people of British Columbia are deeply interested in this subject. I will not say that they are indignant, I will not picture them before you as boiling over with righteous wrath. But this I will say—that hope deferred maketh the heart sick. I appeal to the Government and I say to them with all earnestness, now is the time for them to enshrine themselves in the hearts of the people of British Columbia, a people as honest, as industrious, as good as may be found in any part of this magnificent land, this Canada. Answer us according to the desire of our hearts and we will make you a province that will be the brightest gem in the coronet with which the fair brow of Canada is encircled to-day. We want to fill that land with honest men and bonnie lasses. We want to fill it with a people who have respect for our laws, who will become citizens of the country in which they live and who will be the strong support of Canadian and British institutions. Deny us and let these people come in, let them fill our industries in the future as they have done in the past, and you will give us such a condition of things as that which Goldsmith has so painfully described in "The Deserted Village." But answer us according to the desire of our hearts and we will give you a province which will be as Robert Burns described his native Scotland:

Beloved at home, revered abroad.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I would not like this motion to pass without at least one man saying something against the views expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell). Of course I am not as well acquainted with the facts as the hon. gentleman is, but on the general principle that should control every government in a free land, I have to say that it would be a retrograde move for us to pass laws to keep these people out on the ground that they are Chinamen. There is but one acre out of every hundred of the arable land of Canada cultivated. For myself, desiring that this country shall have population—the only means of wealth—I am willing that Chinamen as well as others shall come in. And if the people of Canada can, as stated by the hon. gentleman, compete with these people, there can be no danger in admitting these Chinamen here. It is very well to say that we can compete with them and then try to keep them out by legislative prohibition. That is an admirable way of showing our ability to compete with them. It is true, we have very few Chinamen in the province from which I come, but I have seen these people in the United States, and I have listened to the clamour against them by the people of that country; and I know that many of them have good qualities which we might profitably follow. But there is another point—there is no such embargo as is now proposed laid upon the people of Great Britain when they go to China, and the same complaint is made by the people of China as is made by the people of Canada with respect to the Chinese. If you go to China you will find the complaint made by the people there against the British that they go to China and make money and then return to Great Britain to spend it. I will say nothing of the festivity attending the visit of the eminent Chinaman who is now in our country, but I was glad, at least, that we did not lay on him the embargo we had laid on the rest of his countrymen. I appreciate the difficulty that the people of British Columbia have to encounter in competing with these people who work so hard and live more cheaply than other people do. But that is an incident of immigration to every country, and the people must learn how to compete with them. If we say that because these men are thrifty, and because they labour hard therefore they are to be kept out, we recognize in a practical way the very vilest of all systems, protection: we declare that the people of this country must be protected.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. That argument is so irresistible that even an hon. gentleman like the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Ber-

geron) sees the force of it. I admit that if you are going to make an exclusion Bill, it must be by imposing a fee of $500 and not $50. I admit also that there ought to be stringent regulations against the importation of these people simply for the purpose of getting them to work for outside task-masters. The Government will never make much out of this, but our degradation will be complete. I can fancy a man rising in the British Parliament and proposing that people from China or from any other country should be kept out of Great Britain. England competes with the whole world, and every man is free to go there and compete with those who are already there. I think we should be following a very bad example if we copied the legislation of the United States in this respect instead of copying England. We did follow the example of the United States in other things. We adopted their miserable system of protection, a system that had been discarded by Great Britain, and we followed them also when we put the duty of $50 upon Chinamen. I remember a man in British Columbia who did not like to have people coming in from our provinces down by the sea. When I was speaking of the fact that the largest province in this Dominion, containing an area of over 400,000 square miles, had only between 80,000 and 100,000 people, not more than is found in some counties of this Dominion, I remember a man standing up, and what do you suppose was the remedy he proposed at a public meeting? Because they could not compete successfully with the miners that came there from the lower provinces, he submitted, as the best solution of the difficulty, that a tax of $50 should be imposed upon every man who went from the lower provinces into British Columbia. That was his solution, and an easy one it was, because if you keep out those who can compete favourably with us, there is room for a man who is dependent on the assistance that the Government gives him. Well, there is the difficulty antecedent to all others. I think we must make up our minds that the Chinaman, and the Japanese, and all others, ought to be allowed to come to this country if they want to, and engage in honest toil, and help to build up the country. Our gates are not by any means wide enough open to the people from other lands. How are we going to fill up our country? Are we going to wait until the people of the kinds that we prefer chose to come in here? Then they will not in increasingly large numbers. But there is a greater question underlying this. Much has been said against the Chinaman because he comes here as a Pagan. So he does. Well, Sir, have we come to this, that the Christian influences and the moral forces at work in Canada, are not able to take those men as they come into Canada, and make them somewhat nearly what they ought to be? Has civilization in Canada come to be such a failure that we must protect ourselves, not only as against the labourer, but against that class which is now under discussion? I know there are difficulties surrounding the admission of these people, I know they do not make as desirable citizens as some others. What then? We must accept them, and we must bring to bear upon them the best moral and spiritual forces in the country, to make them better. We are all in this world children of a common Father, and I would dearly love that we should get hold of the idea that it is a duty we owe to the Chinaman and to every other emigrant who comes into this country, to elevate him and benefit him. It may be said that he comes here as a mere contract labourer. So he may, and so he may go away; but even his sojourn here, be it ever so short, ought to be made a means of benefiting him. Now, in the Island of Trinidad there was a large number of coolies who went there and settled, and what did the philanthropists and Christians do? Did they try to exclude them? No, but the various churches took hold of them—and I speak now particularly of the church of which I am myself a humble member; they sent missionaries to Trinidad amongst those coolies, they opened schools and instructed them, and what was the result? There is now a native ministry among those people. They have been raised, they are better wage-earners, they do better work, and there they remain. But if, perchance, he goes back to India at any time, you have the satisfaction of knowing that you have elevated him, that he has undergone a process of civilization, and he goes back to India a man better prepared to become a citizen of that country. I believe that is the condition of things in Canada, and I would not myself—and I am now only speaking for myself—I would not like that we should proceed any further with this matter. I see a difficulty in going back upon the legislation that now exists in Canada. Surely we should stop now, and go no further. What have both parties been calling for? They have been calling for more people. What have we been spending millions for? To bring immigrants into the country, and with a failure that is astounding. I am sure this proposition of the hon. gentleman is not one of the best methods of helping on a work that every man in Canada who loves his country, ought to have primarily at heart. We must learn to do with the Chinaman just what we do with every other man that comes into the country, we must try to make the best of him, and we must try to make the best of the state of things that exist in Canada to-day. But to exclude them altogether is to give up our claim that we are able to compete successfully with them, and it is to acknowledge that we are not able to make them better. Now, Sir, these being my views I could not for a moment agree that this resolution should pass, though it were merely

to take the sense of the House upon the question. I do not believe that it is the better sense of this House. I believe that even in British Columbia, while they may feel the difficulty presented by the hon. gentleman, I know those noble people will appreciate the fact that this difficulty must be overcome by forces from within, and then it will be solved. In respect to the employment of Chinese by the Canadian Pacific Railway does not the fact that the company employ them, prove that they are capable workmen. The company carry on business on a commercial basis, and care only to employ those who will perform the work to the best advantage. It may be hard, but must we not be able to surpass these celestials. And that is a difficulty that we must overcome in some way. Canada will become great only when she will have learned the lesson of opening her doors wide to all nations; and when Chinamen have learned the good-will that Canadians bear them, when they have learned that they can come here to a better country than their own, they will appreciate the advantages, and it will be found that many of them, instead of going back to their native land, will become industrious and hardy citizens of this country. There is a marvellous adaptability in the Chinaman to the situation in which he is placed, and I believe that if, instead of discouraging him in this way, we took pains to encourage him, there would be no desire of placing a resolution of this kind upon our records. Why, Sir, we have heard of the distinguished man from that country who recently arrived upon our shores; and I say that the very questions he put—that man born and brought up in a civilization so different from ours—I say that the very questions he put, showing such an intimate knowledge of passing events, and of the public men of Canada, should satisfy us that a country that can produce a man like him is a country whose population we may safely allow to come to Canada, and who, if properly treated, can be trusted to become good citizens. My hon. friend from Vancouver has stated his objections, and his arguments are very good from his point of view; but I trust that no step will be taken in that direction. It would be a retrograde step; and I believe that the people of Canada are ready to allow the Chinaman to come, and are willing to treat him well, to make him a good citizen; and he will help to build up this country, an end that we all desire to obtain.

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

After Recess.

LI HUNG CHANG IN CANADA.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a great favour from the House, I may even say, a personal favour, but I will not occupy the time of hon. members for more than two or three minutes. I had the honour of being chosen by the Government of Canada to go as its representative and meet Li Hung Chang, the Viceroy of China. I have spent some time with him in friendly intercourse, and I have heard him express the gratitude which he entertains and which he acknowledges for the hearty hospitality shown him in our country. Let me tell the House that almost the last words he said to me before I took leave of him were these: "Do not abandon us—do not abandon us." I told him I would not abandon his countrymen. He is about to sail from Canada, the hearty cheers with which we greeted him still ringing in his ears. To-morrow he will see in the papers the attack brought against his country to-day. Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way desire to comment, or to say whether that attack was just or unjust; but I appeal to all the members of this House as Canadians to give me the chance of showing that a Canadian can keep his word. I want him to know before he sails next Monday for Asia that when I said I would not abandon him, I meant to keep my word; and when I am allowed, by the rules of the House, to open my mouth on this subject, I shall seek to dispel that dark cloud which is now hanging over the reputation of the countrymen of the Viceroy, who was welcomed so heartily by us only yesterday. I merely ask the House for permission to make this statement in order to let him know before he leaves this country that when the time comes for me to speak, when the rules of the House allow me to speak, I shall endeavour to clear, as far as lies within my power, the reputation of his countrymen; then it will be my duty to do it, and I will try and do it. I thank hon. members with all my heart for the kind indulgence which has been shown to me.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) to confirm an agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 11) to amend and revive the Acts respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 15) amalgamating the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company under the name of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

HUDSON BAY AND PACIFIC RILWAY.

Mr. OLIVER moved second reading of Bill (No. 12) to incorporate the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to explain the purport of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill is the embodiment of an idea held by a gentleman named Nelson, who has been connected with the Hudson Bay railway enterprises for some years, and it is practically the same Bill as was brought before the House last session. The Bill received its second reading, and I think passed the Railway Committee, but by some mistake it was not passed through the House. It provides for the incorporation of a company to construct a railway from Fort Churchill, on Hudson Bay, to Prince Albert, then to Calgary, where it would join the Canadian Pacific Railway, with a branch to Manitou Lake in the Saskatchewan district at or near Edmonton. There is also provision for a line from Fort Churchill to Lake Athabasca.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will be opportunity for full discussion before the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DAIRY PRODUCTS ACT (1893).

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dairy Products Act (1893).

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Would the hon gentleman explain ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been before the House for the last three sessions and I did not think it was necessary to offer very much explanation concerning it. It has, however, been somewhat amended by inserting a schedule setting forth the manner in which those interested have to get a certificate from the Dairy Commissioner of the Agricultural Department. I may refresh the memory of the House by stating that there was a very strong demand from cheese buyers in England that Canadian cheese should be branded. They sent a memorial to Canada stating that our cheese was placed upon the English market under misrepresentation, as it was sold as being made in a different month from that in which it really was made. For instance, July cheese was placed on the market and sold as September cheese. We export a large quantity of our cheese to Bristol, and I hold in my hand a memorial signed by the leading business men of that city asking for legislation in the direction proposed by this Bill. As the House, and country know, there was considerable alarm about this matter some time ago throughout Canada owing to reports which appeared in the English agricultural journals, and which reports might have been very injurious to the cheese industry of Canada. I am satisfied that the House is favourable to this legislation. When I brought the matter to the attention of Parliament before, hon. gentlemen on both sides expressed approval of it and I am quite sure that the majority of members in this new House will endorse the opinions of their predecessors in that regard. I have copies of circulars which were sent out to cheese manufacturers and to the patrons of factories, and they have sent in replies favourable to this Bill. I have also a copy of a circular sent out by Professor Robertson, the Dairy Commissioner, which suggested that there should be a certain brand or mark giving the day of the year merely, and although the form of the mark was put on the circular, and the suggestion placed very clearly before them, yet they expressed themselves as more favourable to the form of branding set forth in this Bill. I need not point out that the cheese industry is very important in this country, and that it is well worth our while to try and satisfy the people of the British market who buy from us. We export between $14,000,000 and $15,000,000 every year, and I believe that over 99½ per cent of that is sent to Great Britain, the remainder going to the United States, Newfoundland and the West Indies. If anything takes place that will cast suspicion upon our Canadian products on the British markets, it would be found to be very detrimental to us, as the people of the United States have already experienced. Our cheese trade has increased over 1,000 times what it was 30 years ago. In 1860 the United States exported 124 times as much as we did, but now we export twice as much cheese as the United States. I may state that we sent our circulars to the manufacturers and farmers asking their opinion as to what was best to be done upon the lines of this Bill which provides that the cheese should be branded with the month and the day of the month, and the registration number of the factory, so that whether this cheese was found in London, Bristol, Liverpool, or in any part of the world, you could tell the spot where it had been manufactured, the concession, township, lot, the post office, the name of the manufacturer, &c. This makes the working of the Act very simple, and will obviate the necessity of any expenditure for employing inspectors. Out of 430 replies received to our circular from the province of Quebec, there were only eleven against the principle of the Bill, and out of 348 replies received from the province of Ontario there were only 53 against it. The grand total of answers received was 778, and there were only 64 against it in those two important provinces. So that there were only 8 per cent of replies against the

proposition. Although the actual number of answers was 778, yet these answers represented a great deal larger number who are interested in the cheese trade, because some of them were from presidents, secretaries, and treasurers of cheese-making companies who spoke for those whom they represented and who were interested in the manufacture of cheese. The cheese manufacturers and the farmers of Canada are strongly of opinion that fraud is being perpetrated upon them, and if we do not try to prevent this feeling, they will continue to feel even more strongly that their interests are not being attended to. I am happy to say that a few who objected to the provisions of this Bill in the commencement are now strongly in its favour. I will cite a couple of facts to show the progress and improvement in quality the Canadian cheese has made. Canada made 195 cheese entries at the Philadelphia exhibition in 1876, and obtained 49 awards, or 25 per cent awards on the number of entries made. In Chicago in 1893, Canada made 847 cheese entries, and obtained 736 awards, or 86 per cent of the awards on the number of exhibits. In addition to that, the quality of the cheese exhibited at Chicago by Canada was so excellent, that the standard had to be placed so high as to almost bar the United States exhibits from receiving any award. The House will see the danger that there would be to our cheese trade if something is not done to protect this country from such an attack as was made upon us a year ago by the "North British Agriculturist." We were much alarmed about that attack at the time, and I think we were justly alarmed. Perhaps it would be as well for me to give the opinions that have been expressed and the resolutions that have been passed on the subject of this Bill in different parts of this country by prominent men who thoroughly understand this business. I have here the evidence of Mr. Ballantyne, who is prominently connected with the cheese industry in western Ontario, and who is well known all over that province. He gave evidence before the committee of this House on this subject, and expressed himself as being strongly in favour of branding cheese with the date of its make, saying that he had always done so himself, and had no trouble in placing his cheese favourably upon the market. Some people undertake to say that there is a prejudice against July cheese, and others contend that July cheese is in some cases better than September cheese. In either case, is it not well to mark the cheese with the date of its make before it is placed on the market? I do not think any substantial argument has been advanced against this proposition. Now, I will give you a resolution that was passed in Ontario in 1895 on this subject. At a meeting of the Dairy Association of Western Ontario, at which were present over 800 representative factory men and farmers from the whole province, the following resolution was passed:—

Resolution passed by Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, at Stratford, on the 15th, 16th and 17th January, 1895:

That in view of the facts that recent reports would seem to indicate that Canadian cheese made during one month has been sold on the British market as the make of another month, therefore, be it resolved, that this Convention of Dairymen, assembled in the city of Stratford, would strongly recommend that such regulations be adopted and such laws be enacted as would compel our cheese factories to brand on each cheese the date and name of the month upon which the cheese was made.

The Dairy Association of the province of Quebec, at a meeting held at St. Hyacinthe in the same year, endorsed the resolution of the western association. Here is another resolution that was passed a short time ago by the Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario:

Moved by Hon. Thos. Ballantyne, Stratford, seconded by George Hatley, Brantford, and resolved, That this convention of dairymen assembled in the town of Woodstock would strongly recommend that such regulations be adopted and such laws be enacted as will compel our cheese factories to brand on each cheese the date and month upon which the cheese was made, and also the word "Canadian," but that no registered number nor trade mark for each factory be put upon the cheese, as we think it would result in complication and injury to the cheese trade of Canada.

What is objected to here is accepted in nearly every other section of the country, as the proper thing to do, so that every factory will stand on its own merits. It is generally felt that it will improve the standard of the cheese, when each manufacturer knows that he will be held responsible for the product of his own factory. Professor Robertson is favourable to this registration, as is also nearly every man to whom I have spoken on the subject.

You see the result of our inquiry, so far as western Ontario is concerned. I will now deal with the position of the province of Quebec on the subject. It has been said in some quarters that the people interested in this business in the city of Montreal were opposed to this proposition. I certainly understand difficulty. It has also been alleged that I said something last year reflecting on the people of Montreal; but my remarks are in "Hansard," and no man can find one word in them reflecting on the people of Montreal or the business men who are trading in cheese. I never even mentioned Montreal in my speech on the occasion referred to. At a meeting held in Montreal on the 29th of May, 1895, the following resolution was proposed and carried unanimously:—

That in view of the meeting to be held in Ottawa on Friday, May 31st, 1895, of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons

on Agriculture and Colonization, for the purpose of securing an expression of opinion from the various Dairy Associations of Canada, this association hereby places itself on record as strongly in favour of the branding of the date of manufacture on all cheese made in Canada, such being the unanimous wish of the entire cheese trade in Great Britain, and further that this Association's Committee on the subject do proceed to Ottawa to attend the meeting mentioned above.

Now, here is another resolution which I consider a very important one, adopted by the Executive Committee of the Dairymen's Association of the province of Quebec on the 25th of February, 1896:

Moved by Mr. Milton McDonald, M.P.P., seconded by Sydney A. Fisher, Esq., and unanimously resolved,—

1. That the Executive Committee of the Dairymen's Association of the province of Quebec, on being informed of the introduction by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture of a Bill concerning the branding of cheese, desire it to be known:

(a.) That they are of opinion that the branding of the month of manufacture should be compulsory on both butter and cheese.

(b.) And further, that they consider this resolution as conveying the opinion of the great majority of the 1,400 members of the Dairymen's Association of the province of Quebec.

(c.) And that a copy of the above resolution be transmitted to Major R. R. McLennan, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa.

This is a resolution moved by a leading gentleman and M.P.P. in that province, and seconded by Mr. Fisher, who is now in this House and Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture, therefore, was evidently favourable to this proposition then, and I have no doubt he is favourable to it to-day. I have here a number of letters from people in Quebec and Ontario, in favour of this Bill, but I shall not take up the time of the House by reading them. I may say that I have spoken to the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Quebec, and that he expressed himself strongly in favour of the branding and registering Canadian cheese. I have also letters from the president and secretary of the Dairymen's Association in the province of New Brunswick, strongly endorsing the branding of the date on the cheese manufactured in this country. All the people from whom I have communications are strongly in favour of this measure. I cannot understand the objection to branding the date of manufacture on the cheese except on the ground that there are men who desire to place on the market cheese which has been manufactured in the month of July and representing it as being that manufactured in another month. Would it not be fair and honourable to pass legislation compelling us to mark the cheese so that purchasers would know exactly what they were buying. I think that I have the support of both sides of the House in this matter. I have not met any hon. gentleman in the House who could show any just reason for not branding our cheese in the way I suggest. I have representations and memorials by the dozen from Great Britain and this country in favour of this measure, which I might read to the House, but I do not think it necessary. I have read some of them before, and I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen will accept my statement when I say that I am prepared to place evidence before them which would prove beyond a doubt that the business men in the old country and in this country are in favour of this change. Out of seven or eight hundred answers from people who were consulted about this legislation, only eight per cent offered any objection at all, and in many cases the objections were not to the principle, and in others they came from parties who were personally interested in preventing this legislation taking place. Now, no matter what representations to the contrary may be made, a great deal of this cheese is kept in cold storage for some months. It is out of the hands of the manufacturers and into the hands of the speculators, who keep it until they can get a higher price. The farmer profits nothing by this, but believes that if this cheese were placed on the British market every month, it would be out of the way and better prices would rule in the spring of the year. It is kept, however, until fall and sold as a make of late date, and so much is kept that there is too much put on the market in the spring and prices are lowered, which is largely the cause of the low price received by the farmer at that season. Then so much is kept in the early season and such a quantity placed on the market in the fall that the price is equally affected at that time. A short time ago the price of cheese jumped up very suddenly, which shows that there is no strong prejudice against the July make. Parties who object to this Bill explain that the cheese made in July is better than that made in September, owing to the quality of grass, climate, atmosphere and other causes. Well, if that be the case, why should there be a prejudice against July cheese; and if such a prejudice exists, would it not be better to brand the July cheese and show the British people what a good quality we can manufacture in that month, and in this way dissipate that prejudice? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there is no such prejudice; and if it be proper for us to place our products on the market without misrepresentation, there ought to be no objection to the measure I propose. The farmers throughout this country believe that this is in their interest. They want such legislation, they ask for it, they believe in dealing honestly, they know the British market is an important one, they know it would be ruinous to them if they lost it, they are the men most interested in this legislation, more so than we in this House are, and why should they

be refused this measure of justice they so earnestly demand. Out of four or five hundred consulted in the province of Quebec, only eleven expressed themselves against it, and these were no doubt influenced by some of the men who tried to influence the late Government against doing this measure of justice. We are supposed here to legislate in the interests of the people, and I do not believe that any man in this House will try to deprive our farmers and cheese manufacturers of the justice I desire to extend to them. I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with this subject at greater length, for I am confident that both sides of this House will do what is just and right.

Mr. McMILLAN. This Bill is in the right direction. I am perfectly convinced, and have been for a considerable length of time, that it would be in the interests of the farmers to have their cheese branded with the date of manufacture. I do not propose to give any names, but may say that some of the best manufacturers and most prominent cheese-buyers believe that this should be done. As an evidence that we have been asked in times past by the people of Great Britain to do this, I may say that in 1895, the Dairy Branch of the Boards of Trade of both London and Bristol issued a circular to the cheese-makers, asking them to brand the date of maufacture upon their cheese.

This Bill is in the interest of the farmers and of the cheese-makers and of all others concerned. It is of the utmost importance that when our cheese are ready they should be put upon the English market at as early a day as possible, and it is also of the utmost importance that the buyers should know the day of the month on which the cheese was made. There is a phase of this question that we have hardly ever dealt with. While we have a large number of factories that make very superior cheese, we have some factories that make an inferior article; and I am afraid that when the cheese is not branded, the poorer qualities are bought and mixed with the superior article and put upon the market. And it would be in the interests of our best cheese-makers that our cheese should be branded not only with the day of the month, but also with the name or initials of the factory and the province. This would put the cheese-makers upon their mettle, as any cheese of inferior quality could be traced back to the maker, and it would also cause those conducting factories to be more careful in choosing their cheese-makers and in encouraging them to put a first quality of goods upon the market. When these experts from Montreal and other places were brought before the Agricultural Committee, it was clearly shown that cheese were kept over and branded with a different month than that in which they were made. That is certainly against the interests of the whole trade. If our cheese is to retain its high reputation in the English market, it must be by honestly and squarely putting our goods upon the market on their merits, so that when the cheese is of first-class quality, the buyers may know where to send again for the superior article. It was stated before the committee that our July cheese is often better than August, and often as good as September. Whether that is so or not, let our goods be placed upon the market for what they really are. The request for this Bill comes from all classes of people interested. In the province of Ontario, twice, I think, at the Dairyman's Association this matter has been brought up and without a dissenting voice they have declared that our cheese should be branded before being put upon the English market. I was in one of the departments the other day when a request was received from the country that the Government should take action in order to have the cheese branded with the month and the day of the month. Samples of our cheese are often taken from the retail shops for analysis. But it is found almost impossible to trace cheese of doubtful quality to the factory in which it was made. I think the country owes a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) for his persistency in bringing this matter before the attention of the House, and I hope that every one who wished to favour the farmers of the country will support this Bill. A great many steps for the benefit of the farmers are proposed. This is one thing that will benefit the farmers a great deal and will not cost the country a cent. It may be said that this will disturb the cheese trade. But, if so, it will only be for a short time. I see it is one of the provisions of the Bill that the measure shall not come into force before January 1st, 1897. Before that time all cheese already bought will be worked off, and then the trade will take a new start under the law requiring the branding system to be carried out. I hope the Government will favour this measure and will have cheese branded with the month, the day of the month, the initials of the factory and the name of the province.

Mr. SPROULE. We have always shown a desire in this House, when a wish is expressed by any large class of people for legislation in their own interests, to grant that legislation, if possible. The great difficulty in many cases has been to ascertain the feelings of those interested with regard to the matter engaging attention. In this case we have had the strongest evidence that the people interested want some such Bill as this for the request for it has come from every class of our own community that is at all interested, as well as from the buyers in the old country who represent the consumers there. When this subject was being agitated about two years ago, the

Agricultural Committee sent out about 2,000 circulars to representatives of the different classes interested, asking whether they desired such a Bill to become law or not. The almost unanimous reply was that they desired some such measure. I am sure that at least 90 per cent of the answers were in favour of the Bill. These answers came from the patrons of cheese factories, from manufacturers, from buyers and exporters and others connected with the trade. Then the buyers on the other side of the Atlantic have declared that some such law is needed because it has been found that cheese made in the worst season of the year is sometimes held over and then represented as having been produced in a better season. The buyers state that if this system is not stopped the reputation of our cheese in the British market will be destroyed. The purchasers in England represent the consumers there. It has been a most valuable market to us, out of which we have made a great deal of money. A large development has taken place in this trade during the last 25 years, and it has reached such proportions to-day that we cannot afford to let it be jeopardized by failure to make such provision as the hon. member proposes. Now, there is a difference of opinion as to what should be put on the cheese, but when we come to work out the details, I have no doubt we will be able to agree. It is held by all that we should put on the word "Canada" so that our cheese may not be confounded with the United States cheese. That is a matter of great importance. Then we should have put on the cheese the month in which it was made. Some say the day of the month, but it is believed by many that that would be going too much into details. Then there should be a number on the cheese by which the factory in which it is made can be ascertained, and the purchaser can ascertain from what factory it comes by inquiry in the department, and can get more of the same make if he desires. I think it is sufficient that we should make known where the cheese is made, and also the month in which the cheese was made, together with the number of the factory by which it is made. If these things are put on the cheese, I think it is all we should do. I see this Bill provides for the name of the factory, the province, the county, the parish, the lot, section and range, the nearest post office, the name of the owner, &c. In my opinion that is entirely too much to put on the cheese.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, the number is to designate all that.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the three things I have mentioned are all that is necessary to put on the cheese. Now, we have of late years been adopting in this country a mode of ascertaining the minds of the people upon public questions, that is, by the referendum, or plebiscite. In my opinion there can be no more direct plebiscite than the questions that we sent out to the cheese manufacturers in a circular some two years ago. The answers are as direct as they could possibly be, and over 90 per cent of them have urged very strongly that this Parliament pass such a Bill. Some have gone so far as to blame the Government because they did not pass a Bill, and many think that such a Bill should have been passed long ago. I am sorry the hon. member who brought this Bill before Parliament two years ago, did not succeed in having it crystallized into law. In my opinion it would have done much good, and the earlier we get it now the better. The present Government have shown, as I think, an honest desire of helping the agricultural class in every way they can, and this is one way in which they can help them materially without any cost to the country. Therefore, I trust that they will assist the hon. member for Glengarry in passing this Bill through the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill. I will, however, suggest to the hon. gentleman that when we get into committee there is a slight verbal change which should be made in the interest of the North-west Territories. As the section is worded, it only provides for branding the names of provinces on the cheese. It will not be news, I am sure, to the hon. gentleman who has this Bill in charge, to be told that in the North-west Territories we produce the best butter in Canada, and some of the best cheese; and I would suggest the verbal change that the letters "N.W.T." be branded on the cheese from that section of the country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MACLEAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) for the better protection of employees of railway companies. He said: The Bill which I have the honour of bringing before the House to-night is similar to the one I introduced two sessions ago. It is introduced by me at the request, not only of the railway men who live in my constituency, but of the railway men throughout Canada. There is to-day in session in Ottawa a convention of railway men representing six thousand employees who endorse this Bill and desire it to become law. It provides, in brief, for two things: that after the year 1900 every railway company in this country shall provide all their trains with, first, an automatic coupler, and second, an air brake. We know now that the great loss of life of railway men in this country and in the United

States, has been owing to the absence of these two things; and so strongly has this been realized in the United States, that they have passed a similar law and it is now in operation, and three years from this time the railways there must provide automatic couplers and air brakes on every train. The railway men in this country think it only just, and think it is in their interest, that they should have a similar law here. The only objection to this Bill, so far as I can gather, is made by railway companies, and it is to this effect, that if they are compelled within four or five years to change the equipment of trains, they will be at the mercy of the men who own the patent on the air brake and on the automatic coupler. But I am told that if they are given five years in which to make the change, they will not be at the mercy of the companies who own these inventions, and that if they equip a certain number every year, the amount of money they will save from the loss of their cars and engines, and the money they will save from having to pay for the loss of life, will make up what it costs them to change the equipment. But what is more to the point is this, that the Intercolonial Railway, which is owned by the Government of this country, has recognized the necessity of changing their equipment, and are doing it now. Last session when we had this Bill up, the representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway attended the Railway Committee and informed us that the Canadian Pacific Railway had appropriated $300,000 for this very purpose, at their last annual meeting; and I believe that the Grand Trunk Railway is similarly disposed. If that is the case, we do not wish to introduce any legislation that would be harsh in its workings on the railways, but we desire to give them a fair opportunity to convert their equipment on the lines of this Bill; and I hope that the Government and the Minister of Railways—and I am sorry he is not in his place to-night—will see his way to making a declaration that they recognize the principle contained in the Bill and will assist in having it become law. The Bill is certainly within the jurisdiction of Parliament; it has been very carefully drawn, and while it has not been approved by the railway companies, they say they have no opposition to it on other grounds than that to which I referred a few moments ago. That being the case, I hope the Bill will get its second reading to-night and be referred to the Railway Committee, where any improvements may be made, and that it will become law this session. I have brought this question up three or four years, and I have called the attention of Parliament to the demands made by the country for improvement in our railway legislation. I have brought up on several occasions Bills in the direction of improving our railway laws. So far we have made very little progress; but this is a new Parliament. We have here many new members, fresh from their constituencies, and in the late elections these railway questions were discussed; and that being the case, I trust Parliament will seriously consider, not only this Bill I now propose, but other railway Bills which will be submitted at an early date, and I specially ask the leader of the House and the Minister of Railways to let the country know what the intention of the Government is in regard to measures of so great importance as this measure, of which I have now the honour of moving the second reading.

Mr. DAVIN. This matter is one entirely in the hands of the Government. If this Bill passes its second reading, then there will be a motion submitted and adopted, to refer it to the Railway Committee, and we know that the wishes of the Government will obtain in that committee. In 1891, I had a Bill on the Order paper, including, among other provisions, like provisions to those in the first two clauses of the present Bill. The Bill passed its second reading and went to the Railway Committee, and out of the Railway Committee it did not come very successfully. Once a railway Bill gets into the chops of the channel of the Railway Committee, the private member in charge of it is pretty helpless, unless the Government signify their intention of taking hold of the measure. So, unless the Government will take this Bill up, I am afraid the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) will have very little chance of seeing it passed into law. But, as that hon. gentleman said, we have a new Parliament and a new Government, and, as the leader of the Government has spoken more than once before the elections on railway matters, perhaps he will declare the policy of the Government. If the Government will take up this Bill, there will be no difficulty in passing it through its second reading, sending it to the Railway Committee, bringing it back to this House and sending it triumphantly on its way. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill of my hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I quite remember, as was stated a moment ago by the hon member for East York (Mr. Maclean), that this Bill has been more than once before Parliament already, and I remember, as well, that on every occasion it elicited more or less opposition from the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). I do not know, as now we have a new Parliament, and that hon. gentleman sits on the other side of the House, whether he is still of the same opinion, or whether he has changed his opinion. So far as the Government is concerned, I will surprise nobody in regard to this matter, if I say that the Government does not think it advisable to make this a Government measure. It is a question on which there is a good deal to say on both sides. I fully apprehend and recognize that the mo-

tive of the Bill is purely humanitarian, and that motive alone is worthy of consideration. On the other hand, the great railway corporations have shown that there are to the carrying out of this idea several objections which cannot lightly be set aside. The best suggestion for dealing with this question is the one made by the mover of the Bill: to have it referred to the Railway Committee. That is the best place to have the question thoroughly threshed out. I apprehend that the idea which is at the basis of the Bill is a right one after all, and that, sooner or later, it will become law. The question, in my estimation, so far as I understand it, is whether the time has arrived when such legislation should be placed on the statute-book. The Railway Committee, I repeat, is the best place where this subject can be threshed out, and so I assent to the second reading of the Bill, with a view to having it referred to that committee.

Mr. TISDALE. I have no objection to again state the reasons why I oppose this Bill, but it will not be necessary to repeat the lengthy remarks I offered on a former occasion, because they will be in the recollection of some hon. members of this House. On the last occasion this Bill was introduced I opposed the principle. I quite agree with the suggestion thrown out by the leader of the Government, that the Railway Committee is the better place to fight out this issue, if it has to be fought out again. The whole principle of the Bill was very carefully considered on a former occasion, not on the Bill introduced by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), but on a Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). Regarding that Bill, the Railway Committee had no less than three meetings, and that occurred only one year ago. The feeling of a large majority of the members of the committee, after full discussion had taken place, was in opposition to the Bill. The two principal reasons why I think it is not desirable to adopt this Bill are these: In the first place, the provision respecting automatic couplers is, as was shown to the committee, largely in the interest of gentlemen who have such devices to sell. The great railway corporations of Canada and the United States, between whom there is a constant interchange of traffic, and accordingly the adoption of a new system in one country ahead of its adoption in another country would cause serious inconvenience, have their own mechanical experts to examine improvements, and so soon as it is demonstrated that a certain device will save life or property, then the companies adopt it. They have men who understand these subjects thoroughly. It is in the interest of the companies themselves, and this is a stronger force than any proposed legislation, to adopt the latest kind of couplings or other inventions as soon as possible. The reason that can fairly be urged against the other provisions of the Bill is that this would be an interference with the heads of all the departments of these railway companies, from the general manager down, and an attempt to deprive them of their own judgment of their skilled assistants. My experience is, and it is experience of every business man, that it is better to bring employer and employee together, and seek to induce the great railway corporations to adopt improvements, rather than to attempt to force their adoption by legislation passed from session to session. I shall not make any very lengthy remarks, because the matter has been extensively discussed in this House, and as has been remarked, we had it before us so long ago as 1891. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) would seem, judging from his remarks, to say that when these Bills go before the Railway Committee they are throttled here. Well, I can say, Mr. Speaker, after nine years experience as an active member of the Railway Committee, that things that ought to pass there cannot be throttled. I reject the argument of the hon. gentleman, and if I were to express my own sentiments I would probably use a stronger word than characterize it as an argument. That Railway Committee is a credit to this House and to this country. Its capacity, its fairness, its fearlessness are such that any country in the world might be proud of it. I am speaking now as a member of the Opposition, and I shall preserve my high opinion of the Railway Committee until I get good reasons to change it. If the hon. the leader of the Government had not asked me to express my opinion here, I would have waited until the Bill got to the Railway Committee, when I would offer any remarks which I had to make on it. If the Bill goes to the Railway Committee, I believe it will get fair play there. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who have been members of the Railway Committee—and I appeal to them more strongly because there are so many new members here—to endorse my opinion of that committee. I speak from my own knowledge as an active member of it, and I say that no tribunal in Great Britain or in the United States or in any free country is more independent, more fair, more honest and outspoken, and more just than is the Railway Committee of this House of Commons.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a few remarks in regard to some of the arguments of my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale). In the first place, I regard the principle of the Bill as correct. I cannot agree with the hon. member (Mr. Tisdale) that as soon as railway companies find these inventions valuable for saving life and property, they will adopt them without compulsion. The principle obtains all over the world of compelling people by legislation to protect life and property. In mills and factories it is provided that there must be fire escapes, and that there must be protection

of machinery, and all such legislation as that is in the line of compulsion, because it has been found that where employers of labour have to incur certain expense, they will not voluntarily adopt those precautions. So it is with the railway companies. There is no doubt that many railway companies are employing these devices to-day, and the air brake, we know, is found more or less upon every railroad in Canada. But at the same time they are not using it to the extent they ought to for the safety of employees. I do not regard it as out of place, that the law should compel railway companies to do this, any more than I regard it as out of place to compel manufacturers to erect fire escapes and to place guards on their machinery. We know that human life is being sacrified almost every day, and that families are left in mourning and distress, and so far as we are aware, that is because in a great many cases railway companies will not incur the expense of supplying these modern appliances. If you give the railway companies a reasonable time to provide these equipments I do not see how it can be at all improper that we should force them to do so by law. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) says that most of these devices are patented, and that therefore this legislation would place the railway companies at the mercy of the patent owners. Why, the railway companies are buying out the patent rights to-day, and if as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) says, the railway companies are ready always to adopt any device that is found valuable, the fact that the invention might be patented ought be no hindrance whatever to adopting it. We should not allow a small outlay to stand in the way of the protection of life and property. There is no doubt that this might be an inconvenience to the railways, but at the same time it would be a great advantage to the employees of the road, and to the travelling public. If we pass this legislation and give the railway companies time to make the changes, I have no doubt that in a short time they will themselves see the desirability of carrying out the law. I know that the railway people have so expressed themselves before the Railway Committee. They have not objected to the Bill very seriously, and they have agreed to provide most of the appliances set forth in the Bill; although they have conceded that somewhat reluctantly it is true. I believe that we could go the whole length of this Bill without doing them any great injustice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the business that comes before our Railway Committee, and I refer to it only because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) has left the impression on this House, and through this House on the country, that every question is considered independently by that committee, and that the result is a fair verdict of what would be the opinion of members of that committee individually. That has not been my experience, and I have been on that committee for 18 years. It is a fact that in that committee, as in every committee in this House, and sometimes in the House itself; where large interests are at stake, where large corporations have their friends there, and take that interest in their own business which they ought to do; make a canvass of the House to try and secure as much opposition to it as possible;—not improperly in some respects because they try to convince the members by argument—but they can always have their friends together there, they can always have the exponents of their views well to the front; they are able at all times to get the ear of the Government, because they are large corporations financially, commercially and otherwise; while on the other hand, the independent public have not their forces arrayed in such a way as to make out their case as strongly as these corporations. Therefore, many questions that come before that committee are dealt with, and decided in a way that I have often thought, if the independent judgment of the members were allowed to be exercised with regard to it without any of these influences bearing upon them, the verdict would be entirely different from what it has been in many instances. Therefore it is not improper that we should draw attention to it, and when it comes before that committee that we should fight it out as best we can. We do think sometimes in that committee that Bills are throttled, Bills which would be valuable to the country, and which would serve the purpose aimed at when they were introduced in the House, if they were allowed to become law.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to pass unchallenged. In the first place, he publicly states in this House, that the members of the Railway Committee are not impartial; that they are influenced——

Mr. SPROULE. I made no such statement whatever, and I do not wish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) to attempt to say that I used language which I did not.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) said that members of the Railway Committee were partial, where the interests of large corporations were involved.

Mr. SPROULE. I never used the word "partial," or "impartial" either.

Mr. LISTER. And, he furthermore said that members of Parliament were exponents of railway companies. He said that members of the Government were influenced.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As I understand the rules of this House, when an hon. member denies having made a statement, the hon. gentleman has a right to accept the denial, and no hon. member of this House has a right

to attribute words to another hon. member that he did not use.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) will accept the statement of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to any language he used on the floor of the House.

Mr. LISTER. I accept the ruling of the Chair, of course, in all circumstances. I keep my own ideas, however.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must frankly accept the statement of the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. LISTER. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will do so, if you so rule. My hon. friend went on to say—and perhaps he will deny this—that if the independent judgment of the members were allowed to be exercised, the decision of the Railway Committee oftentimes would be different. Now, I want to say here that I agree entirely with the statement made by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) in the opinion that there is no committee of the House of Commons more independent than that same Railway Committee; and I have no hesitation in saying, as one who has attended regularly the meetings of that committee, and taken an active interest in its work, that, so far as I can remember now, it has always acted in the best interests of all parties, regardless of particular interests; and I think that the statements of my hon. friend who last spoke unjustly reflect upon the action of that committee. I challenge the accuracy of those statements. Of course, I will leave the late Government to speak for itself. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what sort of influence has been brought to bear on the late Government. I do know, as a matter of fact, that that Government has been guilty, very often indeed—and no doubt the hon. gentleman speaks by the book when he says so—of most extraordinary transactions. I cannot say what influences the railway companies of this country have brought to bear upon the members of that Government, either collectively or individually. It is not for me to say; I can only conjecture. The hon. gentleman probably can speak from knowledge of the facts; and when he gets up in this House and tells Parliament and the country at large that that Government has been improperly influenced by large railway corporations to allow legislation to go through this House that otherwise should not have received its sanction, we are bound to accept his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I object to the hon. gentleman attributing such language to me. I did not say that the Government was improperly influenced by railway corporations or any other corporations, or the committee either.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman says he made no such statement. I am bound, Mr. Speaker, to accept the ruling that you have already made; and if the hon. gentleman says that he did not make the statement, notwithstanding the fact that I recorded it when it was made, I am bound to accept his denial. Members of the Government have been influenced, we are told—these are the words. I say this is the most grave charge that can be made in Parliament against the late Government. I say it verifies and justifies to the fullest the charges that have been made by the party on this side of the House when in Opposition, that that Government has been sacrificing the interests of the people of the country for the benefit of the railway corporations of Canada. Is it possible that a gentleman so faithful to the party which he has been following for so many years—which he had to leave for a short time, though he has gone back again—is it possible that a gentleman so deep in the confidence of the late Government, could make such a statement as this? Can it be questioned? I say, Sir, that it is the most remarkable statement I have heard while in Parliament by a supporter of a political party supposed to know the inside workings of the Government of which he was such a supporter, and to which he was so near. I think it is unfortunate, for the hon. gentleman's own sake that, knowing this for eighteen years, he has supported the Government and has never taken the public into his confidence. It is almost incredible that a gentleman should get up in this House and charge the Government of which he was a supporter with having been influenced by railway corporations to pass laws not in the interest of the people of this country, and that he should have kept that fact in his own bosom for eighteen long years, and never have taken the public into his confidence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. I am in order, I hope, physically and every other way. Now, I think that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill is entitled to the thanks of a very large, important, influential and respectable section of people, the railway men of Canada. The hon. gentleman introduced this Bill once or twice before; but, unfortunately for himself, perhaps unfortunately for the interests involved, he did not introduce it, or at least did not press it, until it was too late in the session to have it passed into law or thoroughly and properly considered. The Parliament of Canada has a right, so far as lies in its power, to protect the lives of the railway men, whose lives are so imperilled every time they go out on a train. The Bill which my hon. friend has introduced is certainly in the right direction, and I am glad to congratulate him on having introduced it thus early in the session, thus enabling Parliament to give it that proper

care and consideration which the importance of the measure deserves. My hon. friend is probably aware that the difficulties which railway companies have contended in the past have been in the way of carrying out the reforms proposed by this law, have been to some extent removed. The chief difficulty heretofore has been that one car would be of a certain height and another car of a different height, so that it was impossible to put on the couplers provided for in this measure. But under the law of the United States, as it is to-day, all railway companies whose cars run in the United States are bound within a certain time to have the cars of equal height. So that the difficulty which the railway companies complained of heretofore is now obviated, inasmuch as the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway, whose cars go into the United States, have to comply with the law of that country, which requires all railway cars to be of uniform height. The difficulties which confronted the railway companies in applying a patent coupler have thus been removed to a certain extent by that law, and I can see no reason why a similar law should not be passed by this legislature. I can see no reason, moreover, why the patent coupler should not be applied to all cars belonging to railway companies in Canada. It is time the old brake should be abandoned. This Bill provides for an air brake. So far as I have been able to see, there are no great difficulties in the way of applying an air brake to a freight train any more than to a passenger train, and the statistics prove that many of the most serious accidents which happen to railway employees are due to the old brake. These employees are exposed to all sorts of weather. They have to do their work from the top of a car, under most perilous conditions, and I do not think that the railway companies are called upon to do too much if the legislature compels them to apply an air brake, because the application of that brake will save many honest men's lives. I think that the Bill is one which should be well considered by Parliament. I think that these men who are interested in having this legislation placed upon the statute-book should have an opportunity of being heard. I think the railway companies should also have an opportunity of being heard, and I have no doubt that the Railway Committee will take proper steps to inform itself as to what should be done and what difficulties stand in the way. I do not see any sound reason why the provisions of this Bill should not become law, both in the interests of the railway men of Canada and the railway companies themselves.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say a few words in support of this Bill and in reply to the hon. gentleman who spoke on the other side. It seems to me that when he puts the question of the rights of the railway companies against the lives of the citizens of this country, no matter to what side the railway companies should lean, there can be no question as to the side this House should take. Let the railway company take care of its interests, but this House is charged with the interests of the citizens of this country. It is an established fact, that there is from day to day and year to year great loss of life on the railways of this country—and there is much greater loss incurred than is generally known, for it is a well established fact that accidents on railways very frequently do not get into the papers. This House has certainly a duty to perform, and the property which is involved appears to me but a small part of the consideration compared with the lives that are at stake. If it is a fact that the condition of the railways in the United States at present is not favourable to this law being adopted in Canada, the other argument holds that when the United States puts in force the law that it has already adopted, it will be just as necessary that Canada should adopt the same law: as it would be perhaps impracticable or difficult to have different law here from that of the United States. We know that in the United States large corporations have certainly quite as great an advantage in dealing with legislative bodies as they have in this country, and if in that country they are compelled to adopt means necessary for the safety of life and limb, that is one of the things in which we will be justified in following the example of our neighbours, although I am not one of those who hold that in the United States everything is right. Where they set a good example, it certainly would be poor policy on our part not to follow it, especially when the circumstances almost compel us to follow whether or no. As to the good will of the railway companies prompting them to act in the interests of their people; although the experience of the hon. gentleman who has spoken may have given him reason to speak in that way, the experience of most of us who have had to deal with railways, is not in that direction. We do not find that they pay much attention to our interests. We find, in fact, that they do not seem, in many cases, to consider their own interests. We find that they do not even protect themselves when they are not protecting us, for they might go further in protecting us and thereby help themselves. This is so far from being a matter that we can leave entirely to the self-interest of the companies that it is the last matter we can possibly leave to their self-interest. I do not know what has been the fate of this Bill in the past, but it certainly seems to me that it reflects very little credit on the gentlemen who sat in the last Parliament, and particularly those who were on

the Government side, if they refused to allow such a Bill as this to become law, particularly for any reason that has been advanced against it to-night. I am not a railroad man myself, and most of us here are not, but if the second reading of the Bill is agreed to, then it goes to the Railway Committee—which is something so fearful and wonderful and mysterious. But at any rate, it is a committee whose business it is to make perfect any Bill which is submitted to it, and see that the clauses of the measure carry out the idea on which it is founded. That being the case, the least we can do is to send this Bill up to the Railway Committee, which is one of the largest committees of the House, and the responsibility will rest upon us who are in favour of the Bill, and who are on that committee to see that it will go through that committee and be put through this House. It is a strange way of dealing with the matter to say that because this or the other committee did not do its duty, it will not do it in the future. These committees are composed of members of the House, and if any committee does not do its duty, it is a portion of the House which has failed in its duty, and the responsibility is on the members of that committee just as much as if they had failed to do their duty in this House. This is a case of life against property, and there is only one course for hon. members who, in this House, are supposed to represent life rather than property, for it was votes and not accumulations of wealth that sent us here. We are put here by the people, and it is our business to protect the interests of all classes of the people, including the railroad men, and even if the interest that is against them is a railroad corporation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ALIEN LABOUR.

Mr. TAYLOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) an Act to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as printed, is the same as the Bill that I introduced in 1890, and is an exact copy of the law in force in the United States against aliens and foreigners. When I first introduced it, it was referred to a committee to collect evidence and report. That committee met, called witnesses from the different provinces, examined them, and made a report, which reads as follows:—

Your committee find, on examination, that this Bill is similar in all respects to a Bill passed by the Congress of the United States in 1885, and amended by that body in 1886.

Your committee have had before them witnesses from different points along the frontier, and find from their evidence (copy of which is annexed hereto) that the American Alien Labour Law has been enforced in such a way as to compel many of our people to relinquish their employment in the United States, or to remove with their families, and reside there permanently, while citizens of the United States are permitted to work in Canada every day, and to return to their homes on the American side of the frontier at night, without interference from the Canadian authorities.

Your committee recommend that the attention of the authorities at Washington be directed to the oppressive application to Canadians of the American Alien Labour Law, and to allow of such representations being made, and to afford time for its due consideration, recommend that further consideration of this Bill be postponed until next session; and if some suitable measure for granting relief to Canadians from the grievance complained of be not passed in the interval by the American authorities, then your committee recommend that a Bill dealing with this question be introduced next session, and taken into consideration.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

GEORGE TAYLOR,
Chairman.

In the following session I introduced the same Bill, but correspondence was then in progress between the Canadian Government and the American authorities at Washington with the view to having the Alien Labour law amended so as to make it less objectionable to Canadians. These negotiations, as I understood, have terminated, without the Americans withdrawing or relaxing their law in any way. On the contrary, they have so amended their law as to make it very much more objectionable. I have here a copy of the amended law, and I will just read one section. I propose, if this Bill is, as I hope it will be, referred to a special committee, to amend it in such a way as to make it acceptable to the House. This clause of the American law will be embodied in this Bill:

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled.

That it shall be unlawful for any citizen or resident of the United States to enter into contract or agreement, express or implied, with any alien or aliens to perform labour or service of any kind in the United States; and all contracts or agreements, express or implied, made in the United States or any foreign country, by or between any citizen or resident of the United States, and any alien or aliens, prior to said alien or aliens having acquired a permanent domicile in the United States, shall be deemed misdemeanours, and shall, on conviction, be punishable by a fine of one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment for one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for every such offence.

The PRIME MINISTER. When was this passed?

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year. As the law now stands, it is impossible for a person to perform labour for pay in the United States without first becoming a resident in that country. I have received a letter dated St. Catharines, 7th September, 1896, which reads as follows:—

Mr. Taylor, M.P.

Sir,—I must congratulate you on bringing forward your Alien Bill before the House of Commons again. Hoping you will carry it through this time. At Niagara Falls and Buffalo, DeBarry has made it a misdemeanour for a Canadian to go there and apply for work.

Yours respectfully,
JAMES BROWN,
Box 46, St. Catharines.

I have also received letters from two large lumbering firms in the west. One of these is from Hamilton, and is as follows :—

Hamilton, Ont., Feb. 13th, 1896.

Mr. Taylor, M.P.,
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We notice you are bringing in an "Alien Labour Bill," something on the lines of the American Alien Labour Law, and hope you will succeed in getting it through the House during the present session as it is but just and right that these laws should work both ways or not at all. We are making square and waney timber in Ohio and Michigan and could supply 500 Canadian axemen if allowed to do so, and would prefer them to the men we are forced to take over there as the Canadians are natural timber makers and the Americans are not, but we are prevented from giving a single Canadian employment on our export timber over there, while the Americans are natural saw-log men and hundreds of them are employed in Canada, particularly in the Parry Sound district, Muskoka, Algoma and Nipissing, and many of our best Canadian axemen are left home idle when we could give them employment at $50 per month for six months of the year if permitted to do so. * * * * * Should you desire any further information, we would be pleased to furnish all the particulars that our experience has brought to our notice, and are sure every timber man in the Dominion will give you any assistance they can, as they all know the injury it is to our Canadian workmen to be deprived of the privilege of getting employment in the United States, while the Americans have free access to any employment that is going here. Hoping you will be successful in preserving for our workmen equal chance with the United States workmen.

Yours truly,
J. & W. FLAT.

I have another letter of a similar character from a firm in Simcoe, Messrs. McColl & McBirney. When I introduced this Bill, it had very few sympathisers, from the fact that the Alien Labour law of the United States had not been enforced against Canadians so rigidly as it has been in later years. The evidence collected in this report proves that in some places, particularly in New Brunswick, hundreds of Americans living in the United States come across into Canada, perform their day's labour and return at night, while not a single Canadian can go over from our side to work for a single day, and any who attempt to do so are driven home. That was the evidence brought out there, and so all along the line. I think this Bill should be referred to a special committee of the whole House, in order to amend our law so that a foreigner, in order to perform labour in Canada, must have his domicile in Canada. All along our frontier, Americans who sleep at home in the United States and eat breakfast there, may take their dinner with them and perform a day's labour in Canada, and go home again at night; while the same privilege is not accorded to Canadians who go there to work. Since introducing this Bill this session, I have received letters and petitions from labour organizations all over the country, complaining of this injustice. When it was first introduced, it appeared to have very few sympathisers in the House, but to-day hon. gentlemen on both sides have asked me if I intended to go on with it and press it to a conclusion this session. My answer has been, Yes. This is not a party question, and should not be treated as such : it is one to protect the workingmen of Canada and should receive the support of both sides of the House. I have been promised that support, and I propose to press the Bill to a conclusion, if the majority of the House are favourable to it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I fully acknowledge the great importance, or, at all events, the relative importance, of the Bill which has just been explained by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I must say at once that as far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I think it is in some respects objectionable. It is certainly at variance with those views of public contracts and the comity of nations which should exist amongst civilized nations. On the other hand, I am fully conscious, also, that in all the border towns in Canada there is great discontent now prevailing, and prevailing with cause, as to the operation of the Alien Labour law which exists on the other side of the line. The principle of the law which exists on the other side of the line, is exactly the same as the principle of this Bill; in fact, the only reason which can be adduced by the hon. gentleman, or by anybody, for supporting such legislation, is that it is altogether of a retaliatory character. I suppose that my hon. friend would not press this Bill, if the American authorities were willing to withdraw their Bill. I must say that I quite agree with him that the character of the American legislation is very unfriendly and very offensive to us. It cannot be defended upon any principle that I know of. For my part, whenever I come into contact with gentlemen having any—I will not say authority on the other side—but having any view of their own on the legislation which prevails in that country, I have never failed to tell them that in my estimation this law is a blot upon the legislation of the United States. Well, if such a law is a blot on the legislation of the American nation, there is no escaping the conclusion that, if we adopt the same principle, we impose a similar blot upon our own legislation. It is true that people are sometimes constrained to do, in self-defence, things which they

would not do otherwise. I may say that, from that point of view, I am, to a large extent, in sympathy with my hon. friend who introduced this measure; and it may be that we may be forced, simply as a measure of self-defence, and to protect our own labourers, to resort to a measure similar to the one which is now advocated. Everybody must also admit that in the town of Windsor, for instance, or in any border town, when a Canadian labourer goes to the other side of the river and is forced back simply because, as a Canadian, he has been engaged by an American contractor, it is certainly galling to him if an American labourer is brought back and finds work in Windsor. Therefore, I am disposed to view with some favour the Bill of my hon. friend. But I will claim the privilege of asking him not to proceed further at the present time. The hon. gentleman has stated, what I was not aware of, that correspondence has taken place between the American authorities and the Canadian authorities upon this subject: and, before the hon. gentleman proceeds further with this Bill, I think it would be advisable for the Government to look into this correspondence and see whether it is not possible to avoid such unfriendly legislation. But if, after having taken cognizance of this correspondence, we find there is no way of escaping the conclusion to which my hon. friend has arrived, I will give him every opportunity at the next sitting of the House to press his Bill, if he thinks proper. Therefore, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. leader of the Government as to what he calls the great relative importance of this measure. There can be no doubt at all that, situated as Canada is, with some five millions of people along side a great population of seventy millions or thereabouts, all the advantages of reciprocal intercourse across the border are eminently on the side of the larger population, and the hardship is very much greater when the smaller population are denied in the adjoining country the advantages which are freely offered to the citizens of the United States in Canada. I am sure no person who is at all aware of the circumstances which have been brought under the notice of my hon. friend the mover of this Bill (Mr. Taylor), can fail to be impressed with the very great temptation that is presented to the Canadian Parliament to adopt legislation which shall, so far as possible, protect the people of Canada from the injury that is inflicted upon them by the free entrance of American citizens into Canada for the purpose of performing labour of every description without let or hindrance, while the Canadian, on the other hand, when he crosses the border, is met with exclusion. I must say that that is legislation of an intolerable character, and is calculated to inspire a very strong feeling of retaliation. The hon. the First Minister says, and says truly, that the existence of this legislation is a great blot upon the statutes of that country. I quite agree with that sentiment, and I feel that it is legislation that is unworthy of so great a country as the United States: but I do not quite agree with my hon. friend that it would be an equally serious blot upon the legislation of Canada, if we passed a similar measure in order to protect ourselves from the great injustice to which Canada is now subjected. It is one thing for a country to initiate and enact legislation of that kind, and a very different thing for the parties who suffer under that legislation to enact similar legislation in order to protect themselves. But I feel very strongly that all retaliatory measures ought to be avoided, and that it is perhaps not the wisest way of obtaining that which we all desire, namely, friendly and cordial relations with the great people alongside of us. Under the circumstances, while I feel legislation of this kind would be quite justifiable on the part of Canada, I agree with the suggestion of the First Minister, that every means for the removal of this difficulty by diplomatic intercourse should first be exhausted. I am quite certain that my hon. friend and the Government will address themselves to that task in the most earnest manner, and I hope with success, and that the Parliament of Canada will not feel itself impelled to adopt a course that seems absolutely indispensable in the protection of the interests of our people. I trust, therefore, that my hon. friend the mover of the Bill will accept the suggestion of the First Minister, that the Government shall be allowed full opportunity for using their utmost exertions to remove this difficulty that is attempted to be met by this measure before it is necessary to proceed with it further.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may just say that I propose to offer a suggestion to the First Minister, and if it is not accepted by him, I will accept his suggestion. My idea was this, that the Bill might be referred to a special committee, which might look into the legislation, and not necessarily proceed with the Bill, while at the same time the Government would be conducting their inquiries and looking over the correspondence which has taken place. I also propose to modify the Bill and limit it to one section, which would read something like this: All foreigners or aliens before they perform labour in Canada for any person or persons for salary or other remuneration shall be a bona fide resident of Canada, and shall be domiciled and have residence here during the time of his or her employment. I think a simple Bill embodying that proposition would cover the whole ground. I will suggest a committee of two members from each province to be appointed to look into American legislation, with instructions to frame a Bill on this line or some other, and to report to the House at a later session, as the First Minister stated he thought it in-

advisible that we should proceed this session. I desire to refer to another matter, and it is this. We have had a good deal of difficulty on the River St. Lawrence in the section known as the Thousand Island district. The American authorities, acting under the Alien Labour Law, refused our oarsmen permission to ply to and fro between their parks, and would not allow them to row Americans who came there for pleasure, rest and fishing; in fact they would not allow them to take tourists in their boats from the American side into Canadian waters to fish.

Mr. LISTER. You settled that by issuing a proclamation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I issued a proclamation. I sent word to the hotel-keepers on the American side that if this state of affairs was going to continue, American visitors could not fish in Canadian waters.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was an abuse of the law, it was not enforcing the Alien Labour Law.

Mr. TAYLOR. The result of the proclamation was that a deputation went from Alexandria Bay and Clayton to Washington, and made representations that if their guests were not allowed to fish in Canadian waters, they might as well close the hotels; and so instructions came from Washington to permit a violation of the law and not prevent Canadians going over to the American side. Negotiations were opened a year or two ago between the American and Canadian Governments to have an international park established between Kingston and Prescott as a common fishing resort among the islands, which would be open to the people of the United States and Canada as well, and where there would be no enforcement of the Alien Labour law. A deputation of Congressmen came to Ottawa, and met the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with a few representative men, and a basis of agreement was drawn up and entered into under which legislation was to be passed by the Canadian authorities and the American authorities, and one of the conditions stipulated in that agreement was that the Washington authorities were to withdraw the enforcement of the Alien Labour law within the district named, between Ogdensburg and Cape Vincent. The gentlemen from the United States said it might be possible to get an amendment to the law to apply simply to that section of our country, but the idea of repealing or meddling with their Alien Labour law was impossible, for such a measure could not be passed through Congress. The result is that although an agreement was then entered into between the Canadian authorities and the American authorities respecting the fishing at the International Park, the legislation to be passed, which was an amendment to the Alien Labour law, has not been passed by Congress in regard to that territory, and I doubt whether it ever will be passed. I offer this suggestion to the First Minister: If he will permit this Bill to be referred to a special committee, that committee might be moving conjointly with the hon. gentleman, and while he was carrying on negotiations, they might decide on this Bill in some amended form or another Bill covering the point to which I have referred. If this proposition is not acceptable to the hon. gentleman, I will readily yield to the suggestion made by him.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the suggestion is one that will not meet with the approbation of the people of this country. We have been waiting long, and on every occasion we have waited and expostulated with the authorities of the United States they have made their laws more stringent. It will be remembered that when the Alien Labour law was passed, it was stated it would not apply to Canada. It has applied to Canada, and the interpretation put upon it from time to time either by the legal authorities of the United States Government or by the Government officials administering the law on the border, have been more stringent each year. I think it has now reached that stage when waiting will not do any good. As to the proposition made by the Prime Minister, that negotiations will probably take place between the two Governments, and those negotiations will perhaps tend to remove the difficulties occasioned by this Alien Labour law, in my opinion the negotiations would be more effective and more productive of good results if the United Sates authorities found we had an alien labour law on the statute-book, identical with their law. As it stands now, we can only go to them and threaten, declaring that if you do not remove this law we will place a similar law on the statute-book of Canada; but if we had that law on our statute-book to-day we would be in a different position. As the leader of the Opposition has very properly stated, it is a different question adopting retaliatory legislation of this character by one country, and another country adopting similar legislation in self-defence. We are proposing to adopt it in self-defence, in protecting our men along the boundary, and in order to maintain our dignity as a great nation. For these reasons I consider the time has now arrived when Canada should place a Bill of this kind on the statute-book of the country. I am glad to see that the Premier and the leader of the Opposition are practically agreed as to the desirability of something being done, if not to-day at the next session of Parliament; and as the Government do not propose to pass any legislation this session, and as next session will be called very shortly, it should be clearly understood by this House that if negotiations are not conducted with good results before next session, Parliament will be pre-

pared to pass a law to protect our Canadian citizens, and one comporting with the dignity of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think those hon. members who are interested in this proposed legislation can complain of the spirit in which the First Minister has met the proposition of my hon. friend. It is not merely in the towns immediately along the border that there is a strong feeling on this matter. One hundred and forty miles away from the border, in towns like Moose Jaw and others on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west Territories, there is the strongest feeling existing. Hon. gentlemen will understand how this is the case when I state that we have coming along the railway line from the United States, brakemen, conductors and employees of American railways working in Canada; and the moment that any of our Canadian citizens residing in towns on the Canadian Pacific Railway get down to the American border, that moment they are not permitted to earn money below the line. It is of course barbarous legislation. If we did not know it to be the fact, it would be incredible that an enlightened people like the people of the United States should be guilty of placing it on their statute-books. But if there is that barbarous legislation, and if our Canadian citizens are treated as they are; then if we are convinced that the people of the United States are determined to cling to this barbarous legislation, it will be for this Parliament as a matter of retaliation—while disapproving of the principle underlying such legislation—and as a matter of justice to our own people, to enact some such legislation as my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) proposes.

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt from the slight attention I have given to this matter, that probably a Bill like this would interfere with the favoured-nations clause under which no doubt the United States have some rights, although perhaps something could be suggested to meet the case. I understand from the remarks made by the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, that practically the Bill is to be deferred to another session.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, not another session, until the next meeting of the House.

Mr. TISDALE. The leader of the Government made a very reasonable request when he asked, that if there was any correspondence on the matter he should have time to look into it. If some friendly solution of the difficulty is not made with the United States, I would go as far as any man in this House in the direction of the principle involved in the Bill. I am quite satisfied that next session some law could be devised that will not interfere with any existing treaties.

Mr. TAYLOR. What treaties?

Mr. TISDALE. The favoured-nation clause in treaties with other countries in Europe, to which the United States would be entitled.

Mr. BERGERON. There cannot be any such thing. They have passed a similar law against us.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the amendment with regard to the residence might meet the difficulty. I agree with my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), and I am afraid that this House will have to deal with the matter. I regret it, because the people of the United States have not listened to the warnings of the discussions in this House, and which discussions have been of a very friendly character.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Mr. Speaker, I am very much gratified to know that the leader of the Government is so fully impressed with the importance of the subject under discussion. To all those members who represent frontier counties, it is a matter of more than ordinary importance. I might illustrate that by citing one case. The legislature of New York decided to erect a public building on their side of the River St. Lawrence. I know as a matter coming under my own observation, that Canadian artisans and mechanics who went across the river to obtain employment were sent back, and they were so carefully guarded to the water's edge, that they were placed on the ferry boat and watched until they left the shores of the United States. Strange to say, and in marked contrast to that conduct; the Ontario government erected the same kind of a building, an asylum, a distance of about fourteen miles from the American asylum, and American artisans and mechanics came across to the Canadian side, and were allowed to work on the Canadian building in competition with Canadian mechanics. This is a case which brought the matter very forcibly to my mind, even since the subject was under discussion before this House in 1891, when the matter was fully gone into. I rise more particularly for the purpose of impressing upon the First Minister this fact, which perhaps he has considered. It was the consensus of opinion on the part of all those who took part in the discussion when my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) first introduced his Bill in 1891, that it was not in the minds of the legislators in the United States to enforce this law in the spirit in which it was enacted. If we read the second clause of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor)—which is exactly similar to the clause of the United States act, except that the word "American" is substituted for "Canadian"—we find that the spirit of the Act was directed against contracts made for the importation of foreign labour into the United States. Here is where the United States have, in my humble opinion, interpreted this law contrary to its spirit and its meaning. A man who goes

from this side of the river to the United States in search of employment finds himself denied employment. That I have known to be true in the case of Mr. DuBarry the officer of the United States government at Buffalo. But, failing to convict him for an offence under this Act for simply going over there to get work, they come at him in this way. If he returns home to his family on a Saturday and remains over Sunday, they say when he goes into the United States again that he has entered in pursuance of a contract previously made. The point I wish to press on the First Minister is this, that in the event of any negotiations taking place between his Government and that of the United States, which I think would be right and proper, I think the interpretation of the law which the United States officers have placed on the Act itself ought to be brought more particularly to the attention of the United States Government; and, unless there is some spirit of hostility, which I would fain believe does not exist in the United States, against this country, I think some good might be done in that direction. What we are aiming at is not the existence of the law in the United States against any other nation: because it is not enacted in any spirit of retaliation against Canada—it is enacted against the whole world; and if we could represent to the Government at Washington that that harsh interpretation is not the proper one—as, apart from my own judgment, I am informed by many Americans with whom I have talked on this subject that it is not—this Government would be accomplishing a desirable purpose without enacting legislation, which I admit would be attended with a great deal of difficulty. With regard to the amendment which the hon. member for South Leeds says has been enacted by the United States Congress, I saw the same authority that he has referred to, that is, the newspaper report: but I did not know that the law had been passed. If it has, so much the worse; but it does not render any more difficult the task which I humbly suggest the leader of the Government might undertake in his negotiations with the Washington Government. That this is a serious matter to all of us is admitted. That is shown by the report alluded to by my hon. friend who introduced the Bill. The serious part of it is that many hundreds of workingmen have left this country and become citizens of the United States by compulsion. I can only express again my gratification that the leader of the Government has been so favourably impressed with the spirit of this Bill, and I can commend the course of the hon. member for South Leeds as one likely to meet the sense of the whole House and country.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Bill which my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has introduced to-night will not be side-tracked, as it has been in former years, and our workingmen and artisans still continued in the humiliating position of being refused a day's work in the United States, while United States workingmen and artisans are allowed the free use of our country to obtain work. I represent a county which is, I presume, affected by this question as much if not more than any other county in the Dominion. Not only are our workingmen and artisans refused admittance to the United States—that is not the grievance of which we so much complain; but the work which our workingmen and mechanics should have is taken from them by the contractors and workingmen who come across from the city of Buffalo or the city of Niagara Falls, and work during the day and cross over to the United States again at night, while our mechanics are denied any similar opportunity among our neighbours. I should be sorry to have to go back to my constituents and tell them that I had sat in a Canadian Parliament which had refused to give to our workingmen the protection to which they are entitled in this regard. I just rise to say that I hope this matter will not be dilly-dallied with or delayed, but that our workingmen and mechanics shall receive at the hands of this Parliament the consideration which they have a right to expect.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). It was my intention to have spoken at considerable length on this subject, for it is one on which I feel so strongly that had not my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) introduced this measure, I should have felt it my duty to have introduced one couched in similar terms. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has pointed out, this is not a question that affects merely border counties, but it also has a very great effect on any place that is a railway centre, even though it may be removed many miles from the border. For instance, take the constituency I represent, the city of Winnipeg. From that city the Northern Pacific Railway runs to the United States. At first the Canadians and Americans employed on that line in various capacities, as conductors, locomotive engineers or otherwise, had exactly the same rights and were treated in exactly the same manner. But now the Canadians find themselves heavily handicapped; for, while the Americans are allowed to take any train that may be given them, whether in the United States or Canada, the Canadians, while allowed to cross the line, are only allowed to do so under such disadvantageous conditions as render it almost impossible for them to do the work. You can hardly understand what a feeling of discontent such a state of affairs arouses and must continue to arouse if it is allowed to exist for any length of time. I was glad to hear my hon. friend the First Minister say that he agreed to a very great extent with the spirit of the measure we are now considering; although

he appeared to fear it on the ground that it might involve retaliation to a certain extent. I must confess, so far as I am individually concerned, that the word "retaliation," conveys no terrors to me whatever. Personally, I am strongly in favour of the utmost freedom of labour. I should like to see the boundary line between us and the United States, in so far as labour is concerned, wiped out altogether. I should like to see the state of affairs that used to exist restored—to see our people free to go and work in the United States if they found they could get a better wage there than in Canada, and to see the citizens of the United States allowed to come to Canada and work on exactly the same terms as our own people. But unfortunately that state of affairs no longer exists. It has been done away with by no act of the Canadian people, the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian Government, but by the action of the American Congress. I must say that personally I would be strongly in favour of giving the Americans a dose of their own medicine in this respect: because I do not understand why—to use the humble phrase—what is sauce for the goose should not be sauce for the gander. I believe it would cause a much more contented feeling among our people if they knew that in this respect they were placed on exactly the same footing as the citizens of the United States. However, as I understand the First Minister to say that negotiations will be entered into with the Government of the United States to see if this unfortunate legislation cannot be removed, or at any rate be so modified as to remove the grievance under which our people are at present suffering: and as I further understand that if such negotiations fail, some measure of this sort will receive the support of the Government, so that our working classes shall no longer be allowed to remain in the disadvantageous position they at present occupy: and as I find that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition—who, like the hon. leader of the Government has had more experience of matters of this sort than I have had—is of opinion that the desired result may be better brought about in this way than by pressing the Bill. I heartily concur in the proposition that the Bill be allowed to stand.

Mr. DYMENT. I was not aware, Mr. Speaker, that this question was coming up to-night, and consequently shall not attempt to discuss it at any length, but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without adding my voice to that of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) on behalf of the Canadian workingman. With the permission of the House, I would like to read a portion of a latter which I received from a gentleman, at Sault Ste. Marie, a few days ago. He says:

I took a walk along the canal yesterday with the view of finding out the number of Americans who are working on this side and living across the river. As you are aware, there is now in course of erection a residence for the superintendent of the canals. On making inquiry we found that there were nine men working on that building who cross over to the American side, night and morning, and bring their dinner in their baskets. The corner and other cut stone is being manufactured also over the river. There is also a large hotel just starting opposite the Bank of Commerce, to cost about $10,000. The work of masonry is being done by an American. These are only samples of what is being done all the time. If our men were treated in the same way we would not object, but when our men go over the river to work they are ordered out of the town. We trust that no time will be lost in stopping this thing.

Now, we have been waiting and waiting, with a good deal of patience, for the labour law of our neighbour to be amended in some way more favourable to us, but, so far as I am concerned, patience has ceased to be a virtue with regard to this matter, and I think, if we are to have any semblance of protection in this country, it ought to be given our workingmen. If not during this session, I hope that in the coming winter session, a Bill will be passed through this House, giving proper protection to our workingmen, or at least putting them on the same footing as the American workingmen occupy on the other side.

Mr. GANONG. Representing, as I have the honour to represent, a constituency lying along the American border, I should not feel that I had done my duty unless I expressed to some extent my sense of the situation in which we find ourselves at present. While I do not agree with the mover of this resolution that it should be pressed this session, I hope that it will receive due consideration in the future when I shall be able to support it. I cannot do so at present, and I will give you the reason. During the late campaign, in our county at least, we were advised that if the Liberal or Reform party got into power, we should have such reciprocal trade relations with the United States as would be most desirable for both countries. In view of this pledge, I do not wish to ask the Government to put themselves in a position in which it might be brought forward that we had passed any resolution that would cause any friction. I do not wish them to be hampered in any way. I came here as an independent Conservative, working, I trust, for the best interests of Canada, and I wish to see this Government have as free hand as possible to adjust, if possible, the trade relations between the two countries. I believe that in our county to-day and the bordering county of Washington in the State of Maine, the citizens of both countries represent as nearly as possible the great brotherhood of man, or as nearly as it can be done under different flags. We have the most cordial relations with each other, social and otherwise, so that I cannot wholly agree in what the

hon. member for South Leeds said with regard to the condition of things in New Brunswick. He had, however, some basis of fact for his statement. A few years ago a United States agent was sent to the city of Calais to look into the labour question. I believe that one of the principal employers of labour in that city, who employed labour from the Canadian side, was fined $1,000. That was the only action taken at that time. Without question it would be better for our community to have a more liberal labour law on the other side for there are probably 500 Americans working on our side of the river, when there are probably not over 100 Canadians working on the American side. We have some of our citizens who have gone to the United States and taken the oath of allegiance in order to be able to run fishing boats over to Canada and obtain fish. Most of the hon. members of this House know what that oath means when taken by a British subject. However, some of these Canadians do not seem to have lost their desire for Canadian citizenship, for they came over on election day—30 of them—and voted for the Reform party, and took the oath. That may be good law—I am not prepared to say whether it is or not—but there is a chance of its being ventilated in the courts before long. I do not wish to put any stumbling block in the way of the present Government, for down along the border we know just what we have to deal with. Some of the hon. gentlemen in this House, who live further away from the border, may not realize what a task it will be to obtain reciprocity. But coming in contact, as I have, with the people of New England and the Northern States for the last twenty years, I think I can as well judge the pulse of that population as any man in this House. When I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that right down within sight of the Union Jack, and where we could hear the reverberations across the St. Croix River, the Hon. J. G. Blaine gave vent to utterances which I shall read to the House, as indicating to some extent what our hon. friends opposite will have to meet when they attempt to obtain reciprocity: In 1888, during the campaign, Mr. Blaine came to the city of Calais and delivered a brilliant address to the Republican party in which he used these words:

> Beyond the frontier, across that river, our neighbours choose another government, another allegiance. They are subjects of Queen Victoria, they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes, and enjoying the actual cash remuneration of American markets. They cannot have both at the same time. If they come with us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, who have no part or lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign with us; it is an absolute wrong for Congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have. So far as I can help it, I do not mean that they shall be Canadians and Americans at the same time.
>
> There is no middle place for Canada. For she must be either incorporated with our own union or be deemed a foreign country. It is for Canadians to say whether they choose to be treated as brothers or as strangers.

Now, in view of these facts, I do not wish to put any hamper or obstruction in the way of the Government obtaining these relations which they so gladly anticipated. I even met our hon. friend the late member for our county (Mr. Gilmour) in this city the other day, and I judged that he had come here to congratulate the Government on having obtained reciprocity; for during his campaign he gave us to understand that just as soon as these good Reformers got into office, that moment a special train would carry delegates from Washington, and there could not be found a train fast enough to carry these delegates from Washington for the purpose of obtaining a reciprocity treaty from us. These are the reasons why, at present, I wish to leave the matter in the hands of the Government.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not propose to say many words with regard to this matter, because I think everything has been said already. But I do wish to say that I am heartily in accord with the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in introducing this measure. That hon. gentleman has persistently brought forward this measure before the House. He has told us that the American nation are guilty of great tyranny to our workingmen and I think that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has well earned the gratitude of every mechanic and labourer in this Dominion for his endeavour to see that justice shall be done to them. He has shown us that not only are Canadians not allowed to go across to work in the United States, but that, if they persist in doing so, they are not merely ordered away, but, if they remain, are liable to fine and imprisonment. I think that a great many hon. gentlemen in this House must have had the same experience in their constituencies that I have had in mine in meeting with men who have suffered at the hands of the Americans in this regard. I have met men who have moved away with their families from British Columbia to some portion of the United States, with the intention of getting work there. But when they obtained work, as soon as it was found that they were not American citizens, they were ordered away. I say that is rank tyranny. And, though the First Minister says that the principle of retaliation is altogether wrong, still, I cannot say that I do not believe in it myself. My personal feeling is that if the Americans are aggressors in a

matter of this kind, it is the duty of the Canadian Government to retaliate in some way or other in order to obtain justice and fair-play for our workingmen. It may be that the smoother course would be better than retaliation, but we have in so many other instances found that, when that was tried, it was of no earthly use, that they paid no attention to it, that I have come to the conclusion that the only thing to do is to pay them back in their own coin. But, though I am individually of the opinion that this Bill is a good one and would have the effect that is wished for, still, when gentlemen of the experience of the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) state that it is far better to try other methods, I must bow to that superior knowledge and experience. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) stated that the Bill that was passed by Congress was not aimed alone at Canada, but at the whole world. That does not, to my mind, do away with the necessity that exists for Canada to look after herself. However, I sincerely hope that the Government will think it its duty to look into this matter most carefully, and, if possible, allow a committee to be formed to look into the question, and I sincerely trust the hon. member for South Leeds will not allow the matter to drop, as it is one of the very greatest importance to a large number of the citizens of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I fully recognize, Mr. Speaker, the difficulties attending a Bill of this kind. The proposition of the hon. the First Minister was, in a sense, reasonable; but I think that perhaps my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) also has a large measure of reason on his side. I am sure that the House will recognize fully the difficulties of retaliatory legislation. We must all recognize also that a measure of that kind is of the nature of a last resort, and I am sure that both sides of the House, on a question of this kind, can afford to lay aside all party squabbles and all consideration of party advantage. Now, the question the hon. gentleman is pressing is not one of a purely sentimental character, of real hardships that have been suffered under the operation of the very illiberal and very harsh and unfriendly law of the United States. I might refer to cases of hardship that have come under my own knowledge. Living close to the boundary line and not far from the city of Detroit, some cases of special hardship have come under my notice. I have known vessels to go there loaded with lumber, and not a single Canadian workman was allowed to take part in unloading the cargo. The moment the vessels reached the docks, American workmen take hold and discharge the cargo. I hope the First Minister will see to it that this Bill gets its second reading and that a committee is appointed to draft a Bill that may be brought before the House next session. This will in no sense interfere with the proposition made by the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition. It will in no sense show an unfriendly feeling on the part of Canada to allow this Bill to take one stage and afterwards to be put into the form that will be given it by a committee. If the negotiations referred to by the First Minister should fail, nothing is lost; if they should not fail, but if the most desirable result should be brought about by friendly negotiation, so much the better. In the meantime I feel disposed to assist my hon. friend in pressing the Bill this session, in so far as having a committee appointed, and deal with it, with the understanding, at least, that it shall be subject to the approval of the House and that it shall take no stage that will in any sense interfere with the negotiations which have been undertaken by the Government.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad that the Bill has been introduced, and glad also to hear from the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition that the matter will be taken up. I live in a border city, and I am free to say, so far as negotiations between the labour on the Canadian side and labour on the American side, it is reciprocal. We send from our side six or seven hundred persons across to Detroit to work. They board and sleep on our side, and are Canadians. The Americans send about 150 to 200, who work in Canada. So far, as I have said, the trade has been reciprocal, and I hope and trust that, when the Prime Minister has had time to look into this matter carefully, negotiations may be brought about, with the result of putting on the statute-book a law that would be more satisfactory to both parties. Not only is there this reciprocity in the city I live in, but there are other cases. A mile and a half above is the town of Walkerville, which has the same advantages. A ferry boat leaves every ten minutes, and the traffic goes backward and forward, some of the people even taking their dinners on the opposite side from that on which they work. We have also a town of about 1,700 or 1,800, the town of Sandwich. People cross from there also, and are not molested in any way. Once in a while we have a difficulty because of some stranger coming in from a distance, but so far as our own people are concerned, we have reciprocity in trade relations between the two sides. But if the Americans should interfere with our people, as it is said they have done in other places, I will gladly favour the Bill, with some modifications made in in it before it passes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the First Minister if his intention is to have the Bill dropped entirely this session, or merely to ask for an adjournment for a few days.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the principles involved in the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I wish to say that I am, on general principles, heartily in favour of introducing legislation on the

lines laid down. But I have risen for the purpose of emphasizing what has been said by the mover of the Bill in reference to the effect produced on the lumbering interests of this country. Along the north shore of the Georgian Bay the Canadian lumbering interest, as regards the employment of Canadian lumbermen, has been greatly affected in the past five or ten years, owing to what, in my view, and the view of a large number of people in the province of Ontario, has been the policy of the local government and of the Dominion Government also, in permitting the exportation of logs from Canada to the United States, and which has resulted in carrying in its wake the introduction into Canada of a large amount of American labour. While I do not maintain that the employment of men has been exclusively from the American side, still the better positions in the lumbering camps have been given to men coming from the United States, and as a result those wishing to work in the woods on this side have been debarred from participating in the best positions that were in the gift of those employing labour. But not only in the matter of taking logs from the woods, but also in the manufacture of timber upon the shores of the Georgian Bay, a large number of Americans have built mills there, and it is within my own knowledge, and must be within the knowledge of every person who has been about those mills, that a large number of the men employed in such concerns are Americans coming into this country and working the best part of the season, and then returning to their homes. As I understand the law of the United States in this regard, Canadians are debarred from going to the other side and there seeking permanent employment without first having taken the oath of allegiance. Now, if this is correct, as I think it is in many states, it is a case of hardship that our men going over there should be forced to foreswear their allegiance to this country, while on the other hand Americans are permitted to come here and participate in the labour afforded in this country, and which should be given to Canadians if at all possible. As to the proposition made by the First Minister that the Bill should not be proceeded with now, but that it should stand until the next session, I would rather favour the proposal that the Bill should go to a special committee to be named by the House, and the gentlemen composing it should fortify themselves with facts and figures, so that when the House next meets we would be in possession of a great deal of information which cannot be acquired as speedily next January as in the delay that will intervene between this session and the ensuing session. I trust, therefore, that the Bill will go to a special committee, and that the gentlemen composing it will feel it incumbent upon themselves to acquire all the information they can, and place it before the House at the next session.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. HENDERSON. In my opinion the time has come when some action must be taken along the lines laid down in the Bill of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I think in self-defence we are compelled to do so. In the county which I have the honour to represent, I know that the feeling along that line is growing very strong indeed. Not only are the Americans endeavouring to regulate labour and to prevent Canadians from going to their side to work, but they are interfering in another matter which has come to my notice recently, and which seems to be fully as serious. As the First Minister intends to look into this matter, I would like to draw his attention to the fact that during the recent election an attempt was made to interfere materially with the political affairs of this country. There are many people owning property here, but who are living at the present time in the United States and working there; and it was no unusual thing in the section of the country in which I live, for men who had the franchise in my county and were living in the state of New York, to receive letters signed by the immigration agent in the state of New York, telling them that in the event of their coming to this country to vote at the general election, they would be prohibited from returning. I do not say that this was done at the instance of the Liberal party, or that the influence of Mr. De Barry was secured in this matter by the Liberal party; but it did not come to my notice that these letters were sent to any but Conservatives. I will read a letter received by a constituent of mine who formerly resided in the village of Acton, who is an owner of property there, but who at the present time is living in Buffalo, I believe going to school there. He was notified by Mr. De Barry in the words following :—

Buffalo, June 20th, 1896.

My dear sir :

I have received a list of names of parties who work in this State and are about going to Canada to vote in the coming Dominion elections ; your name appears on the list.

Now I would advise you to remain where you are as steps will be taken to prohibit you returning to New York State, should you go to Canada and cast your vote at this election.

Yours very sincerely,

J. DeBARRY.

Now this was not the only elector that was interfered with on that occasion. I am aware of others who intended to come to the county of Halton to vote, who had a perfect right to come, and who were prevented from coming entirely by the receipt of this letter, thinking that if they did come, the threat here contained would be carried out, and that they would be deprived of their positions on returning again to the city of Buffalo. I think this is a matter of so much importance that in any negotiations this Government may have with the United

States Government, it would be proper for the First Minister to draw the attention of the authorities at Washington to what I think was a very undue interference with our political rights.

The PRIME MINISTER. With reference to the question asked me a moment ago by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I may repeat what I had occasion to say, I believe in his absence, that I thought it advisable to ask the House not to press this Bill any further to-night in order that the Government may satisfy itself as to the nature of the correspondence which intervened between the late Government and the American authorities, and to see whether any hope can still be entertained of coming to a satisfactory settlement of this question with the American authorities. If, by the correspondence which has taken place, we have to come to the very painful conclusion that nothing more is to be expected from the American authorities, but that they will persist in maintaining upon their statute-book a very unfriendly law, then in my estimation there will be nothing left for Parliament to do but to adopt the measure proposed by the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. HUGHES. This session ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly. But if, on the other hand, there is reason to believe that further negotiations would operate to induce the American authorities to retrace their action and take a more friendly attitude, then, of course, when the question comes up again, I would ask the hon. gentleman to defer it until the next session. Now, I come to the suggestion which has been made by the hon. member for Leeds, and supported by some hon. gentlemen on the other side, as to the appointment of a committee to investigate this question. Well, I must say to my hon. friend that I do not see that there is any necessity for such a committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I meant a committee to prepare or amend the present Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. The object of the committee might be, first, to investigate the facts, as was suggested by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) ; but there are no facts to be investigated, so far as I am aware, which are not sufficiently well known to enable us to take any action. The only question is whether the American law is to be maintained or not. If the American law is to be maintained, I feel that we should have this measure. The hon. gentleman says a committee should be appointed to inquire into the matter and settle the provisions of the Bill. I differ with the hon. gentleman on that point. I am very strongly of the opinion,—and I place myself in the judgment of the House—that if we are to adopt this measure, which will be a retaliatory measure, its terms should be word for word with those of the American law. That is the best way to deal with the matter, for the Americans cannot complain if we apply to them an identical measure of justice or injustice. Therefore, there is no use in having a committee to settle the terms of the Bill. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) said that retaliation had no terrors for him. I do not agree with that sentiment. I think retaliation is always a measure to be deprecated ; but there are occasions when retaliation, which we all must deprecate, becomes a necessity for a nation which has a sense of its own dignity, and I believe such an occasion will arise if the American authorities persist in keeping on the statute-book this law, which is certainly a most unfriendly law.

Mr. HUGHES. It is not my intention to speak at any length, but I think a misapprehension prevails among hon. members sitting on this side of the House as to the intention of the First Minister. I understand his intention is to inquire into the subject during the next few days, and if satisfactory evidence cannot be adduced that the American government are friendly, to allow the Bill to proceed this session. Any number of arguments could be adduced in support of passing the present Bill, if the Americans do not repeal their law. Negotiations might possibly result in this, that after a settlement has been arrived at between the Washington authorities and the Dominion Government in regard to such a law, difficulties might arise under some State law, as was the case with the canal regulations. I suggest that in any negotiations carried on, the First Minister should inquire into this matter and see that it is placed on a proper basis.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think any misapprehension exists on this side of the House. I am inclined to think the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was not present during the whole of the debate. The understanding was a very clear one, and the proposal of the First Minister was this : That the Bill should not proceed any further, but remain over till next session, and thus give the Government an opportunity during recess of opening those friendly and diplomatic relations with the United States that we all hope will avoid the necessity of proceeding with this matter. The suggestion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Tisdale), that a special committee be appointed for the purpose of acquiring information and investigating the subject, would fail in its object, because we all anticipate a very short session, and the moment the session was concluded the functions of the Committee would be at an end, and so nothing would be obtained in that way. We are all of the opinion that the best mode of dealing with the question is that suggested by the First Minister—to exhaust every possible means of diplo-

macy with the United States, and failing to secure a satisfactory result, then we would be in a position that even the great country alongside of this Dominion would see that we had no alternative but to fall back on a measure that we were most unwilling to resort to it if it could possibly be avoided.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the First Minister is looking into the correspondence, which he will no doubt find in the archives of the Secretary of State, I trust he will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to show him the correspondence that took place between that department and the deputation that came from Washington, because the Alien Labour law is referred to in connection with the International Park arrangement.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay Canal and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Boyd.)

BEHRING SEA COMMISSION.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the hon. the First Minister whether he can give the House any information as to whether the Government has received any confirmation of the reports which have appeared in the papers with regard to seizures of Canadian vessels in the Behring Sea by American authorities. Also, whether the date has been fixed for the meeting of the commission appointed to settle the claims of the sealers. Also, whether the Government have already appointed counsel to appear on behalf of the Canadian sealers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). With respect to the report which has appeared in the papers as to the seizure of some Canadian vessels, I may say that the information of the department is just exactly that which has been published—nothing more nor less. With respect to the date on which the commission will sit, we have no intimation as yet of any agreement having been arrived at, but no doubt the date will be a convenient one for both countries—early this autumn. The question of the appointment of counsel is still under consideration. I have had communications from gentlemen who have claims, stating that they intend to employ private counsel of their own, if that were not inconsistent with the wish of the Government. I have replied that the Government certainly could have no objection to anything of the kind, and that, no doubt, the counsel appointed will act in unison and conjunction with the Government counsel, although, necessarily, the counsel appointed by the Government will have control of the case.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH GOVERNOR GENERAL—PORTFOLIO OF THE INTERIOR.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I beg to lay upon the Table some further correspondence on the subject of the motion that was carried the other day, calling for the correspondence between Sir Charles Tupper and His Excellency the Governor General. The other day, my attention was called to the portfolio of the Interior. Well, I am not prepared at present to say definitely when the portfolio will be filled, but it is the intention of the Government to offer it to some gentleman from the North-west. At present, however, there are good reasons, in the public interest, why some further delay is desirable.

RIGHT HON. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose we must be thankful for small favours. The information is not very complete, but the hon. gentleman, I hope, will be in a position at an early day to state exactly what the Government propose to do in this regard. I rise, however, at this moment, to call the attention of the First Minister to a statement in the "Mail and Empire" newspaper, coming from the special correspondent in Montreal, which I read with the greatest possible regret, and I am quite sure that the First Minister will be only too glad to be afforded the opportunity of setting the matter right. In the "Mail and Empire" of 9th September, the following appears from the special correspondent in Montreal:—

According to "La Patrie," the Liberal organ, Mr. Chamberlain will not visit Canada because he knows very well that Mr. Laurier will have nothing to do with him or his Imperial schemes. Mr. Laurier is not looking after the interests of Englishmen.

I take it for granted that this statement is entirely unauthorized, and does not in any respect reflect the views or opinions of the hon. First Minister. But I felt it was really important that a distinct statement should be made, giving emphatic contradiction to a statement of this kind in a paper which professes to be one of the strong supporters of the Government, as I felt that it was calculated to do very great injury to Canada. I may be permitted to say that there has been no public man who has held the high position of Secretary of State for the Colonies for many years, who is more devoted to the interests of the colonies, and to whom Canada is more indebted, than the hon. gentleman who now occupies that position. I will take this opportunity also of saying that there never has been the slightest foundation for any imputation upon the entirely impartial attitude which that right. hon. gentleman has occupied in regard to political affairs in Canada. It is quite true that I had the honour conferred upon me of being invited to form an Administration, and did receive the personal congratulations of that right hon. gentleman and of a number of other gentlemen who had either been Governors General of Canada, or held the position of Secretary of State for the Colonies: but I may say that, so far from there being anything out of the way in this, I received the same congratulations from the Under Secretary of State who served under Lord Ripon. I had the warmest possible congratulations from Sir John Long, who is well known to hon. gentlemen opposite as being a very strong Home Ruler and supporter of the late Government, of which Mr. Gladstone was the head, and who now sits in the House of Commons. I may say that during my residence in England, I never took the slightest part in any question which was a party question in England. Whatever political questions I had to do with, they were entirely distinct from party. On a score of occasions or more, I refused invitations to dinners which were of a party character, either on one side or the other. I felt that it was my duty to Canada, which I then had the honour of representing, to entirely abstain from anything during my position as High Commissioner, which would, in the slightest degree, partake of a party character. I may say more, that from the day I went to England down to the time I returned to Canada, I enjoyed the most kindly relations with the prominent leading men of both the great political parties; and, if there is one gentleman more than another with whom my relations during my tenure of office were of the most cordial and personally friendly character, it was the distinguished head of the great Liberal party, Lord Rosebery. From the time I went to England down to the time I left, I had the most constant, and, I may say, personal relations with that distinguished nobleman. I may say, also, that there was no gentleman occupying the position of Colonial Minister during my tenure of office, with whom my relations were more intimate, and upon whom I felt always that I could more confidently rely for everything that could be done in the interests of Canada, than the Marquis of Ripon.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but of course he is aware that at this stage of the proceedings, as at any other stage, no debate can be held without a motion being before the Chair. Of course, it is usual to allow the leaders to explain matters of public business, or to allow any hon. member to ask an urgent question. It is, however, understood that we must not allow debate in this informal way. We assume that the hon. member will conclude with a motion which will bring his remarks in order, and will give any other hon. gentleman an opportunity to speak if he so desires.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in concluding with a motion. I have taken the earliest opportunity of drawing the attention of the First Minister to this matter, as I have felt that it was one of the very greatest importance. I was explaining the hearty and cordial co-operation I have always received from the Marquis of Ripon when he held the office of Colonial Minister. I may say that I had occasion to bring strongly to his notice on one occasion—with my colleague from Australasia—the question of cable communication between Canada and Australasia, in which the late Government took a great interest. I also took occasion to confer with that distinguished gentleman when he was Secretary of State on the fast Atlantic service. He manifested the heartiest desire to do everything in his power to meet the views of the Government of Canada. But it must be remembered that the Marquis of Ripon, when Colonial Minister, was the representative of a party which had a very small majority in the House of Commons. Therefore, however desirous that hon. gentleman was to meet our wishes, as I know he was in regard to these questions, he was not able to take the same prompt and efficient action that he could have taken had he had a large majority at his back in the House. I felt bound to say this in justice to the Liberal Administration, who were not less anxious than the present Administration to meet the views of the Government of Canada. As soon as the present Administration was formed, I took the opportunity of waiting upon the distinguished gentleman—(regarded as one of the most eminent statesmen in Great Britain and holding a very strong position in the Cabinet)—who accepted the seals of office as Colonial Minister, with regard to two questions of a Pacific cable and a fast Atlantic service. I represented to that right hon. gentleman as strongly as I could the

importance the Government of Canada attached to this measure, and the great interest that it possessed as affecting the interests of Canada and those of the Empire as well. I was fortunate enough to obtain the hearty support and concurrence of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, and, at an early day, he was in a position to inform me, that he was prepared to take up both these questions and to give them a hearty support. And, after further communication, he gave me to understand that Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to supplement the grant given by Canada of £150,000 a year for ten years by contributing in the proportion of about one-third the amount that might be required. He stated, however, his opinion that it was absolutely necessary that new tenders should be called for, as it might be found that the service could be obtained for a less amount. I mention this on the present occasion to show to the House and the gentlemen opposite what I regard as the gratitude—as the good feeling, to say nothing less—due to the present eminent Colonial Minister for the hearty way in which he entered into measures which he believed would be for the benefit of Canada and which were being pressed upon him from that point of view. But, while giving that hearty approval and co-operation to the measure to which the late Government attached the greatest possible importance, no action on the part of the right hon. gentleman ever indicated that he was disposed in the slightest degree, to depart from that strictly impartial position in regard to the two great parties in his country that, during my tenure in office in England as High Commissioner, has always characterized the action of the representatives of both great political parties there. Had not this matter received some notice from the press, I should not have felt it necessary to refer to it. With the exception of the communications which have been made public between the Rt. Hon. Mr. Chamberlain and myself, which were confined to a personal expression upon his part when I assumed the position of First Minister in Canada and a communication sent to me through the Governor General upon my retirement from the office of High Commissioner, when he was good enough to express the views that he entertained with regard to my services to Canada and to Great Britain, I am able to say that there never has been the slightest communication, direct or indirect, between myself and that right hon. gentleman which is not known to the hon. Prime Minister now. The communications I had with the Colonial Office through the present High Commissioner with regard to the fast Atlantic service, and a communication which I received after my retirement from office, and which I placed in the hands of the Secretary of State, with reference to a British subject who was undergoing imprisonment abroad, were the only communications between that right hon. gentleman and myself. I felt it due to him, I felt it due to Canada and to the interests we all have in this matter to say that there has never been the slightest ground for the imputation that the present Colonial Minister, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, manifested in the slightest degree any preference or partiality for one or other of the great political parties in this country. I feel, therefore, that my hon. friend the First Minister will be only too glad to have the opportunity of disclaiming anything so coarse and insulting to a gentleman who has always shown in every relation the greatest desire to advance the interests of Canada. I may refer to the occasion on which I had the honour of being a colleague of the right hon. gentleman when appointed one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries at Washington. I can bear testimony to the zeal which he showed for the interests of Canada without which it would have been impossible to reach the satisfactory conclusion that was reached in the Atlantic treaty of 1888. On every occasion throughout his career this right hon. gentleman has shown, so far as I am aware—certainly in everything that has relation to Canada—his readiness to do anything that he could to promote Canadian interests irrespective of party. Under these circumstances, I felt that the hon. leader of the Government would be only too glad to have the opportunity of explaining any statement that would indicate that the people of Canada did not appreciate the evidences the right hon. gentleman has given of his anxiety to promote everything that he had reason to believe to be was for the best interests of Canada. I move that this House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition had been in the country some twelve months ago, he would know now that the newspaper "La Patrie," published in Montreal, is not and has not been an organ of the Liberal party; he would know that about twelve months ago, under my own signature, I declared that "La Patrie" was not an organ of the Liberal party, and did not reflect the views of the Liberal party. At that time the "Mail" newspaper had thought it advisable to attack me for a letter which I had written, and stating that in so doing I had shown myself a slave of the hierarchy. Now, it suits the same newspaper to represent the "La Patrie" as an organ of the Liberal party. I have only to repeat now what I have stated all along, that my views are well known in the country at large, and especially in the province of Quebec, and the views held by "La Patrie" are not the views which I have been advocating ever since I have been in public life.

I am very sorry to hear and to know, in fact, that Mr. Chamberlain is not to visit

Canada while he is in America. I hoped that he would come, and I still hope that some day, sooner or later, and sooner than later, he will yet visit this country. It is not perhaps out of the way for me to say that we in Canada acknowledge that in Mr. Chamberlain the Colonial Office has one of the ablest men that have presided over it for many and many a day. Though we may not agree in every particular with some of the views of policy he is said to entertain, still I think the ideas which he has expressed in the Colonial Office for the development of the Empire are views which, I have no hesitation in saying, must meet with strong commendation in all Canadian hearts. Now, with regard to the statement which the hon. gentleman made a moment ago, when he went out of his way, perhaps, if he will pardon me for so saying, to defend Mr. Chamberlain against any imputation of a desire to interfere in the late elections, I must say that if there has been an imputation of that kind entertained by anybody, the blame does not rest with Mr. Chamberlain himself, but rather with the hon. leader of the Opposition. For my part I am quite sure that Mr. Chamberlain knows too well what his duties are in his own office, ever to have desired, however remotely, to interfere in the late elections, or to indicate any semblance of a desire to interfere with them. When Mr. Chamberlain wrote a letter to my hon. friend on the occasion of his being called to the Premiership of Canada, it was a letter of a friend to a friend, of a gentleman to a gentleman, expressing no views, I am sure, but the views of Mr. Chamberlain himself, and not the views of the Colonial Minister, upon the appointment to a high office of a gentleman who had been associated with him in public life for many years in England. But, Sir, I think it was not altogether in good taste to publish that letter. It was a private letter, and its publication rather indicated a desire on the part of some one to bring the name and the office of Mr. Chamberlain into the late election. For this, I think, if anybody was to blame, it is not the gentleman who wrote the letter, but, I am sorry to have to say so, it was rather the gentleman who permitted the publication of the letter.

Mr. McNEILL. Might I be allowed to ask the hon. gentleman whether any attempt has been made on the part of the Government to induce Mr. Chamberlain to visit Canada ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry I cannot give any answer to the question of my hon. friend, but if he will do me the honour of calling upon me at some time, I will perhaps be able to satisfy him.

EMIGRATION TO BRAZIL.

Mr. BERGERON. I will take advantage of this occasion to ask the attention of the Government to a very important matter contained in a despatch which I have just received, stating that the steamer "Moravia" of the Brazilian line, is now in the port of Montreal, and that agents of that line are trying to engage peasants from the country to go and work on the coffee plantations in Brazil. I am also asked in this despatch whether the Government have taken means to protect our people, and to dissuade them from going there, or to ascertain whether the engagements which are made are binding. The steamer leaves on the 15th, and rumour has it that hundreds of Canadians have been engaged to go by that vessel to Brazil. I will lay the despatch before the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, hoping that they will take the matter into consideration, if they have not already had their attention drawn to it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am not aware that the attention of the Government was ever called to this matter, and it is now brought to my notice for the first time. What action the Government can take in the matter, I do not see very plainly at this moment. Every Canadian is at liberty to go wherever he pleases ; though I must say that I would count it part of the duty of the Government in some way or other to inform Canadians that they would make a great mistake to go to Brazil to settle. Canada is a far better country for them than Brazil, and every attempt should be made on our part to show them that they have everything to gain by remaining in this country ; and especially to show them that they would do well to look very carefully into the truthfulness of any inducements held out to them to go to Brazil.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think what has given rise to the telegram is a report I have seen in newspapers that the English Government has taken pains to warn the subjects of Great Britain against going to Brazil on account of the unsettled condition of the country, and the manner in which they have been treated there. Having that in view, I think it would be well for the Government to notify all parties that the condition of things at present existing in Brazil is not healthy for foreigners.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be well in this connection, I think, also to lay the fact before the public that the Italian Government has taken measures to warn Italians against emigration to Brazil, and are taking further measures to prevent emigration to that country from Italy. Under the circumstances, the action of the English Government and the action of the Italian Government indicate that it is important that our people should be deterred, if possible, from making the mistake of going to that country.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLY—CASE OF J. K. LAMBERT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the case of J. K. Lambert, in Regina. I think it is important that we should be in a position to take any statements that are made by the members of the Administration, as I am ready and forward to take them, as statements upon which we can entirely rely, especially when those statements are statements of policy. We have had in this House statements from leading members of the Administration as to the course that would be pursued in regard to persons in the employ of the Government. Now, I have to bring before the House a case of a humble man employed as a caretaker, against whom there is no charge whatever that he took any part in politics. I am sorry to see that the Minister of Public Works is not now in his place; but that hon. gentleman told me there was no charge whatever against this man of having taken any part in politics. And he said to me that if I were to take a certain course, some result that might be desirable to myself might take place. To that I do not refer further. But here is the fact, that this man was dismissed, and what I find to have been the case is this: there is a political committee at Regina, which gave his name into the department, and he received some time after 21st August, this notice:

21st August, 1896.

J. J. Lambert, fireman, Court House,
Regina, North-west Territories.

I am directed to inform you that your services in connection with the Court House at Regina will be no longer required after 31st August.

E. EWART,
for Chief Architect.

This, of course, will seem a small matter as compared with anything affecting higher officers; but the fact that this man is a humble man is no reason why this House should not take notice of an act which I declare, on my responsibility as a member of Parliament, I believe to be an act dictated by political vengeance. This man, I can say, as I told the Minister of Public Works, took no part whatever in politics. The Minister said: I have no charge against him on that head, that he took any part whatever in politics. Yet he has been dismissed. The Minister said to me that he was informed that there was nothing for the man to do. The position of fireman in the court-house at Regina is this, that he is in the employ of the Government all the year around, but is only paid during the winter while at work, and of course if those persons in Regina who have charge as to whom should be employed and who should not be employed told the Minister of Public Works that there was nothing for this man to do, they were simply punning on the peculiarity of his office and deceiving the Minister, and if under such a deception he was led to dismiss this man, then he should restore him. I hope in the face of the statements that fell from the Controller of Inland Revenue, from the Whip of the party, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and in fact from all hon. gentlemen who spoke from the Treasury benches as to what would be the policy adopted, that no man would be decapitated who had not shown himself an offensive partisan, we shall not be treated, even in the case of a humble individual who occupied the position of caretaker of the court-house at Regina, to having the word of promise held to the ear and then broken in action.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Speaker, after I had been sworn in as Minister, I thought some rule should be applied to my new office. I asked the chief of every branch to prepare a statement for me of the number of employees, the number of men who were wanted and the number of men who were not wanted. I must say at once that I rested for the time being implicit confidence in the chief of every branch; I had not time to go into the details of the cases, although I took as much precaution as a man could do in the case. I found this man Lambert had no employment for the time being, and I dispensed with his services. I do not regret it, and I propose to follow the same course everywhere else—wherever I find a man having nothing to do I will dispense with his services. I have found in my department dozens and dozens of men who have nothing to do, and I hope no hon. gentlemen on either side of the House will ask me to take any one of them back. I have had very strong pressure from friends made on me. It is not a pleasure to dismiss public servants. I have dispensed with the services of men whose relations have been Liberals and who are themselves Liberals. I did not instruct the chiefs of my department to inquire into the political leanings of any man, but I instructed them to prepare for me lists of men numbered according to merit. When twenty men are employed and only ten are wanted I remove the ten who are the bottom of the list, and I think no business man would do otherwise. The chiefs of my departments may have made mistakes, although I must say that, after having looked carefully into the cases of which complaints have been made to me since, I have generally found that my chiefs have been loyal to me and loyal to the public interest. I will inquire further into Lambert's case, for I have no feeling against him, I do not know the man. Although since the hon. gentleman called on me I have received a letter

that Lambert is a strong partisan, at the time his services were dispensed with there was no complaint against him. I dispensed with his services because I found out that he was a man who had nothing to do, and who I thought was overpaid. My hon. friend has said since that he was not under pay. I think some of my officers told me he was under pay; at all events, I dispensed with his services as I have done elsewhere. I will inquire further into the case, and if injustice has been done I will certainly repair it.

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

(In the Committee.)

Post Office Department..... $199,120 50

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I may say on behalf of the Postmaster General, who is not here at the moment, that the point taken by the ex-Finance Minister is well taken, and I propose that there be six messengers and twenty-three packers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I applied to my deputy for information in regard to this matter, and I was informed it was a clerical error on the part of the clerk who made up the schedule. I move that the item be reduced by $600.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

Department of Marine and Fisheries..... $55,980

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any change in this vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). There is a change, owing to the superannuation of the late Deputy Minister, Mr. Smith. His salary was $3,600, and he was superannuated, and Mr. Gourdeau, the accountant, was appointed in his place. Mr. Gourdeau's salary was increased $850 by that appointment. Then, the late Government appointed one of the first-class clerks to the accountant's position, and Mr. Cunningham to the position of assistant accountant, and another gentleman to the position of second-class clerk. These promotions amounted to an increase of $1,250. But, owing to the superannuation of the Deputy, there is an actual decrease of $2,420, as compared with the Estimates brought down last year. There was a clerk put in the Estimates without any name, and I do not ask the House for that appointment.

Mr. SPROULE. There seems to be an increase of one in the number of technical officers. Why was that done?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no change made whatever. They stand exactly as they were brought down by the Finance Minister last session.

Mr. SPROULE. There were five technical officers before, and there are six now. Either the Estimates are wrong, or there must have been some change made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were six provided for in the Estimates of last session, and there are six provided for now.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase in the number of technical officers. There was an increase of one in the Estimates I brought down last year, but there was no opportunity of explaining to the House why the increase was made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, the late Government added another technical officer in 1895-96, and they brought down the estimates for that officer. I have not had time to make a thorough examination to see if I could dispense with any of them, nor do I know that I have the power, unless I superannuate them.

Mr. SPROULE. Nevertheless, there is an increase, and we have never had any explanation of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A young gentleman was appointed there by the late Government. He is one of your own friends. He is the son of a member of this House. I have to provide for him; but, if you want me to strike it out, you can do so, and I will dismiss him. I am assured, however, that he is a good officer, and that he is discharging essential duties. I do not want to discharge him, but if the House will not vote the sum, I will have to do so. I can give his name, if hon. gentlemen insist upon it.

An hon. MEMBER. Give his name.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Tyrwhitt.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there is no disgrace nor harm in that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. My impression was that it was Professor Prince who was put among the technical officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not Mr. Prince, at all. Mr. Prince's salary was proposed to be raised by my predecessor, and I did not think it fair that I should interfere with that. I accepted my predecessor's recommendation in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me that it is not sufficient for the Minister to say that these Estimates are just the same as those brought down last year, and give that as a reason why they should be accepted by this House. The Estimates of last year were never explained to the House, and when we make inquiries, it is not a proper

answer to say that the Estimates are the same as were brought down last session. The Minister in charge of the department ought to know why these changes are made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the request of the hon. gentleman is perfectly fair and reasonable, and I shall be most happy to give him all the information I can. When I entered the department I went through each branch, and I talked to my deputy with respect to the number of officers employed, with the view of ascertaining whether any reduction could be made in the interest of the public service. I have the name of each officer now in the department, and so far as I am able to judge, I would not be justified in asking the House for a penny less than is asked for in these Estimates. I made the casual remark that my predecessor had come to the conclusion after several years' experience that he could not make a reduction. I admit that that fact is not a justification for me, and I am willing to answer any and every question the hon. gentleman asks me with respect to any branch of the department. The name of one of the technical officers was not on the list, and therefore I did not read it, but when asked to give it I gave it.

Mr. MADORE. I would ask the Minister why there is an increase in the salary of the Commissioner of Fisheries. I see that the salary for 1895-96 is $2,000, while for 1896-97 it is increased to $2,200. I do not see why there is an increase in this salary when there is a decrease in almost every other item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I tried to explain a little while ago that when I came to make up the estimates this year I called for the estimates submitted by my predecessor in office. I found that he had decided to increase the salary of the Commissioner of Fisheries by $200, which had been done after consultation with his predecessor, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper. Finding that both my predecessors had come to the conclusion that the services rendered by Prof. Prince should be recognized by this increase, I did not feel that with my short experience in the office I would be justified in asking the House to strike it out.

Mr. FOSTER. And I think, when he looks into the matter, he will be still less inclined to strike it out. Prof. Prince is not only an educated scientific expert, but a thoroughly practical man as well. He is a graduate of scientific institutions in the old country, he has been here about four years, and he has certainly made himself master of the fisheries of Canada. I do not think $2,200 is too much for a man of that kind.

Department of Public Works..... $52,090

Mr. SPROULE. I see an increase in the number of second-class clerks from eleven to fourteen. Will the hon. Minister give us some information as to the necessity for that increase?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). There is no increase over the late estimates, which I took from my predecessor as I found them. As the House knows, I have in my department a great number of temporary employees. The late Minister, rightly I believe, thought that we should put an end as far as possible to the system of temporary employees, and appoint deserving men as permanent employees; and for that reason he asked for this increase of three in the number of second-class clerks, which was granted, I understand, by his late colleagues. I am not responsible for that change in any way.

Mr. SPROULE. Were the additional second-class clerks appointed by promotion in the ordinary way, or were new men taken in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only one of these second-class clerkships has been filled. My secretary has been appointed to one of them, and the two others are still vacant. I intend to give them to the most deserving men.

Mr. BERGERON. We have seen in the papers lately that the services of a good many of the employees of the Public Works Department have been dispensed with—I understand, because there was no work for them at this season of the year, and there was no use keeping men doing nothing. But I want to ask the Minister if, when the Estimates are voted, and there will be more work in the department, he will be disposed to take back those employees, if they have given satisfaction to the department, and there is nothing against them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two or three classes of men whose services I dispensed with. I hold in my hand statements that have been prepared for me, but I hope I will not be questioned too much about the names, though I am prepared to give them all. I have dispensed, under the reports of my officers, with men who were unfit, but I do not want to do any harm to these men by giving their names. They were not, on the report of the chief of the department, found fit for public duty. Other men I dismissed who were good men, but for whom there was no work, and for whom there will be no work, I am sure.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has said that he is not responsible for the Estimates because he took them from his predecessor. Let me tell my hon. friend that he cannot get rid of the responsibility. He is responsible for everything he recommends.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that he has not dismissed any permanent clerks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one.

Mr. FOSTER. How many second-class and third-class clerks are now on the pay roll ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have twelve second-class clerks, but two of the positions are vacant.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he include his private secretary in those ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; I propose to put my secretary into the second class.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he get the $600 allowance as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He will not get the whole, but I must say that my private secretary is a gentleman who, in Montreal, was earning as much as he is earning now. He is a strong stenographer in French and English ; and I must say that since he has been here, I would not do the work he has done for the same amount of money.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not finding fault with my hon. friend, but we used to be strongly criticised for making our private secretaries second-class clerks. If the hon. gentleman's secretary does his work well, he should be well paid, for a good secretary does pretty nearly as much work as the Minister. With reference to the other two vacancies, my hon. friend has estimated for them in order to fill them later.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may be in a position to make permanent men who deserve to be permanent, and for this reason I left these two vacancies.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. Minister found so little work to be done that he could dismiss so many officials, how is it he finds need for two more second-class clerks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have dismissed a certain number of men who ought never to have been there, but there are good men in my department who are not permanent. I have thirty-seven or thirty-eight employees who are permanent, but I have a considerable number still of temporary employees. In my opinion, when a civil servant has worked from year to year, his position, if he is a good man, should be made permanent. I think that the late Minister was wise in making provision for men who may be promoted. I have got men in the service to-day who are not permanent, and I propose to make two of them permanent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. From what vote were these temporary men paid last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will look at page 50, he will find three items, namely, to provide for salaries of engineers and draughtsmen and clerks, Chief Engineer's Office, this year $46,000, last year $51,000. To provide for salaries, architects and clerks, Chief Architect's Office, last year $28,200, this year $22,500. To provide for salary of staff telegraphic service, last year $3,500, this year $2,900. Out of these items the temporary employees are paid.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The reductions principally are mainly in the technical staff.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I found a large number of men there who should not have been there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has informed the House that so far as the ordinary staff is concerned he proposes a reduction of $900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On one item I propose a reduction of $8,000, and on another of $6,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Those are technical offices.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are engineers, draughtsmen and so forth. My hon. friend will find elsewhere a reduction of $25,000 in what may be called the Ottawa service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like an answer to this question. Is it not the fact that several Ministers in the late Government employed more than one private secretary ? As I understood it the Minister of the Interior had two and the Minister of Finance had two, one in his office and one at his house.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be for me to answer rather than the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). I had two private secretaries for a portion of the time, and I could have had six if thereby I could have done my work better. The point of criticism was whether the $600 was exceeded. It was not.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister tells us he has reduced expenses by cutting down the estimates for engineers, draughtsmen and clerks, presumably because he is dispensing with the services of temporary men. How does he account for the increase of $3,100 in the salaries of the permanent staff ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry I did not make my statement clear. It is no use trying to make the House believe that I am making an increase. I hold myself responsible—I must do so—for the increase that my predecessor made. The reason for this increase is that I will take deserving men from the temporary list and

put them in position of second and third-class clerks.

Mr. BERGERON. Not third-class.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I might take a man who is in the third-class and put him in the second-class, and so on. In that I wish to be free.

Department of Railways and Canals... $44,062 50

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. Minister say who the second and first-class clerks in his department are now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have sent for a list of the clerks now in the department. The statement I have before me gives the clerks at the time that the Estimates were introduced last session. I know of no change. Certainly there has been no change since I took office. The first-class clerks are Mr. F. A. Dixon, Mr. Neil Stewart——

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman need not read the list. He will understand the object of my question. Some time ago I moved for a return of the Orders in Council approved by the Governor General and not yet brought down. There were some recommendations made by the late Government for the appointment of second-class clerks and I want to know whether they have been carried out or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not having been in the House at the time, I was not aware that such a motion had been carried, and it has not since been called to my attention until now. I will ascertain what the hon. gentleman wishes to know and let him know at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask why it is that there are nine third-class clerks estimated for here, while there were only eight according to the first series of estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The first estimates passed the Council in January, 1896, prior to the coming into operation of the Act which did away with the third-class clerkships, and on the 31st December, 1895, an additional third-class clerk was appointed at a salary of $450—a Mr. Gleason, I believe. The late Minister was not proposing, as I understand, at the time he submitted his estimates, to make provision for all the third-class clerks he had in his department. The appointment of Mr. Gleason was made by Order in Council transferring him from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman had on the last of June, nine third-class clerks in the department ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so—and has now.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not understand the hon. gentleman's explanation in answer to my question and will be glad if he will read the names of the second-class clerks.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have told the hon. gentleman that I have sent for the list, thinking it might be called for, but have not it at present.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. gentleman tell me whether all the second-class clerkships in the department are filled or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not certain as to that, but no appointments have been made since I came into the department, and the employees remain, as I understand it, as they were when the department was presided over by my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART. When I was in the department there were two or three vacancies among the second-class clerks. I recommended that they should be filled, and I want to know if they have been filled. If the hon. gentleman is not able to give us the information, perhaps the item had better be allowed to stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have filled no vacancies.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand. But the hon. gentleman cannot tell me whether those positions which I recommended should be filled have been filled or not. The item had better be allowed to stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall have no objection to let the item stand, but perhaps it would serve the hon. gentleman's purpose as well if the information were given on concurrence.

Mr. HAGGART. It will not suit me. The hon. gentleman does not understand the point at all. It is impossible to discuss the question on concurrence. I wish to know at this stage, and I am willing to pass every part of it but one item. Or, if you will allow me to have an opportunity of discussing it on any other item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it is the understanding that the vote is passed barring that item, we will accept the suggestion, and give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. FOSTER. That is rather irregular. It won't retard the matter at all. Just let this stand, and go on with the others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is understood that we are not passing it, but when we reach it, that is the only portion remaining to be debated.

Department of Geological Survey..... $50,475

Mr. FOSTER. As this department belongs to the Minister of the Interior, we will

let them all stand. Our arrangement was the other night that they should all stand until the First Minister made his declaration. But I have no objection to taking this one. When an item of $50,000 is asked from the House, it is usual to have explanations as to details, if there are any changes.

Mr. DOBELL. There are no changes. I am prepared to bring down the names of all the officers of that department, and their salaries. There are only the statutory increases.

The Department of Trade and Commerce $8,762 50

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The numbers are the same. The change here is made by the promotion of one third-class clerk to be second-class clerk, and there are a couple of statutory increases. I observe that my predecessor asked for $9,562. I only propose to ask for $8,762.50. The difference of $562 over last year's Estimates, is made up by the statutory increases I have referred to, and the promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be opportune to ask the hon. gentleman a question or two as to this department. I do not wish to worry the department with quotations, but I have them under my hand, sundry and numerous. Amongst these quotations I could name certain spicy and strong ones from a certain gentleman who used to occupy the seat I am occupying to-day on this side of the House. I remember that he took strong grounds against there being such a department at all as a Department of Trade and Commerce, that he thought it was altogether unnecessary, something as bad as the fifth wheel of a coach; and he was very pressing and curious for information as to what this particular department would do. But he was certainly of the opinion that it needed no deputy, and that one or two clerks would be quite sufficient to dance attendance upon the Minister, and do what little office work there was. He was also very curious to know on what lines this new Minister and his department would be projected. Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend for information. Of course, times have changed, and the season is not as it was at that time. My hon. friend when he made these strong criticisms, was looking forward to a time when he might be one of an incoming ministry, but when that happy time should come, my hon. friend did not expect to occupy the Department of Trade and Commerce—at least I take his own assertion for it, and the promise made by the Prime Minister. His own promise to his constituents was, as I understand, that he would be Finance Minister, and I am quite sure there was a promise by the First Minister that no one in all the wide Dominion could possibly be looked upon as Finance Minister outside of my hon. friend who now occupies the subordinate position of Minister of Trade and Commerce. Now, does my hon. friend propose to ask, in all seriousness, that the House should appoint a deputy and a lot of clerks for an office of this kind which he thought a few months ago was entirely unnecessary? And will he also tell the House upon what lines he proposes to work? I think we must have full explanations. There has been such a complete turn-around that my hon. friend must perform again for the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, or tenth time, the grand act of swallowing himself.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. gentleman's remarks have to do with the item under discussion. I venture to tell the hon. gentleman that I think he will find that I will be able, after a few months' residence in the office, to show that I can find work for a deputy, and for the very small staff, as I am bound to say it is. The hon. gentleman, or his predecessors, have attached some work to this department in connection with subsidies, steamship subventions, and some other matters in connection with the development of trade and commerce, which will certainly afford work for the two, or three, or five, or six men who are attached to it.

Mr. FOSTER. There were some five or six contracts under way.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And there will be, I hope, under our Administration, something done to promote the commerce of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, that is what I would like to have the hon. gentleman explain.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think we will succeed in doing something if the hon. gentleman will possess his soul in patience. I know he is very unhappy in his present seat; I know he and his colleagues sit on thorns. I remember perfectly well what our old and late esteemed colleague, Mr. Rymal, said once of the hon. gentlemen when they were robbed of office. All I can tell him is this: We will endeavour to carry on the Government of this country on, I think, a little better and happier lines than those on which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues carried it on six months ago. I think we will be able to show a few months hence how the commerce of this country can best be developed.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has hardly given much information to the House. He has very ingeniously tried to stave off the effect of his words of a few months ago, very ingeniously tried to put a screen up between his position then and his position at the present time, but he has not said one

word to the House as to what he proposes to do. He says he has five or six contracts to look after, and five or six clerks to look after them, or one clerk to a contract. My hon. friend must see that when he is asking the House to give him this money to spend, it is not sufficient to say: Oh, give me the money, I think I will find something to do with it. He must tell the committee when he is asking for money what he proposes to do with it. Now, my hon. friend, after having been a working member in a Government, and after having been eighteen years on this thorny seat—my hon. friend spoke from experience, I suppose it was thorny when he sat here, but it is very soft, as far as I am concerned—but my hon. friend must have matured views, and he must be able to give them to the House. What does he propose to do?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have already stated what I propose to do, and I am not disposed to indulge the hon. gentleman with any further information on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very good. My hon. friend is cultivating the virtue of silence, taking the position of a man who looks wise and says nothing. My hon. friend cannot escape from the position that he never proposed to take so inferior an office as the Department of Trade and Commerce, an office which he vilified and ridiculed with all that mastery of English which he possesses, an office which he declared to be totally unnecessary. My hon. friend now, a few months afterwards, sits down at the command of the Prime Minister, who has given that other place to one more worthy of it than himself—he sits down now and takes the despised position, and then coolly aske the committee to give him money, without saying what he proposes to do in that office. If the hon. gentleman had said nothing about the matter before, it might have been different; but he was so plain and so clear in announcing his opinion that the office was entirely unnecessary, that there was no work to do, and he was so clear on this point that the House and the country have intense interest in learning what the hon. gentleman will find to do there. If it is so unnecessary as it was a few months ago, the hon. gentleman should not ask the House for this appropriation. If this office is necessary, surely the hon. gentleman should, with his superior wisdom, vouchsafe to the committee explanations as to what he proposes to do. I hope hon. gentlemen will not cast the responsibility of defending their actions, as it has been the practice in such a large degree this session, on the shoulders of hon. members sitting on the back benches, who have been engaged in throwing bombs over the heads of Ministers, projectiles which did not hurt them, but were intended to hurt the Opposition. Ministers are responsible; they should explain their policy, and not leave that duty entirely in the hands of hon. gentlemen behind them. If the hon. gentleman has nothing to say, and prefers to sit in silence, the House and the country will form their own opinions in regard to the whole matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the ex-Minister of Finance would rather be a doorkeeper to a government than occupy a seat in opposition. He evidently feels the position to which he has been relegated by the people, and he feels his present position a very unpleasant one. The hon. gentleman has entered into an extended criticism of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I can well remember, when the question of creating it as a separate departmen was before the House, the Government were pointedly asked as to what would be the particular duties assigned to that Minister. We obtained but very scanty information from hon. gentlemen opposite, who then occupied seats on this side of the House. It was quite clear that the office of Minister of Trade and Commerce was not created because the necessity presented itself for establishing a new office, but simply because there was a gentleman who wanted to get some position, and the office was created for him. Hon. gentlemen divided up the duties of the several departments, and certain duties were assigned to the Department of Trade and Commerce. No doubt those duties have given the hon. Minister some work to do. The hon. gentleman claims that we challenged the propriety and prudence of creating that office. We did so, because there was no intimation given to the then Opposition as to the duties the Minister would have to perform. It was then thought by the Opposition that the office which had been created would be a comfortable and easy resting place for an hon. gentleman who is now a Senator. No doubt the office was created for that purpose. But, if, in considering the work of the different departments, the Government find that they can utilize this position to the advantage of the Dominion, there can be no doubt but that the position of Minister of that department will be kept in existence. If, on the other hand, it is found that a prudent reduction can be made, the office may perhaps be abolished. I am quite satisfied that the interests of the country will be safeguarded by the present Administration, either by continuing or abolishing the office. The Government, however, cannot be expected to attend to all these matters at once. It was announced, at the opening of Parliament, that the business would be confined to passing the Estimates, and that the Government did not intend to introduce any new legislation. Hon. gentlemen opposite surely must allow hon. Ministers time to warm the seats left by hon. gentlemen opposite, and look around to see what reductions or changes are desirable to promote

the well-being and prosperity of this country, and I am satisfied that changes necessary to promote the interests of the Dominion will be carried out. In the meantime, the duties devolving on the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be efficiently performed and in the public interest, and possibly the performance of the duties may redound to the general well-being of the people. The hon. gentleman at present occupying the office will, no doubt, render efficient service to the public, notwithstanding the belittling remarks made by the ex-Finance Minister, and it may possibly prove that this department is one of the most advantageous to the interests of the people of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure the committee will regret that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was not made Minister of Trade and Commerce, because he has manifested great anxiety to give all possible information and to add a little advice as well, all of which is very refreshing. This, moreover, is done without salary, and it is, therefore, all the more interesting and agreeable. Would the Minister of Trade and Commerce give information to the committee as to the necessity for adding $1,100 to the Estimates proposed last session? If there was little work to do, more economy was needed, as an increase of salaries seems scarcely compatible with the work there appears to be to do.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would just remark to my hon. friend that, upon entering my office, I found my predecessor had recommended the appointment of two additional second-class clerks at $1,100 each. It appeared to me that one additional second-class clerk would be sufficient for the purpose, and I reduced the estimate by $1,100. The sum asked for at the last session was $9,562; the sum I ask is $8,762. The promotion was recommended before I entered the office, and I did not feel disposed to stop it, particularly as the party likely to be promoted is declared to be a gentleman well up in statistics, and likely to be of very considerable use in his advanced position. But I will point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that, so far from having taken all that was expected to be taken, I have taken one second-class clerk less.

Mr. SPROULE. That information, of course, is quite appropriate, and is certainly appreciated. But there seems to be something wrong in the Estimates, because the Estimates placed the amount for the last year at $8,200, and for the coming year at $8,762.60.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The latter is my estimate. The estimate for the former year was $9,562.

Mr. DAVIN. This is one of the offices that was discussed at the last election, and which it was declared would be abolished. It is disappointing to my constituents, both those who voted for me and those who voted against me, especially those who voted against me, to find that, after the asseverations made that this superfluous position would be done away with——

The PRIME MINISTER. Is it disappointing to you, also?

Mr. DAVIN. It is disappointing to me, because, of course, I attach the greatest reliance to any statement made by the Prime Minister, and his statement was that more economy would be practised. During the elections the changes were rung on reductions in the number of Ministers, on reduced expense in the Government, on reductions in the civil service, and promises were held out that such reductions would materially affect the taxation of the country. It is a great disappointment to find, not only that the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce has been retained, but that the hon. gentleman who denounced that ministerial position, is comfortably ensconced in it, but yet does not care to defend it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to inquire from the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he has addressed a circular to the boards of trade, to manufacturers and to the importers of Canada, to ascertain their views regarding any probable reduction or increase in the tariff.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No; no circular was addressed to manufacturers, as I mentioned yesterday, asking their views with respect to the tariff. A circular was addressed to the various boards of trade requesting suggestions from them as to the best channels in which the trade of Canada might be extended and developed; and I believe some information was sought by officers of the department from certain manufacturers with respect to the quantity of their production, but they were certainly not consulted with respect to reductions in the tariff or on any questions connected with the tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to see my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) taking refuge in that superior sort of silence. I know he feels badly under all the circumstances.

Mr. GIBSON. Not half so badly as you do.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) not get so mad.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think he has exhibited so many moments of weakness as you have.

Mr. FOSTER. A number of hon. gentlemen over there seem to be getting angry, following the example of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If the Minister does not give us any idea of his policy, we shall have to ask him some questions, and I suppose he will be courteous enough to answer

them. I had hoped he would give us a comprehensive view as to what position he would elevate his department into. The only explanation of his not doing so is that he knows nothing about it, that he was looking after a different department in which he was thoroughly 'au fait,' and which he could answer for at a moment's notice, but having been placed in this obscure and unexpected position the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has nothing to say as to what he will do. He vouchsafes to the committee the very important information that if we give him the money now, by and by, he will be able to do something. But the hon. gentleman ought to know whether or not he is able to do something before he gets the money. Necessity is always a prime element in asking for a parliamentary appropriation, and it is the duty of the Minister to explain what the necessity is. May be, the hon. First Minister would take up the role, and tell us what it is proposed to do in this new Department of Trade and Commerce, which both he and my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) most strongly deprecated and most strongly ridiculed only a few months ago in this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My answer is very simple. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) think the office useful or not? Will he answer that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I will answer that. But, before I answer it I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) that he and his brother Ministers are taking most childish ground.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I want to say frankly what I think. They are taking very childish grounds, when, after eighteen years of finding fault with everything the Liberal-Conservative Ministry did, after saying for eighteen years that everything that Government did was wrong and there was nothing right; then when they come into power they swallow at one great gulp all these strong denunciations. And when we ask them for explanations they are as dumb as oysters, but after a while they venture to get up and say: Well, you did this. Why that is the very thing you found fault with while you are in opposition. You said, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself said, that there were too many departments of government. You said, and your Minister of Trade and Commerce said, that this was one of the too many departments. You said that anyway, if the department was created it should not have a deputy head, and that there was nothing to be done in that department which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs could not just as well do. The leader of the House at the present time, together with several of his Ministers, stated this over and over again. But now when you take the reins of office, you put in just as many Ministers as we did, and when you are asked to define the reason why you have thus changed your ground, your answer is: Well, you did it; do you not think it was right? But hon. gentlemen opposite sit on the Treasury benches to-day because they said they would not do such a thing if they were in power. They told the people of this country that the late Government were creating useless expenditures, were multiplying offices, were adding to the expenses of civil government, and they promised that when they came into office they would make a change. You have got into office because you stated that. You stated it broadcast in this country from one end to the other, and now that you have worked yourself into power on that propaganda you adopt everything that we have done. You take and place the present Minister of Trade and Commerce where you said you were not going to place him, having passed him over for the position of Finance Minister, and you put him in that office which you yourself, and he himself, declared was an office which was unnecessary, and which was of no use to the country. And when we ask: whether you propose to continue it, and whether you propose to elevate it from the useless and unimportant office you said it was, you get up and you simply ask: did not you have such an office as this? What do you think of it? I submit to my hon. friend that that is not satisfactory.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has fairly now given to the House, and I thank him for it, the motive and the spirit which animates him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) told us that in our campaign we condemned everything the late Government did, and that now we approve of everything they did. Well, Sir, we did not condemn everything they did, but we condemned a great deal of what they did.

Mr. FOSTER. You condemned this.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, I will take the statement of my hon. friend. Suppose we did, what could we do? Have we not to obey the law? Here is a law which has created a great department of state, and whatever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would do under the circumstances, it is our deliberate intention to carry out the law as we find it, until it is amended by Parliament. When this department was formed there were many things which I stated ought to be done in connection with it. When I called my friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to take the portfolio, I stated under my own signature in the public press, that it was the intention of the Government to reconsider the whole system of the Trade and Commerce Department. That is our intention now. But at the same time that I stated that, we have stated over and over

again that it was not the intention of Government to introduce any legislation during the present session; that this session was called simply to vote the Estimates. Since there is a Department of Trade and Commerce established under the law, I must ask every fair-minded member in this House to vote the money necessary to carry on this department. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that we have condemned everything the Conservative Government did, and that now we are swallowing everything we have condemned. Well, Sir, I hope we shall never be guilty of such moments of weakness as that. While it is open to the Government either to approve or condemn at the present time, I place myself in the judgment of Parliament and in the judgment of the country when I say: whatever views we may have as to the present organization of the Government, as to whether there are too many departments or not, as to whether we should introduce the pruning knife or not, yet we have stated that we shall not ask for any legislation this session, that we shall only ask for Estimates to carry on the Government, and I put it to any fair-minded man on either side of this House or in any part of the country, whether it is right that we should be asked to introduce legislation now, when we have no time to do so. Why, Sir, two of the Ministers were only elected after this session opened. Under such circumstances, I ask can any fair-minded man blame us because at the present time we are not able to introduce measures of reform, even though we think reform advisable. Next session, if we are not prepared with this or any other item of our policy, the hon. gentleman can fairly criticise us. But I repeat that this session was called only for the purpose of voting the Estimates; and, whether rightly or wrongly, we have taken the Estimates prepared by our hon. friends opposite. I again ask the hon. gentleman, does he believe that the Department of Trade and Commerce is useful? He will not answer that. I will answer it for him: he believes it is useful. He created that department himself; he asked Parliament to vote for it; and if we abolished it at the present time, he believes we would commit a great error. I do not care what his judgment may be in the future; but at the present time he is not fair in asking us to lay down any other policy than the policy for which this session was called.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend could set forth a non possumus, he would be perfectly right in the ground he has taken. He says the Government called this session for one special purpose; but it was within their power to introduce legislation if they wished. It was within their power this session to introduce an Act to do away with useless offices if they thought fit to do so. If they did not think fit to do so, it was not on grounds of public necessity, but on grounds of party convenience. My hon. friend is on record as saying that this was a useless office; he is on record as saying that we have too many departments; he is on record as having written to the Controller of Customs, pledging himself—and that before Parliament had voted on it at all—that he would be paid $7,000 a year and be raised to the rank of a Cabinet Minister. And now he says: I am not ready; party convenience does not allow me to be ready yet to state my policy with reference to these matters; and consequently I am not going to introduce any legislation. The hon. gentleman says that two of the Ministers were not elected till after Parliament met. Whose fault is that? Certainly not the fault of the Opposition. It is the fault of the hon. gentleman himself. He might have chosen his colleagues earlier, and had the elections earlier. My hon. friend cannot shelter himself from the inconsistency of having declaimed for five years against the departments, the constitution of the departments of the Government, and against this one in particular, and yet coming down here and asking for a vote for that same department, and doing it without vouchsafing to the House one single item of information as to the policy he proposes to follow in regard to it.

Office of the High Commissioner—Contingencies, etc $11,200

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that the hon. member for North Wellington should have something to say about this.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will say this with regard to the office of High Commissioner. I certainly hope the expenses connected with that office will be reduced. I believe they can be, and I look forward to that being done. In the meantime, while it is necessary to provide for the gentleman who now occupies that very distinguished position, I do not think it would be right to detain the House by entering into a criticism at present. But I believe this department and every other will receive due consideration at the hands of the Government; and, if hon. gentlemen opposite will only possess their souls in patience, they will find that very considerable reductions can be made, and they will no doubt be delighted when they find how economically the Government now in power can handle the affairs of this country. If the ex-Finance Minister will cultivate a little patience, I hope his seat, to which he is relegated for a number of years, will be more comfortable in a little while.

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard that expression used so often, "possess your souls in patience, we cannot make the reduction now," that I would like my hon. friend to give me a definition of it. Is it to be coterminous with the occupancy of the Gov-

ernment benches by the present Government ?

Mr. McMULLEN. We intend to do something different from what my hon. friend did when he intimated some time ago to this House that he was going to reduce the tariff. He sent a delegation through this country—the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue ; and he himself and Mr. Angers went to the North-west to find out what changes should be made in the tariff. He was not able to tell us what he was going to do ; he wanted the people to tell him what to do. Then he came down to Parliament with a large number of reductions in the tariff ; but when the manufacturers expressed their indignation at the proposed changes, the hon. gentleman declared that a lot of them were clerical errors, and he put the old duties back again. The mountain in labour brought forth a mouse. I hope nothing of that kind will be done by this Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to detain the committee long, but I feel that it would be only right that I should take this opportunity of saying that whatever reductions the Government may find it in their power to make in the public expenditures, I think a careful examination will bring them all to the conclusion that it would be very unwise to reduce the expenditure connected with the High Commissioner's Office. I may remind the committee that the first gentleman who was appointed to that office, with the same salary and emoluments that now appertain to it, Sir Alexander Galt, after holding the office for some time, refused to continue in it because he said the provision made for the office was not sufficient to enable him to discharge its duties efficiently. The Government, being unwilling to ask for an increase on the amount that had been provided, namely, $10,000 salary and $4,000 contingencies, were reluctantly obliged to accept that hon. gentleman's resignation. He resigned solely and distinctly upon the ground that he could only retain the office of High Commissioner and efficiently discharge the duties connected with it, unless the Government would materially increase the salary. I believe that the more attention the Government give to that office, the more satisfied they will become of the importance of continuing it and having it filled, as it now is, by a gentleman of high character, position and ability. I am quite certain that a most careful and critical examination of the expenses connected with that department will bring the Government to the conclusion that they would not be acting in the public interests if they made any reduction.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am bound to say that the results of the expenditure on this office have not been satisfactory. I felt very much humiliated the other night at the public dinner given to Lord Russell when he and his friends said that people in the old country knew nothing about Canada. I submit there is something wrong when men of broad education, such as those, know nothing about this country. There is a very striking letter published in the papers, written by a clever gentleman from my province, Mr. Eaton, in which Mr. Eaton finds that the ignorance regarding Canada in England is so great that he, a Conservative of the Conservatives, advises Canada to become independent. He mentioned, for example, a journalist over there asking if Nova Scotia was one of England's possessions. A gentleman from Montreal told me that he was in Liverpool or Manchester one evening among a crowd of people who were listening to an agent employed by some American railway companies, discussing the United States and this country. He spoke of Montreal as a little village inhabited by Indians and French. Mr. Eaton asked permission to speak, which was given him, and he told the crowd that it was a shame for Englishmen to know so little about their own colony and be so easily deceived, and he then went on to tell them what kind of a country Canada is. As a matter of fact, there is little information about Canada in England, although we have spent large sums of money for the purpose of making our country known. Perhaps we have not been spending enough, but certainly we have spent a good deal for a country of our population. Perhaps the fact that so little was paid the High Commissioner may be the reason why so little is know of Canada in England. If not enough is paid, let the amount be larger, but the plea put forward by the ex-Premier was not that it was not large enough for the purpose but that the High Commissioner could not live on it there, and of course, I suppose, could not travel. The late Government were always claiming that they were going to bring out people from the old country to this, and for this purpose they had agencies established all through the great centres on the other side. One thing is certain, Canada must be made better known in the motherland. It is very sad to know that not only the capital but the people of England find their way to the United States when we should have them here ; and I, for one, would not begrudge any reasonable expenditure to remove the ignorance that exists regarding this country in England and make Canada better known as a field for investment and immigration, and thus bring to our country the best elements in the world to become citizens in our great and wealthy country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I had the honour, like the hon. gentleman, of being present at the banquet to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I did not understand the Lord Chief Justice of England to express his views

regarding the complete ignorance of the English people concerning Canada in the way in which the hon. gentleman seems to have understood him. I understood him to say that the knowledge of Englishmen of Canadian affairs and the resources of Canada was continually increasing, though he admitted that for a long period of time the English people had been sadly ignorant of the resources and capabilities of this country. I think that Canadians, especially those who occasionally visit England, must admit that so long as Canada remains an important portion of the Empire, it is quite out of the question that she should not be represented by a High Commissioner. If the hon. gentleman expects that the High Commissioner is going to travel round and educate 38,000,000 or 39,000,000 of Englishmen for a salary of $10,000, I could readily understand that he would call upon the Government, of which he is an important supporter, to consider whether the High Commissioner should not be paid a little more. Though I am strongly opposed to the present Administration, yet, if the High Commissioner is to be entrusted with the education of the English nation, I would be quite prepared to support the Government in increasing his salary by a good many thousand dollars, and I do not think he would then be paid too much. But even if that increase should take place, it would be quite impossible for the High Commissioner to do anything more than attend to the business that is continually being transacted between England and Canada. I am prepared to say that I do not believe that the High Commissioner is paid sufficiently for the position he occupies. His first duty is to represent his country in a manner worthy of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I differ a little from some hon. gentlemen with regard to the rerults brought about by our having a High Commissioner in England. I have thought that, probably, the difficulty is not so much in the salary as in the man. The expenditure has been a large one. It is stated that the salary is nominally $10,000. But we know that there is an extra vote of $2,000, and that practically the High Commissioner gets a salary of $12,000. The salary may not have been too high, but the Commissioner has been too high—I think that is where the fault is. If we are to have a man there, he should be one who will mix more with the masses and less with the aristocracy, a man who will make his influence felt among the people whom we wish to draw to this country. I believe you could find such a man in the ranks of the Liberals; I believe we could have more effective service by having a Liberal as High Commissioner than by having an old fogy Tory. We know that we had a Commissioner in Paris, and we used to have fights over the vote to pay him. It was discovered that for several years—I think it was four or five years—the total result of the mission of that man in France, who was getting about $4,000 a year, was that he succeeded in getting one woman to emigrate to Canada. And yet the Government kept on paying him $4,000 a year and other expenses. For these positions we want practical men, who will do practical work, and we have not had that kind of men.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say one or two words on this vote.

Mr. FRASER. Hurry up.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I think he is not likely, by making such remarks as that, pertinent or otherwise, to further progress in this committee. I will take the liberty, on any item that comes up, to express the opinion of my constituents, and any criticism that is called for from me as a member of this House. I deprecate, and I believe the country will deprecate the position taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side. Their position seems to be this: Now we are in power, these offices that we attacked as extravagant while others were in power, we intend to maintain, and you are in no position to criticise, because you supported the men who filled or favoured these offices in the past. I hope we are not going to see any great party in this country, after having for a series of years attacked certain expenditure in opposition, when they get into power cynically declare that they will make no reduction and no reform. And I say here that the country will be disappointed, and especially the western country, so far as I know, it will be disappointed, if hon. gentlemen who have made promises so persistently and so definitely, do not accomplish something in the line of their various promises. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) referred to what was said by the Lord Chief Justice of England at the banquet——

Mr. FRASER. And others.

Mr. DAVIN. I had the honour of being at the banquet, but I did not understand that anything that was said indicated that the High Commissioner, or the High Commissioner's Office in the past had failed to do an educating work that would tend to get rid of the ignorance that my hon. friend, I think, exaggeratedly, described. The office of High Commissioner would be a very extraordinary one, indeed, if it was expected to remove the ignorance—but only the comparative ignorance—that has existed in England. I differ from my hon. friend in his opinion. He seems to think that the ignorance is dense and unrelieved. My opinion is that in England there has been a constant increase of knowledge concerning Canada, and that that increase is going on, and that anybody who has kept track of the conduct of this office by the late High Commissioner and his predecessor, could not fail

to see that these gentlemen had done the very thing that my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Somerville), says should be done. They have gone about the country, they have interested themselves in everything that took place in England in any way relating to Canada ; and no man who is accustomed to read the English papers, could have failed to see that these gentlemen kept Canada constantly in evidence in the old country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville), if I understood him, said the very contrary to-day of what I have heard from him in the past. He does not seem to think now that too much money is spent on the office of High Commissioner. He seems to think now that it is not so much the money but the man, and that the High Commissionership has failed to achieve its object because he was what he calls an old fogy Tory. Well, Sir, nobody acquainted with the magnificent abilities of Sir Alexander Galt, nobody acquainted with his capacity for filling a quasi-ambassadorial position, as this is, should have committed himself to any such propostion as that. I will not say anything here about the way the present leader of the Opposition discharged his duties in the office of High Commissioner, because it is not necessary : his record in that office is so recent that it is not necessary for me to say one word about it. His action was so successful as to defy adverse criticism. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman rather adumbrates a picture than paints one, as to the type of man that will succeed as High Commissioner. He thinks an occupant of that office should be more democratic, and says that in the rank and file of the Liberals the right man may be found. As Lord Byron said about a poem of Wordsworth that was sung in regard to a very interesting subject :

> He that saw the poet in his glory
> Conceived the bard the hero of the story.

I could not help thinking that when my hon. friend was eulogizing that undefined Liberal in the ranks of the Liberal party who was to be so affected, that he must have had himself in view, and that he would be successful as High Commissioner. Well, Sir, I quite agree with him, that in any great function like that it is not merely the salary that is to be considered, although we have to look very carefully to the amount ; and I have no doubt that when my hon. friend is promoted to that high position, he will discharge his duties with a more democratic flavour, probably, than they have been discharged in the past. But whatever democratic flavour may attach to his action in that position, I greatly doubt if either he or any other member of the Liberal party can show more energy, more zeal, more activity and more attention to everything that could further the interests of Canada, than have been shown in the past by Sir Alexander Galt in the first place, and in the next place by the late incumbent of that high position.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not rise at all for the purpose of defending the present Government and the present Prime Minister from the attack that was indirectly levelled against him and the Government by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). When the hon. gentleman complained that all who had been appointed High Commissioners were men of the wrong stamp altogether, he, of course, condemned the course of the present Prime Minister, of whom I thought he had been an ardent supporter, when he continued in office the present High Commissioner who had been appointed by the Conservative Government. I do not think, either, that it is necessary for me in this House to say one word in defence of the present High Commissioner. I think he is a gentleman who has commanded the respect and the admiration of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, and I am surprised that there was to be found any single member in this House who would have thrown a stone at him or at his reputation.

But what I did wish to say, and only for a moment, is this, that I should be very sorry indeed if this House were to suppose that there had not been a very marked and a very remarkable increase of knowledge in England with respect to Canada. I think it would be very unfortunate that the idea should go out of doors, or should prevail in the minds of hon. members of this House, that such a dense condition of ignorance with regard to Canada exists in England as one would naturally conclude from listening to the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I regret as much as any other hon. member of this House that more is not known in England about Canada ; but I know also that there has been a most remarkable increase of knowledge with regard to this country in England as compared with the knowledge which existed only a short time ago. I visited England in 1892, and I was astonished to find how much more was known then of Canada than had been known when I was over there previously. Day by day, and almost hour by hour, one might say, the public mind in England is being more turned towards this country, and I venture to say that never since the people of England have taken an interest in Canada, have they taken so warm an interest as they are doing as this moment. When I hear hon. gentlemen get up in this House and talk about some suggestion that Canada should become independent, whatever that may mean, because the people of England do not know more about our affairs than they do now, why, I must say that for my part I deprecate remarks of that kind very much on the part of any hon. member of this House. The remarks that were made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), I think, were perfectly correct, and apropos, to the effect that what was required in England was simply the education of the young

people with regard to the great outlying possessions of the Crown. It is quite impossible that that knowledge which we all desire to see can be found in England with regard to Canada, and Australia, and South Africa, unless it is imparted in the schools to begin with. You want to go to the root of the matter, and you want to endeavour to induce those who have the control of the educational system in England, to take hold of this great and important question. In order to spread the knowledge that ought to be possessed by every British subject in every part of the Empire with regard to all parts of the Empire, you want to get those who are in authority and have control of education in the mother country, to take that question up, and to have a careful instruction of the young people in the public schools with regard to the resources of the Empire. Until that is done we never can expect that the people of England will know as much about our affairs, and as much about the affairs of our friends in Australia and South Africa, as they ought to do. But to suggest that this can be done from the High Commissioner's office, is, I think, a little too absurd. Certainly the High Commissioner may endeavour to bring that view before the minds of the governing classes in England, and endeavour to get them to take the question up. But further than that, and further than the High Commissioners have gone already in the way of instructing public opinion in England, I do not think they can very well go. So far as I am concerned, if the important office of High Commissioner in England requires, in order that it shall be maintained, and that the duties connected with it shall be efficiently discharged, that there should be a larger appropriation for the purpose, I shall for one gladly support any proposition of that kind, provided the necessity for it be made evident.

Mr. LISTER. I may say in answer to the hon. member who has just spoken—(Mr. McNeill), that it may be quite true that within his particular circle in the old country, people may know something about Canada. But is is equally true that should a Canadian go to the old country, he is put down at once, not as a Canadian, but as an American. The people of England do not appear to distinguish between people from the United States and people from Canada.

Mr. McNEILL. They put him down as an American because he is an American.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, and he is a Canadian, too.

Mr. McNEILL. Certainly.

Mr. LISTER. Whether this office is necessary, I do not intend to discuss at all. Suffice it for me to know that the office has been in existence for a great number of years. I think I am well within the mark when I say that long before, and up to the time that the hon. leader of the Opposition became the incumbent of that office, the duties were as well discharged as they were since that hon. gentleman took the position. Sir, the people of this country may well complain that the office has been an expensive luxury to Canada; they may well say that that office, although it may be necessary, although it may be in the interest of the country, may be carried on at a less expenditure than it has been. I remember well that I was in Parliament at the time the leader of the Opposition was appointed to that office, and while I was not in the secrets of the party, it was pretty well understood throughout the country and in the House, that at that particular time the late Sir John A. Macdonald wanted to get rid of the late incumbent of the office, but the inducements were not sufficient, and so the importance of the office was increased, increased in many other ways as well as in point of salary. It was then made $10,000 a year as salary, with all the other things appertaining to the office, a free house, taxes upon salary paid, furniture and rent paid, with $2,000 a year for travelling expenses. Even the champagne glasses that were used upon the table of the hon. gentleman, were paid for out of the treasury of this country. There was actually a charge in the account for the winding up of a clock in the residence of the High Commissioner for Canada. Sir, all these things have come out, and the people of the country were astounded, they were amazed, at the charges that were imposed upon Canada in connection with that position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. There never was any such charge—no charge for winding the clock.

Mr. LISTER. I beg pardon. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the Auditor General's report, he will find it. It was unearthed by the hon. gentleman who has just entered the House (Mr. McMullen), either in the House or in the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was a charge of that kind in connection with the High Commissioner's residence?

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. gentleman say that there was no charge for winding up the clock in the office?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not speak of that.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman was appointed to the office. I have never heard, and I have never tried to find out what were the particular duties of the High Commissioner in England. No doubt the records show that the hon. gentleman travelled over France and Spain and other countries, but I never found anything accomplished by the High Commissioner. We heard two

or three sessions ago that the High Commissioner went to Southampton, took off his coat, pushed his hands into a supposed diseased carcase, and declared there was no pleuro-pneumonia. These are the duties performed, so far as the public know of them. The Government found an excuse for establishing the office. What was the excuse? We were told that whereas we had to pay large sums of money to negotiate public loans, when the High Commissioner was appointed this would form a part of his duty, and in this way money would be saved to Canada. It is hinted—I do not know with how much truth—that the High Commissioner did on one occasion negotiate a loan, and it is said that a very considerable commission was kept by the High Commissioner for the negotiating of the loan. That may be true or false—that is the statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. gentleman is abusing most grossly his position as a member of this House. He knows that the only person who ventured outside of this House to make that charge was served at once with a criminal process, and that the newspaper in Montreal, the Montreal "Herald," promptly made the amende honorable, and the hon. gentleman knows that against the party in the city of Halifax who made that charge criminal proceedings were instituted against him, and that case is now before the courts. The hon. gentleman is grossly abusing his privileges as a member in venturing to reiterate a foul, lying statement, in regard to which I took the most prompt and effective measures to bring the parties to justice. The statement that I made, in connection with any loan for the Government of Canada, one single farthing in any shape or way is the most unfounded falsehood any hon. gentleman could make.

Mr. LISTER. Of course, the hon. gentleman says that he has never received any consideration whatever in connection with any loan he negotiated for the people of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman made that statement. All I know is this, that there is a matter of a good many thousands of dollars in connection with a loan negotiated in England that has never been satisfactorily accounted for by the late Government. And I know moreover this, that while the hon. gentleman says he has taken proceedings in Halifax for the prosecution of the man who published the statement, that case has never been brought to trial. Of course, until it is brought to trial, we have no right to prejudge it; we have no right to say what defence will be made. The hon. gentleman says now that the charge made is unfounded. Of course it is our duty to accept the answer of the hon. gentleman and the explanation that he has made here. But, Sir, as I have said, that trial has never taken place.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that I have taken the most prompt measures possible down to the present moment to press that matter to a conclusion.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me; there is another point brought up, that should be either substantiated or withdrawn. The hon. gentleman has made a special and a general charge. He has said that with respect to the loans issued by the late Government there is a large charge in connection with one or more of them that has never been satisfactorily explained to the House. The impression which the hon. gentleman desires to leave, and which he did leave, was that there was a corrupt transaction in connection with a loan. He cannot stay there; he must substantiate what he has stated or withdraw it.

Mr. LISTER. I do not purpose to be dictated to by the ex-Finance Minister either in the House or out of it—and I think the hon. gentleman must not be ignorant of it. The people of the country generally believe that in connection with certain negotiations involving loans in the old country satisfactory explanations have not been made.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I ask the hon. gentleman to specify the loans. I have been Finance Minister from 1889 on. I want to know if that statement includes any loan I issued in London. The hon. gentleman must specify.

Mr. DEVLIN. The country regrets you ever were Finance Minister.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman probably will have an opportunity——

An hon. MEMBER. Answer his question.

Mr. LISTER. I shall not be interrupted by you, Sir. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity, no doubt, before very long——

Mr. FOSTER. But I want the opportunity now. I do not want to lie under an imputation of that kind and have it go abroad to the country, and then for the hon. gentleman instead of specifying his charge, to tell me that some time I shall have an opportunity. It is a base thing to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will just say this——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

An hon. MEMBER. Order, order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What is the point of order raised by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I cannot address the committee, I will speak to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A question was put to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and I suppose he has the floor now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The other hon. member (Mr. Taylor) rose, and he is now addressing the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was going on to say this, that if hon. gentlemen opposite expect to get the Estimates through, they will have to repress their supporters behind them. This item will not pass until the hon. gentleman who made that statement either retracts it or comes down with a definite statement in regard to the ex-Finance Minister, or any other item in the Estimates, even if members stay here three months. If hon. gentlemen are going to undertake to blacken the character of the late Government by insinuations regarding loans——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call hon. gentlemen to order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not speaking to a point of order. If it was argued that I had not the right to speak, I said I would speak to the point of order.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). What is the point of order?

Mr. TAYLOR. The point of order I raise is this, that the hon. member for Lambton has made an accusation or insinuation that he does not attempt to prove.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). That is not a point of order.

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

After Recess.

House again in Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose we were discussing the items in connection with the office of High Commissioner in England, and I was attempting to point out to the committee that the reasons given by the Government for increasing the salary and increasing the expenditure of that office had entirely failed. We were told at that time that the High Commissioner's services would be utilized in the way of negotiating loans for Canada, and that the brokerage charge and commissions that had formerly been paid by the Government for this service, would be saved to the country. I pointed out that it was stated that only one of those loans had been negotiated through the instrumentality of the High Commissioner, and that all the other loans had been negotiated in the usual way, namely, by brokers employed by the Government, to whom the usual commission was paid. I pointed out that there was since a rumour that the reason the Government did not continue to do the business in the way contemplated was that the High Commissioner had negotiated a loan and that he had charged brokerage. I also stated that that charge had been made by a newspaper in Halifax, and as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says he demanded a retraction of the charges in that article; but, as a matter of fact, I believe the editor refused to retract, and the consequence was that criminal proceedings for libel were taken against him. Those proceedings I believe are still pending, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says that the charge made by that paper, and the rumour that he had charged commission upon the loan negotiated through him, are utterly foundationless. I am bound, Mr. Chairman, to accept the statement of the leader of the Opposition unreservedly. That is his statement made upon the floor of this House, and it must be accepted by me here, at all events, until the criminal proceedings have been terminated one way or the other.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) thought proper to take exception to a statement which I made, namely, that he was unable to account as to whom brokerage charges for the negotiations of a late Canadian loan had been paid. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that I have a distinct recollection of his being unable to give that information; but that in making that statement, I did not want it to be understood in any sense that I imputed any personal corruption to him at all. Nothing was more remote from my intention or idea, so far as that is concerned. I wish it to be understood, however, that he as Finance Minister did not give the information as to the brokerage paid by the Government for the negotiation of that loan. Now, my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who is not in his seat now——

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, he is.

Mr. LISTER. I beg your pardon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) took occasion this afternoon to speak in the most fervent language of the virtues and the great services that the ex-High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper) had rendered to the country.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend will excuse me. I believe that the ex-High Commissioner has rendered very great services to the country, but I was not referring at all to the ex-High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper), but to the present High Commissioner (Sir Donald Smith).

Mr. LISTER. Oh, you were not referring to Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. McNEILL. I was referring to a remark which had fallen from an hon. gentle-

man opposite (Mr. Somerville), which was a reflection on the conduct of the leader of the present Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks I made with reference to the High Commissioner were not intended to refer to the present High Commissioner (Sir Donald Smith) at all, but to the ex-High Commissioner, the gentleman who now leads the Opposition in this House.

Mr. McNEILL. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) were applied to all the High Commissioners who had been nominated by the Conservative party.

Mr. LISTER. Well, Mr. Chairman, so far as the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is concerned, a change indeed has come over the spirit of his dreams within the last five or six months. He has certainly changed his views as to the ex-High-Commissioner within a very recent period. If I remember correctly, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) delivered a speech during the last session of this Parliament which reflected very, very severely upon the ex-High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper), and in order to show how a man's mind will turn, and how people may be come hypnotized, so to speak, it will be interesting to the House to know how the hon. member (Mr. McNeill viewed the ex-High Commissioner, only last session. If time permitted, it would be interesting to the House to know how it was that such a change has come within such a short time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) said last session:

I say that the course he (Sir Charles Tupper) has pursued since he came here, goes to show that he is utterly unfit to be the leader of any party in a constitutionally governed country.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly we are a constitutionally governed country, and for a considerable number of days past we have been discussing the constitution, and gentlemen on the other side, including my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), proclaimed that the constitution was shattered and torn to pieces on account of the Governor General's warrants. He continued:

I say unfit to be the leader of any party which has any respect for itself.

Yet we find the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) to-day supporting a leader who, on the 2nd day of April last, he said:

—was unfit to be the leader of any party which has any respect for itself, or the leader of any House that has any respect for itself.

If the information which I have just received is correct, that hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill), who to-night spoke so fervently and so feelingly, and who appears to be so loyal to the leader of his party, on the 2nd day of April last used these words:

Mr. McNEILL.

Any hon. gentleman who has no more consideration for the conscientious differences of members of his own party than the hon. gentleman has shown, is, I say, unfit to be the leader of a party. If ever there was a time when it was necessary for a man to show something of his gifts of statesmanship in the leading of a party, this is the time. If ever there was an occasion when a leader of a party utterly failed to show those necessary gifts, the time is now, and the leader is the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me, surely in this House, or before the country, to repudiate the insinuations that the hon. gentleman has made with regard to my desire for a seat in the Senate. That matter has been before this House already. The hon. gentleman's leader has written a letter with regard to that matter, in which he has stated the very opposite of what the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to insinuate here to-night. Whether that was so or not, whatever the character of the hon. gentleman may happen to be here in Canada, whatever views the people of Canada may happen to hold of the hon. gentleman's record as a public man, I venture humbly to believe that they hold a view of my public record rather different than that which the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to instill into the minds of the people to-night. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I do not think any hon. member on either side will say that I have done anything derogatory, either to my position as a member of this House, or as a member of the Conservative party in this House. I wish I could say as much of the hon. gentleman. He has not been here very long, but he has been here long enough to do what I believe is disgraceful to the party of which he is leader; he has been here long enough, Sir, to give a solemn pledge in writing that a certain resolution, which was amended to suit himself, would receive his cordial support in this House; he has been here long enough, after having given that statement in writing, to speak over and over again to the gentleman to whom he gave that written pledge over his own signature, promising him his support to the resolution when it came up in the House, and he has been here long enough to get up in this House and falsify the pledge he gave, by deliberately opposing the resolution he promised to support. I hope, Sir, that so long as I have the honour of a seat in this House, no such disgraceful record can ever be urged against me. I should be ashamed, Sir, I should hide my head, I should wish leave this House and to retire into private life, if such a statement could be truthfully made against me. The hon. gentleman knows what the facts are. The hon. gentleman is here, and he can contradict what I say, if he pleases; and I will sit down and give him an opportunity to do so, if he can do so.

Then the hon. gentleman did sit down. He went on:

I have his letter, and his letter has been read in this House; and, if the hon. gentleman can give any explanation of the course he has taken in that regard, any explanation which will persuade hon. gentlemen that he has pursued an honourable and straightforward course in that regard, I shall be very happy for the sake of the party that he unfortunately leads.

One can scarcely believe that these words were uttered by the hon. gentleman who rose in his place and spoke so eloquently

of the services of the hon. gentleman whom he now follows. Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as this matter is concerned, I think my view has always been that the expenses of the establishment in London could, in the interests of the country, be cut down. I believe they should be cut down, and I believe the Government in power to-day, in the performance of the duty they owe to the country, will, in this case, as in every other where it is possible, be found exercising that economy which they promised to the country they would exercise. I firmly believe that the Government of the day will be found carrying out the promises they made to the people, and giving to this country an honest and economical administration of public affairs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I imagine that in the history of the Parliament of Canada this is the first occasion on which a few words uttered by the leader of the Opposition in support of an estimate submitted by the Government, have been made the basis of an elaborate attack upon him. I am at a loss to know what this means. I cannot understand it. It is a course so unparalleled, so utterly at variance with what we have been accustomed to in this Parliament, that it puzzles one to arrive at any conclusion as to what it all means. There is only one thing that occurs to me on the spur of the moment: that is, that the Government, having made a motion to go into Supply, instead of raising any question on any motion—and hon. gentlemen know that there are a number of questions that require ventilation—the Opposition were prepared, at the suggestion of the Government, to go into the Estimates without loss of time, and to assist the Government, as far as they could, in expediting the business of the House. Well, Sir what happens? An hon. member who has taken a very prominent part in the transactions of this House for many years, gets up and makes an altogether unprovoked attack on the Opposition, who have shown a desire to facilitate the public business. Was the hon. gentleman acting on behalf of his friends around him who are anxious that this session should not terminate within thirty days? I put it to the committee whether any exhibition has taken place in this House which was more obviously a waste of time or an unqualified obstruction of public business, than that which the hon. gentleman has been guilty of. There was no necessity for his reading from the pages of "Hansard" for the purpose of dragging into this discussion an unfortunate collision which took place between the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and myself. Nobody regrets more than I do that in the heat of debate that unfortunate collision occurred, and I have no doubt that in the heat of that unfortunate collision the hon. member expressed himself more warmly than in ordinary circumstances he would have done. We recognized that that hon. gentleman was just as conscientious in the course he took in obstructing the measure which we believed it our duty to press, as we were in pressing it; and the antagonism which existed between the leader of the party in the House of Commons and a section of the party who differed from us on that unfortunate question which led to those unpleasant exchanges of views on both sides. Why should the hon. gentleman drag in that matter, which is entirely unconnected with the question before the House? He does not mean to say, I suppose, that gentlemen who have acted in opposition to one another, gentlemen who may have spent many long years in determined opposition to one another, are never to become associated again. What does he say to the presence in this Cabinet of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)?

Mr. LISTER. He left your party on account of its corruption.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that my hon. friend from Quebec West, if he will allow me to call him so—because we have always been friends—for many years conscientiously differed from the party with whom he is now associated, and was regarded as one of the strong, active and energetic supporters of the Liberal-Conservative party. I have always regarded the hon. gentleman in that light, and was always proud to have his support in every possible way for the party with which I was connected. I do not complain that that hon. gentleman, for reasons best known to himself, should have felt it his duty and his right to give his support to the gentlemen now on the Treasury benches, and to become a member of that Administration.

I have not challenged that right: but I say that if the fact that gentlemen have been led by active warm debate and discussion to express opinions strongly in opposition to each other, is to prevent their ever acting together again, I think the hon. gentleman will find that it will hardly do for gentlemen on that side to take that position. There can be no question that public interests very often compel gentlemen who have acted in strong antagonism for years to become associated and identified in the same party and work together. I do not intend to take further time in connection with this matter, but I may ask since the hon. gentleman is adopting the course here to-night of obstructing the Government, for his conduct is the most pure and palpable obstruction that this Government has met with since Parliament assembled.—I say unhesitatingly there has been no action on the part of any member of this House that has been so calculated to obstruct the progress of public business—what can be his reason? It looks as if he were alarmed, when he found the Opposition ready to facilitate the

Government in carrying through the public business, lest this session would not go over the thirty days, and therefore he must make an entirely unprovoked attack on the Opposition of this House for the purpose of protracting and preventing business being done. I am not certain that that was the case. I think perhaps there is another reason. Every one knows that the hon. gentleman has been smarting keenly and complaining bitterly of the fact that he was overlooked. Every one knows that no hon. member in this House has felt more keenly the indignity that has been placed upon him by the Government of the day passing by his long continued services on the floor of this Parliament and going to a gentleman who never sat inside of these walls to take the place which he ought to have taken in the Cabinet. Is it possible that it is this smouldering wrath on the part of the hon. gentleman against the Government for having overlooked his services which has led to this unprovoked obstruction of public business ? Let me give the hon. gentleman a little advice and a suggestion, which may be useful to him in the future. The hon. gentleman has been content to do the humblest and most offensive and most unjustifiable work that was ever done on the floor of this Parliament. For long years he has consented to be the scavenger of his party. For long years he consented to lower himself, and what I regret infinitely more, lower and degrade the character of this Parliament, by pursuing just such unworthy courses as he has pursued to-night. He has ventured, when sitting in Opposition, to assail the Government of the day and the members of that Government with foul, baseless innuendos.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LISTER. Let him go on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say innuendos of a most damaging character, which he dare not outside of this House commit himself to for a moment. The hon. gentleman sheltered himself under his prerogative of member of Parliament, to utter the most scandalous libels upon hon. gentlemen where he knows he is safe and protected from retaliation—protected from being placed in the dock, as he would be if he ventured to give these scandalous innuendos that measure of belief on his part, which would enable him to be dealt with by the criminal law of this country. The hon. gentleman found that that is not a very paying service. He has found the men against whom he levelled these attacks still enjoying the confidence of the people of Canada to an extent that he can never hope to enjoy it. He has found that, while these attacks and these innuendos have passed by without inflicting the slightest injury upon their object—these attacks which, I repeat, were not only degrading to himself but calculated to degrade the character of this Parliament as it has never been lowered by any other hon. gentleman in this House—he himself has been passed by just as completely. What has been the result of these attacks ? Why, the Government in whose behalf he apparently took this course of conduct on the floor of this House were ashamed to associate themselves with him as a Minister of the Crown. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he wishes to attain that great object of his ambition at some future day, he had better conform more to the practices that are customary among gentlemen in the Parliament of the country than pursue such a course as he has constantly committed himself to and as he has ventured to pursue to-night. There never was, in the history of Parliament, a more unjustifiable, disgraceful, unwarranted attack upon any hon. gentleman in this House. The hon. member got up here and by innuendo made a charge of gross corruption and malfeasance of office—a charge of having profited by loans put on the market by the people of Canada, a charge of the most disgraceful character, although he knew that the instant it was made, the newspapers that made it were instantly brought to book, and those who did not tender a frank apology, as was done by more than one paper, were subjected to criminal proceedings and the matter placed before the courts. I instructed my counsel, who are present in the House and know the truth of what I say, to proceed as vigorously as possible ; but the party proceeded against, on one pretense or other, obtained postponement, from time to time, and has prevented the issue being tried as promptly as I desired. The parties who were guilty of this libel against my character knew that all they had to do was to place me on the stand and examine and cross-examine me, and they did not do it. Under these circumstances, there has never been an instance, in this or any other Parliament, in which a gentleman, in such a case as that, came forward and took the responsibility of making an insinuation of that kind, knowing that he was sheltered by the privileges of Parliament from being prosecuted, as he would be instantly, if he dared to make outside of this House the statement he made here.

I do not want to assist the hon. gentleman in obstructing public business, but as he has raised the question—and a very important question it is in my judgment—that it is the duty of this Government to cut down the expenses of the office of the High Commissioner in London. I would fail in my duty to Canada if I did not give the House some reason why I think such a course would be most unjustifiable. The position of High Commissioner was instituted by the Government of Canada, and an Act passed fixing the salary at $10,000 a year for the services of that officer with contingencies of $4,000 a year for house rent, fuel, light, carriage expenses and things of that kind. That is the position to-day. The hon. gentleman

ventured to say that before I would accept the office, I insisted upon an increase of the salary and emolument. The statement is as foundationless as all the other statements the hon. gentleman has ventured to make. What happened was this ? When the Government felt that they could not ask Parliament to increase the salary and contingencies of that office beyond $14,000 a year, and the late lamented Sir Alexander Galt declared that he could not afford to hold the office unless the salary was increased, I consented to accept the position at the same salary as that of my predecessor, Sir Alexander Galt.

It was found that during the incumbency of Sir Alexander Galt, at one time he was occupying lodgings in one part of London, and at another time in another part of London. When I came to enter upon the duties of the High Commissionership I suggested to the late lamented Right Sir John A. Macdonald that it would be as well to pay interest as rent and that it was desirable that the High Commissioner for Canada should have a fixed residence, so that every Canadian coming to London, high or low, rich or poor, however humble he might be requiring the services of the High Commissioner, might know at once where he could find him at any hour of the day or night. Under these circumstances the Government decided to purchase a house and furnish it for the use of the High Commissioner, and they charged against the contingencies payable to me $2,000, and brought the contingencies down from $4,000 to $2,000, giving me a furnished house instead of the payment provided for the rent of a house, and the balance of the contingencies were expended under the law in the same way as they had formerly been. No increased expenditure was incurred, and during my incumbency of the office, which commenced in 1883, either here or there, the duties have been discharged to the best of my ability. All I can say is that no officer of this Government ever endeavoured more conscientiously and more untiringly to perform the duties of his office and to do everything that it was possible to do to promote the interest of Canada and to meet the wishes of Canadians of all parties and all classes than I have done. The hon. gentleman would insinuate that the salary paid to Sir Alexander Galt has been increased and that it ought not to be increased. Now, in the first place, no increase has taken place ; and, in the second place I will detain the House a few moments while I call attention to a return laid upon the Table of this House last session in answer to a motion by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) I think. This return says :

In accordance with your instructions, I have caused to be prepared a statement, year by year, of the various correspondence between the Privy Council Office and the High Commissioner's Office in London, from its establishment on the 1st May, 1880, to the 1st January, 1896.

I may state that Sir Alexander Galt was first appointed and that I became High Commissioner in 1883. The following is the table referred to :—

Year	No. of documents.	No. of folios
1880	32	77
1881	47	121
1882	110	210
1883	246	486
1884	669	1,335
1885	657	1,635
1886	1,229	3,487
1887	1,188	2,772
1888	952	2,607
1889	849	2,661
1890	726	3,468
1891	1,223	4,041
1892	1,773	5,808
1893	1,120	3,089
1894	1,509	5,799
1895	1,304	4,423

It will be observed that this shows only the increase of communications between the Privy Council here, and the High Commissioner's office in London. The return goes on :

The following statement shows the amount saved in salaries and allowances to the High Commissionr during the several periods when Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., filled that office without salary :—

From 30th May, 1883, to 20th May, 1884, at $12,000 per annum	$11,934 24
From 27th January, 1887, to 28th May, 1888, at $12,000 per annum	15,813 70
From 15th January, 1896, to 15th March, 1896, at $12,000 per annum.	2,000 00
	$29,747 94

During the whole of this period, from 1893 down to the appointment of the Hon. Sir Donald Smith, the office was under my management, and expenses were saved to the extent given, during the time which I held the office of Finance Minister and had the supervision of the office under the able management of Mr. Colmer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). But you were in Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes ; I was in Canada during the session, and in London during the summer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You were drawing full pay as a Minister ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was drawing full pay as Minister of Finance, but nothing as High Commissioner, and thus the salary of High Commissioner was saved. That is the very point to which I was drawing the attention of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And we had to get an Act of Parliament passed to enable you to sit in the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the interruption of the Postmaster General is justified ; it relates to a different question

altogether from that we are discussing. Unless he also wishes to join his friends in the back benches in obstructing the business of the House. I trust he will allow me to proceed. The hon. gentleman must not forget that we have changed sides in this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I don't think the hon. gentleman has discovered that yet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have so much pleasure in seeing the hon. gentlemen there that it quite reconciles me to the cold shades of Opposition. Now some, like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lister), seemed to think that there is nothing to be done by the High Commissioner and that the salary ought to be decreased. I would draw his attention to the following in this return which was laid upon the Table of the House :—

The following cablegram being of so much importance, I reproduce it here in full :—

Silver coinage since 1883, nominal value, £389,000 ; actual cost, £294,207 ; profit, £94,793. We were able to reduce mint charges in 1883 from five to three per cent, equal to a saving in the period mentioned of about £7,000. Copper coinage, nominal value, £37,400 ; actual cost, £13,103 ; profit, £24,297. Prior to 1880 coinages arranged through Morton, Rose, on commission ; details Finance Department.

There was in connection with this a statement of the correspondence in detail pointing out the great importance of the subjects dealt with. Now, if the House will permit me, I will draw attention to the importance of having a High Commissioner in London. I took up the morning "Times," one day at my breakfast, and I found that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had introduced a Bill into the House of Commons to raise the charge on all foreign and colonial debentures from 2s. 6d. to 10s. per cent, a very important change. I took that matter up, and got all my colleagues from the Australian and South African colonies together. We had interviews with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was then Mr. Goschen, and, after a number of very interesting discussions with him, that Bill was amended in such a way as to relieve the colonies from the increased charge of 7s. 6d. per cent. The hon. gentleman knows that at that time we were in the habit of putting a large amount of our loans upon the market in the form of debentures, and he will at once see the importance of being on the spot and in a position to protect the country in a question of that kind.

Take another question of great importance to Canada and to every British colony—the right to invest trust funds in our securities. At present, by law, that cannot be done. That measure was taken up, and it was prosecuted by myself and my colleagues from the other colonies in the most energetic and determined manner, until a committee was appointed, on which the Lord Chancellor was represented, the Bank of England was represented, Canada, the Australian and South African colonies were represented, the Treasury was represented, and the Colonial Office was represented ; and, after a full and elaborate discussion lasting for months, the committee unanimously reported a Bill to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament, removing that disability from the colonies and giving us the great advantage of having our securities used for the investment of trust funds, a thing that would give at once immense value to our securities. That Bill, however, was not introduced, for the reason that just at the time the Chancellor of the Exchequer had agreed to submit this Bill to Parliament, that unfortunate condition of financial affairs occurred in the Australian colonies that led us all to the conclusion that it would not be a very opportune time. I draw the attention of the House to the efforts that were made, and which all but succeeded, and which have paved the way to future action, when the credit of Australia is restored, as I trust it will be at no distant date, to its former pitch ; and the credit of Canada, as every hon. gentleman knows, stands infinitely higher to-day than it did on that occasion. Now, Sir, why should the hon. gentleman single me out as an object of attack for having accomplished for Canada that which never had been accomplished before for any British colony in the history of the British Empire? What did I do, Sir ? Why, every one knows the vital importance, not only to the credit of Canada, but to the financial interests of Canada, of being able to put our loans upon the British market at the lowest possible rate. When I occupied the position of Finance Minister in this House for two sessions, I was entrusted with authority to negotiate a loan of four million pounds sterling on the London market. Immediately on the rising of the House, believing that the time was more opportune then than it would be later on, and without even going to take leave of my constituents, I hurried to London and took that question up, and succeeded, as I say, for the first time in the colonial history of Britain, in putting a 3 per cent loan on the market in London. Well, Sir, what was the result ? The result was that such was the credit of Canada that we succeeded in getting twelve million pounds sterling offered for the four million pounds we asked, and we got an average price of £95 1s. per cent on that occasion, and those 3 per cent debentures were subsequently put upon the market by my hon. friend the late Minister of Finance, and they have been away up to 106, and are in that neighbourhood to-day. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen may think that all this is very easy, and that there is no necessity of having a gentleman of ability, and industry, and devotion to the interests of Canada, in

a position to deal with great financial interests that are concerned on occasions of that kind: but I think that the result proves that there was an advantage in having a representative in London, when the things occurred to which I have referred. And yet, Sir, those services rendered to Canada, which most Canadians would be proud to recognize, whether they came from a political friend or a political foe, are made the basis of an unfounded and slanderous attack upon the character of the man who performed them.

I do not intend to detain the committee further than to say a few words on this occasion about the staff in the High Commissioner's office in London. The head of that staff is Mr. J. G. Colmer, a gentleman of the highest ability and of the most untiring industry; and, though I have said before that I have a high regard for the civil service of Canada, I do not believe there is a man to be found in that service, more devoted, more able, or more untiring in his efforts to benefit Canada than Mr. Colmer. I may mention also that when I was named by the Board of Trade of Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, to represent them at the late Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, I was unable, of course, on account of the duties that then devolved upon me, to undertake that representation, and they asked me to name a gentleman upon whom they could rely, who would effectually serve them on that occasion. I named Mr. Colmer, and Mr. Colmer, as hon. gentlemen who have followed these proceedings in England know, took part in that discussion in a way that reflected great credit upon Canada. I dare say that hon. gentlemen all know that the "Statist" offered a prize of a thousand guineas, and asked Lord Salisbury and Lord Rosebery to name the person who was to decide the merits of the competitors, and they named the Marquis of Lorne. Mr. Colmer wrote an essay in competition for that prize, and was awarded 500 guineas, or one-half of that prize. That prize was offered on a question of great importance to the people of Canada, a question upon which I am glad to know all parties in this House concur, and that was in relation to the best means of bringing about preferential trade. Now, Sir, I say that not only Mr. Colmer, but every one of the small staff in the office of the High Commissioner, are gentlemen of great ability; they are almost all shorthand writers, they are all good correspondents. Not only is the business done in the most thorough and efficient manner, but these gentlemen are often there until a late hour, in order to overtake the work of the day without increasing the expense. I feel bound, therefore, to say to the House that there has been no department of the public service administered with more efficiency than the High Commissioner's office, and that every gentleman in it, from the highest to the lowest, is unwearied in his devotion to the interests of Canada. I regret to have been obliged to take up so much time, but, as this vote was challenged by gentlemen behind the Government—although I am happy to say that no gentleman on this side challenged it—I feel bound to say, in defence of this estimate, and of the policy that the Government are pursuing, that they would, in my judgment, inflict a most serious injury upon the best interests of Canada, if they failed to see that the office of High Commissioner is filled by a gentleman of great ability and experience, as we all know is now the case; and they would be making a great mistake, if the emoluments of that important public service were in the slightest degree impaired.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman to-night has excelled himself. He has been utterly regardless of facts; he has pursued his usual course of vomiting forth vituperation and abuse of everybody about him. He claims, as he always does, that he is the great man, that he is the man who made Canada, and the inference to be drawn is that when he passes away Canada will sink into utter insignificance. The hon. gentleman took this occasion to charge the Government side of the House with obstruction, simply because a few members on this side thought proper to question the propriety of the Estimates prepared by hon. gentlemen themselves. The hon. member has taken occasion to make an attack upon me. He has stated that I was disappointed because the leader had not thought proper to take me into the Government. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman to-night, as I have stated before, that there was no desire on my part to be taken into the Government. That matter was left entirely with the leader of the Government, and every member of this party is satisfied with what he did, and the hon. gentleman in pursuing these tactics is pursuing his old game. How dare that man, above every man in this country, attack any man for corruption or extravagance. How dare that hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. member has no right to address an hon. gentleman except by an appellation different from "that man."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is the duty of every hon. gentleman to address the Chair.

Mr. LISTER. I repeat again——

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, that was not the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What was it?

Mr. FOSTER. The point is this, that any hon. gentleman speaking in the House ought to refer to another hon. gentleman as the hon. gentleman, or as a member of the

House, and he should not use an opprobrious epithet—"that man," or "how dare that man." I do not think that is respectful or in order.

Mr. LISTER. I say, how dare——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have to address the Chair, and at he same time when he speaks of an hon. gentleman in this House, he must speak of him as an hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. LISTER. In obedience to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I will call the hon. gentleman the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton, which I think he represents. How the hon. member for Cape Breton, above every man who sits in this Chamber to-day, could have the audacity to get up in this House and charge any hon. gentleman with impropriety passes comprehension. How dare the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton rise and in the presence of this House and before the country use an epithet with respect to myself such as "the scavenger of the Liberal party." The hon. gentleman knows that I have sat in this House for fifteen years, and I want to tell him to-night that coming into this House with 345 majority, I was returned by 1,485 at the last election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to know what the hon. gentleman means by 345 majority.

Mr. LISTER. That was my majority at my first election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. First election where?

Mr. LISTER. Fifteen years ago.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I misunderstood him.

Mr. LISTER. I want that hon. gentleman to understand that I regard the good feeling of my constituents more than I do his good feeling, and those constituents, commencing by giving me a majority of 345, have increased that majority at every election, until I stand here to-day by virtue of the magnificent majority of 1,485 votes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman how many candidates there were?

Mr. LISTER. Let the hon. gentleman when he makes such charges across the floor remember that if this country is debauched, politically, he more than any man living in Canada to-day is answerable for it. If there is any man living in this country to-day who has debauched Canada, that man is the hon. member for Cape Breton who sits in this House to-day. The people believed it. He appealed to the country on the 23rd June. He appealed to the people, having prophesied in this House that his Government would be returned; but he was defeated by an enormous majority, who turned the party out of power, they hope so long as the hon. gentleman lives at all events. What do we find? I came into this House in 1882. This party had charged that corruption was going on in the public service. The charge was made over and over again at every election. The hon. gentleman rose in the House and as fervently and as earnestly as he has done to-night denied the statement, and said there was not an atom of truth in it. I believed the duty was thrown on me, with other members, to unravel and expose to the people of the country the terrible extravagance and corruption which we knew was going on. I took that to be my duty to the people of Canada. I undertook it, knowing that such a man as he would call me the scavenger of the party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TISDALE. I rise to a point of order. The same question as that on which the Chairman has already ruled the hon. gentleman out of order is involved.

Mr. LISTER. I will place myself in order, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman will allow me. I knew when I undertook those investigations in 1891 that such hon. gentlemen as the hon. member for Cape Breton would in after years assail me as he has done to-night; but I assumed the responsibility, and in the interest of my country I went through with those investigations and it is not to be wondered at that the hon. member for Cape Breton should rise and assail me in the way he has done. I know the people of Canada approve of what I have done. I know that the people of Canada are at my back, and knowing that, I care not for the vituperation of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper). I do not give one snap of my finger for what he says. I know that I have the sanction and approval of the people of Canada, and I am here to-day to defend myself against the hon. gentleman or any of his friends who may assail me. What are the facts? Sir, up to 1891, these people, charged upon the hustings with demoralizing Canada and debauching our people with the most flagrant corruption that ever was found in the British colony, had the hardihood to deny it. I knew it to be true, and I went to work in the face of almost insuperable difficulties, surrounded by a majority of men who were bound to support the Government through thick and thin, and I pressed on these investigations day after day, week after week, and month after month, until it was proven that the late Government and its followers, and its civil servants in the different departments, were saturated to the very core with corruption. And, Sir,

because in the interest of good government in Canada, I took upon myself that responsibility, and because I proved the hon. gentlemen corrupt as I knew I would, I am to be assailed in this House as the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) has thought proper to assail me to-night. He has asked me why I should bring up the matter in reference to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). Well, Sir, it is incredible that after three or four short months, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) should have so changed his opinion about his leader, and be found singing his praises here to-night. Does the hon. gentleman think for a moment that I object to their reconciliation? No, I am glad to see them shake hands. I knew they would; I knew that my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) would never leave the party no matter what he said. But, fortunately for Canada, there are Conservatives who believing in the utter corruption of the Conservative party have thought proper to leave it. Sir, we welcome these men to our ranks. For men who believe that the policy of a party is bad, and who believe that the party is corrupt, there is no odium attaching to them because of their leaving that party and joining men whom they believe to be purer and better able to govern the country.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) above all others should not talk in the way he has done to-night. Why, he came into this House from Nova Scotia with the reputation of a corrupt politician. The very man whom he afterwards took into his Cabinet, Mr. McLelan, compared him with a man who is sitting in a coach with false hands, and while he exposed the false hands he had his real hands in the pockets of his fellow-passengers. And what more? Prior to the last general election we saw the hon. gentleman going through Canada trying to buy up the electors by wholesale. He goes down to the Island of Prince Edward immediately before the elections, and he proposes to spend two millions of dollars there. He goes to Manitoba and he goes to the Territories, and he proposes to spend other millions there. And what for, Mr. Chairman? Simply to capture the votes of the electorate of the different provinces. Think for a moment of the position which he put himself in. When the Manchester Canal was being built, if Rosebery or Salisbury were to have gone to the constituencies in England, and said: This is a great public work deserving of public aid, and if our Government is returned to power we will give you £10,000,000; if they had said that what would be thought of them. Why, Sir, the Liberal and Conservative press alike in England would have indignantly denounced the party leader who would try to bribe the electorate in such a manner as the hon. member (Sir Charles Tupper) has attempted to do in this Dominion. But in spite of all his efforts, the indignant electorate of Canada ejected him from power. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that I am smarting under the indignity he says has been done to me. I repeat, Sir, that the members of the Liberal party are prepared to stand by the eloquent and pure man who leads that party to-day, and they are prepared to yield to, and to submit to his wishes whatever they may be. We are not like the party over there. There are not three or four sections of this pary. It is a united Liberal party pledged to stand unitedly by its leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman tries to blame the Liberal party for wasting the time of this House. Look at the position of hon. gentlemen opposite for a moment. Here are their own very Estimates submitted by them to this House last session. Here we find the ex-Finance Minister, the leader of the Opposition, and other members of the party, catechising the Government as if they were ignorant about their own Estimates. Sir, the motive is manifest. These gentlemen are wasting time. What was there in the lengthy debate the other day? Nothing, Sir, and even if there was, they themselves have violated the law at least fifty times within the last ten years. Mr. Chairman, I hurl back at the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) the insinuation which he has tried to convey against me. My services to this country have been appreciated by the people, and if there is a desire in Canada to-day that Government shall be more pure than it was, that is largely the result of the investigations of 1891. I made charges against the then Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and hon. gentlemen opposite voted down a request for an investigation. I proved many charges against these gentlemen opposite, but they were whitewashed by their friends in this House. Sir, these investigations of 1891 have had a salutary effect in this country, and I believe we shall never see again—at all events not for many, many years—such a condition of moral depravity as we have seen during the regime of the Conservative party.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not for one moment, Sir, propose to endeavour to emulate the language of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) who has just addressed the House. But, as the hon. member has done me the great favour of referring to me on two occasions this afternoon, I think it perhaps right that I should say a word in explanation of the position I hold. If the hon. gentleman or any other hon. member of that party supposes that because I differed from the policy pursued by the leaders of the Conservative party last session I am any less a Conservative than I have always been, I desire these hon. gentlemen to remove that false impression from their minds with as little delay as possible. It seems to me somewhat remarkable that the hon. mem-

ber who is so anxious to facilitate the business of this House should have travelled altogether outside of the four corners of the question we were discussing, to drag in a subject that had nothing whatever to do with it. We were not discussing the question as to whether the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is or is not an admirable leader of the Conservative party. No one had said anything with reference to that matter. The question of the High Commissionership was before us—the question whether the hon. leader of the Opposition had discharged efficiently his duties as High Commissioner. No one regrets more than I do the incident that occurred during the last session of Parliament; but it had nothing whatever to do with the question we were discussing here to-night. The hon. gentleman, however, unable to find any kind of argument in support of the position he had taken with regard to the High Commissionership, passes off and drags in another question altogether. And all this was in order to facilitate the business of this Chamber. Now, I am glad to see that my hon. friend has been so carefully studying any remarks I have had the honour to make to this House, whatever they may have been. So far as those remarks are concerned, which he has done me the honour to quote here to-night, I will venture to hope, at least, that he will find in them no expression which a gentleman might not use on the floor of the House; and from that point of view, I would most respectfully recommend them to the still further consideration of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, it may not be time spent uselessly if I review briefly what has taken place within the last two or three hours in this House. What were we doing? We were asked by the Government to go into Supply, they having from time to time expressed a very great desire to pass the Estimates and terminate the labours of this session. This afternoon, when they asked us to go into Supply, the Opposition consented, without any motion, without the least attempt to take up time in discussing even important matters, and the House went into Supply. I put it to the House, and I put it to the country, who will read the remarks made during the afternoon, if anything was said on this side of the House on the items which were passed—and a great many were passed—which was not germane to the question that was being considered. When my hon. friend who sits beside me (Sir Charles Tupper) rose to make a perfectly apt and proper comment with reference to one of the items we were discussing, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), who acts as the knocker-out for the party opposite, suddenly arose and commenced a violent attack upon my hon. friend—an attack not in the way of open and honest statement, but in the way of insinuation, almost stating in explicit terms that my hon. friend had been guilty of that worst of all crimes—putting a loan for his country on the market, and making money for himself improperly in connection therewith. If the hon. gentleman does not rearrange what he said this afternoon when "Hansard" comes before hon. gentlemen to-morrow, they will see that that insinuation was made. Now, if the hon. gentleman did not wish to obstruct, if hon. gentlemen opposite were actuated with the simple desire to get through the business of the House, has it come to this, that if an hon. member on this side rises to make a perfectly gentlemanly and apt comment on an item that is being discussed, an attack must, forsooth, be made upon him? If that is to be the course of intimidation and menace, for I care not how old a politician is or how long he may have weathered the storms of battle, it is not a nice thing for his public honour to be impugned in that way in the House of Commons and before the country, with the representatives of the press present to waft the sayings of the hon. gentleman to every part of this Dominion. And so, when the hon. gentleman arose, his statements seemed to be in the line of a stated plan of campaign, that whenever a gentleman rises on this side to comment on or discuss the question under review, he must be subjected to a calumnious attack from hon. gentlemen opposite. Is that to be done? Are we to hear for the thousandth time hon. gentlemen opposite going away from the question under discussion, and launching out into tirades upon hon. gentlemen on this side as men above all things corrupt, and insinuating things ten thousand times worse than they have proved or attempted to prove. If that is the case, hon. gentlemen may find that there are two sides to the question. In the first place, is it a fair way to conduct the business of the House? There are times when recriminations will take place. In the heat of political battles we know that men will call up the records of each other. But for an hon. gentleman in cold blood, when the question under discussion has nothing to do with them, to launch out into charges and epithets such as the hon. gentleman has indulged in, is not consistent with the dignity of a deliberative assembly. Will the hon. gentleman retract what he said this afternoon or not? He has not had the manliness to state that he did not mean what he said. He comes, after having been ear-wigged by the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and others, with a carefully prepared statement insinuating everything charged this afternoon—not having the manliness to say that he did not mean it. As if nothing had occurred, he reads a perfectly cool and carefully-balanced statement, which he had prepared, and then goes on with the discussion of the item under review. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has not done all he should do. When hon. gentlemen take up "Hansard"

to-morrow and read it, if he does not change what he said in the afternoon, the hon. gentleman will be represented as having stated that other Ministers have placed loans upon the markets, and have profited by those loans.

Mr. LISTER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He insinuated it. He almost stated it in as many words. Mark you, Sir, when I asked him to specify, when I said that it was hard for a man to lie under an imputation of that kind and asked him to specify the loan that was implied in his statement, the hon. gentleman had an opportunity to say that he did not mean to insinuate anything improper. Did he do it? No; but he said, "The hon. member will before long have an ample opportunity to answer the charge;" as if he had the charge bottled up and intended to spring it on this House at some time when it suited his own pleasure; and I, forsooth, a humble individual, but one whose honour is something to him, must stand before this House and the country while the hon. gentleman dangles his charges and his insinuations until it suits him to bring them before a committee of this House and try them out. I am within the cognizance of this House, if that was not the tenour, and if those were not the words, of my hon. friend opposite who has just taken his seat. Now, he said not one word after recess with reference to that, except that he did not mean to insinuate that there was anything corrupt in what I did, but that I was asked somewhere about some loan as to the charges and expenses, and that I declined to answer, thus implying that there was something in the loan that was not allowed to see the light of day, and consequently I kept my mouth closed. I ask the hon. gentleman to specify the loan and the charges, I ask him to specify the time and the place, when every explanation was not given as to the charges upon any loan which I have placed upon the market. Now, Mr. Speaker, these things do not make for the credit of Parliament, and they do not make for the common courtesies and the proper amenities of debate: and I tell my hon. friends opposite that, if it is to be a settled part of their programme that every day, and almost every hour, they are to rise and revamp these old charges, when questions are before the House that do not call for them at all, so far as I am concerned, the war will be carried into Africa. But it would be much better that we should conduct business in a different manner. My hon. friend (Mr. Lister) then began to castigate the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) with respect to something which had no reference at all to the business before the House. He read a debate in which the hon. member for Bruce had made some statement regarding the hon. leader of the Opposition. Well, that was a small thing to do, and a childish trick that any one could do. Why, if I chose, I could do something in the same line to-night. I could read statements, which I have under my hand, that the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) made with reference to his present leader—most amusing statements, most cutting statements, which that hon. gentleman has never retracted. And I might read a counter-statement made by the First Minister himself in 1884, when he retaliated on my hon. friend in a very sharp and biting manner. But that would not count for anything. It would simply mean that these men had different opinions at one period of their history, and that they had subsequently changed those opinions. The only thing a public man prizes in this country—and he does not get much else—is his reputation and character for honesty. I say that neither on one side of the House nor on the other ought we gratuitously, by insinuation or otherwise, to assail and throw doubts upon the public honour of men who are trying to serve their country. If a man does wrong, and another knows it, let that other bring his charge manfully, and have it tried out, so that the innocent may be able to prove his innocence. But this charging by innuendo, by implied and veiled assertion, continually thrown out, and which, on the wings of a partisan press, is spread from one end of the country to the other, leaves its sting of poison in thousands of minds, who know neither one of the parties. That is some thing like the assassin's work, and the sooner hon. gentlemen abandon it, the better. I want to emphasize this point. If the Government wish to see the business of the House carried through—and I am not saying this by way of menace in the least—I do ask them that, when we are discussing the Estimates, we may keep to what is germane, and leave the character and the reputation of honourable men where it ought to be, and not, by implied assertion and innuendo, try to set current in the world what men dare not state by specific charge and attempt to prove.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I do not rise for the purpose of prolonging this debate or indulging in what must be felt by hon. gentlemen on both sides to be useless recrimination. Those who know my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Foster), know how perfectly harmless his little moral lectures are. We have listened to them in this House the last fifteen years, almost in the same words. His moral lectures are as harmless as his undisguised threats, and the Government do not propose to deviate from their course because of any such lectures or threats. They propose to try and carry through the Estimates, by giving all explanations that hon. members can reasonably ask for. We are perfectly aware of the strength of the Opposition in prolonging debate, and have an evidence of it in

the undue prolongation of this debate in which hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to indulge to-night. I am in the judgment of the House, when I say this. After the little sparring which took place in the afternoon and the explanation of my hon. friend from Lambton in the evening, the matter might well have been allowed to drop. We had a charge made by my hon. friend against the leader of the Opposition, which that hon. gentleman denied in the most emphatic terms, and then we have that denial accepted most unreservedly by the hon. member for Lambton.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, whether my hon. friend did not accept the denial unreservedly; and, when an unreserved acceptance is made, the hon. leader of the Opposition ought to know, as an old parliamentarian, that it was his duty to accept the withdrawal, just as it was my hon. friend's duty to make it. The matter might well have been allowed to drop at that point, but for one hour we had to listen to oft-repeated statements, which have been made on every platform of Canada, of what my hon. friend did when he was High Commissioner.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was that germane to the charge that the office was overpaid and the service valueless?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not want to be too critical. I know my hon. friend's leaning to extended and prolonged statements, but I venture to say that, with his ability, he could have comprised all he had to say within five minutes. Then we had a speech from the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), with reference to some statement made by the hon. member for Lambton, of which he complained. What was that statement? My hon. friend from Lambton simply said that there were certain charges for discount and brokerage and management in connection with a loan, which had not been satisfactorily explained to him, and he declared that, in making this statement, he did not imply any charge of corruption or wrong-doing. In this he was exercising his legitimate and perfect right of criticism as a member of this House, and the matter should have been dropped. We have had recriminations enough, and I am sure such recriminations do not add to the dignity of the House; and I appeal to hon. gentlemen whether, at this late hour we might not be allowed to proceed with the Estimates. We have had explanations on both sides, we have had personal encounters across the House which have been listened to with some amusement, and now that it is all over, let us get to work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am perfectly aware that hon. members can prolong this debate, but let it be understood that there shall be no evasion before the country. I was long enough in Opposition to know the powers of the Opposition; and I am prepared to recognize them and to sit in my seat quietly and let hon. gentlemen talk. I know that hon. gentlemen can waste from now until two o'clock and make very able, and some of them very brilliant speeches, but the business of the House will not be proceeded with. There is no public question debated. Let us get on with the Estimates. If any estimate is brought before the House that provokes criticism or calls for comment, let that criticism or comment find voice. But, if not, I appeal to hon. gentlemen as business men, after what has been said and done, let us get on with the business of the House.

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite sure that on neither side of the House is there an hon. gentleman who would less desire deliberately to misrepresent me than the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Davies), and I am quite sure that what he said with regard to myself he said in the most perfect good faith. When he said the whole matter had passed, but that I referred to some matter of difference——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said I did not object to the hon. gentleman's criticism on that.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman said that the whole matter would have been over with when we came back from dinner, but that I had made reference to——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, no; you misunderstood me.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say this—that my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) made the statement that I referred to the hon. leader of the Opposition in the course of the remarks I had made before dinner, and I got up to say that I had done nothing of the kind. And then, instead of accepting my denial, the hon. gentleman went on to quote at length this speech which he had been studying and which I commend to his consideration still further. I think my hon. friend will see that I had nothing whatever to do with prolonging the discussion.

Mr. TISDALE. I regret very much to hear the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am quite prepared to give the hon. gentleman credit for proposing to carry on these Estimates on the line expressed by my hon. friend. But he must consider what started this disturbance. I want to say this in all seriousness—I have never obstructed the proceedings of the House, and I do not propose to obstruct the passing of these Estimates, and

when gentlemen opposite bring in good measures I will support them. But the hon. Minister did not put this matter in such a way that I am prepared, as a humble member of this House, to sit still and refrain from expressing dissent. If he had said one word in the way of putting responsibility upon the gentleman who, he cannot deny, started this disturbance, or if he had disavowed the action of his supporter in going out of his way to say a thing that to say the least of it—because I do not propose to go into it further, because he has been well answered—would have been better left unsaid; it would have been much better, and I would have desired, for my part to go on as rapidly as possible with the Estimates. But when the hon. Minister rises and coolly and deliberately ignores statements, which he could not gainsay, by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) as to the way in which this disturbance arose and intimates that he is going to hold us up to the country as obstructing the business of the House, I think it is too much, and I confess that I feel it not a little. For my own part—and I appeal to my past record—I have never attempted to obstruct and I do not propose to do so now. But I shall not be afraid to stand up to say what I deem it my duty to say because the hon. Minister makes such a statement with regard to us, without one word of disapproval of the gentleman behind him, who caused all this discussion, and not only that but prolonged it by speaking two or three times and by failing to take back any of his charges; for his pretended—and I use the word advisedly—his pretended taking of them back was almost worse than the original charge. We had the ruling of the Chair. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) is an old parliamentarian and that is the reason that I insisted—as I very seldom have done—upon a point of order; for when an old parliamentarian wilfully and deliberately persisted in charges which must lead to disturbance, no cry to the country that we are obstructing business justifies us in remaining silent. I do not think it would be fair or manly for us to allow this debate to terminate without disavowal and some assurance to us—because we have rights, and when gentlemen who are opposite were on this side I often had a great deal of sympathy with them in the position they took in these matters, though I am not prepared to do as they did in unduly prolonging the debates—that hon. gentlemen behind the leaders, and hon. Ministers themselves will not provoke these discussions. I think I understand the feelings of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I can say that we will not tolerate this sort of attacks without replying to them. If hon. gentlemen will give us assurance that they will stop these attacks, as they can do, though I understand that at times they are not to be held wholly responsible for them, it will be easy to confine the debate within the limits it should be confined to. Just one word more. We hear gentlemen opposite say frequently that these Estimates are our Estimates. Now, to a certain extent that is quite proper. The Minister of Public Works to-day, in discussing his Estimates, was fair about that; he did not try to shirk the responsibility of the Estimates because we prepared it, but he did say quite properly, There are certain things in the department I have not had time to master; there are so many clerks of one sort and another, and I have not had time to get the statements of those officials under me. I am sure that the Ministers themselves will not consider that our criticism has been unfair. If we can avoid such discussions as we have had, I think we should try to do so, for they are very regrettable in every way. I believe that the Ministers themselves do not approve of this sort of discussion any more than hon. gentlemen on our side. I do not think they will object to reasonable discussion such as the one that has taken place about the Governor General's warrants, and which, whatever may be thought upon it upon each side, was a matter of much importance, and is worthy of challenge and debate. But these recriminations, these attacks, are most regrettable. I say it was an attack, and a most unjustifiable one, because it was neither the time, the method, the place, nor the proper way to make it. In addition to attacking the leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman went further and attacked the whole Conservative party. He went back into questions of so general a nature that you would hardly use them in a campaign speech, let alone in Parliament. I will even go so far as to say that if every hon. gentleman on this side got up and replied to that attack, it would be serving that hon. gentleman right who made it. I am not going to say it would be right to detain the Cabinet Ministers, if they show that they do not approve of such conduct. But I must say that I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) rather attempted to justify the hon. gentleman instead of trying to pour oil on the troubled waters. I think his own remarks were rather in the line of justifying the hon. gentleman who caused the disturbance, and who naturally raised party feeling by his aggressive language. I think if he had said a little more in condemnation of his friends on that side of the House, probably the debate would not be so prolonged.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before you left the Chair at six o'clock, I rose to a point of order. I made the statement that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) had charged our respected leader and the ex-Minister of Finance with corrupt and dishonourable motives. I raised a point of order, it was then six o'clock, and you ruled that there was no point of order. The point I raised was

that the hon. gentleman should retract, inasmuch as the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Finance Minister had repudiated the statement, and you ruled that there was no point of order in it. I would have appealed from your ruling, had it not been six o'clock. I want to know now, as a member of the House in Opposition, if this ruling is to prevail, if an hon. gentleman on that side can charge members on this side, and ex-Ministers, with dishonourable and dishonest motives; and when they have repudiated the charge, I want to know whether it should not be retracted? The hon. member for West Lambton came in at eight o'clock, after having been taken by the throat by the Premier, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and by the Finance Minister; he came in with a carefully prepared statement. But he has not yet retracted any of the charges he made against either of these two other hon. gentlemen. I stated then, and I repeat now, that this item will not go through until a full and ample retraction is made. As the ex-Minister of Finance has said, when you read "Hansard" to-morrow you will find that the statements he made have gone broadcast, that these two hon. gentlemen have been guilty of dishonest and dishonourable transactions, and that the Chairman has ruled that the hon. gentleman who made the charge has nothing to retract. Now, I claim that it is the duty of the Government, if they want these Estimates to pass, either to make themselves a full and ample retraction, or to require a retraction to be made by the hon. member who made the charge.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is always regarded in the country that the conduct of the House of Commons may fairly be taken as a proper example for others to follow, either in debate or in committee. We have rules and regulations laid down to govern debate, and we are expected to observe them, not only as members of the House of Commons, but as gentlemen in our conduct towards each other. In the discussion which took place this afternoon upon the Estimates, I think there was no disposition shown on this side of the House to interfere with the progress of business. The questions asked were proper ones, were reasonable ones; they were asked decorously, and in many instances we got replies in the same spirit. But at an unfortunate moment an hon. member on that side of the House saw fit to diverge from the course of the debate, and make insinuations against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that would not be allowable outside of this Chamber, that would not be tolerated by one gentleman to another without a full retraction. Now, that hon. gentleman, I regret to say, is in the habit of doing this, and he has never shown a disposition in this House to act the part of an hon. gentleman whose duty it is to retract statements when they are denied by the hon. gentlemen against whom they are made, and when he is called to order by the Chair. Up to six o'clock the hon. gentleman made no effort to retract. There is no doubt that his insinuations, if believed by the country, would be very detrimental to the character and standing of some hon. members of this House. People would believe that these gentlemen are corrupt beyond anything that ever was known in Canadian parliamentary history, and that they were not fit to remain members of Parliament, or even to associate with respectable people. These innuendos were uttered and these insinuations were made, and when a denial was given by the hon. gentlemen against whom they were hurled, they were not retracted in the manly way which the amenities of debate required. Now, what can we think of the character of an hon. gentleman who does that? What does Shakespeare say of such a character:

> He who steals my purse steals trash.
> * * * * * *
> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which does not enrich him
> And makes me poor indeed.

I see the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) laughs in derision. Shakespeare, the great artist, represents such a man as lower than a sneak-thief, who would take your purse in the street. Is this the man the hon. gentlemen is prepared to defend? Is the language used here to-day such language as one member should use to another under the rules of Parliament? I think it is far from it. It ill becomes any hon. member to make such charges, and a retraction of the insinuations made against the two hon. gentlemen should have been made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) before six o'clock. Did he do it? No. After eight o'clock he accepted the ruling of the chair, and said, "I conform to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as I am bound to do;" or in other words, he would do what he was compelled to do. But following that charge, a short time afterwards declared that the hon. member was the most corrupt politician that ever came from Nova Scotia. Is that in harmony with what we consider the amenities of Parliament? Again, he said that the same hon. gentleman was one of the most debauched politicians who ever sat in this House. A man would be more than human if he could sit still in his seat and hear such accusations without trying to repel them. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in an apologetic tone addressed the House, and in a half hearted way justified what had been done by the hon. member for Lambton, and endeavoured to draw a red herring across the path by making it appear that the Opposition were resorting to obstruction when they were endeavouring to defend their characters in this House.

Such action ill became the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and hon. members on this side of the House expected he would act differently. While I have no disposition to retard the progress of business, I cannot sit still and hear those irrelevant and offensive insinuations, remarks and innuendos reiterated without in some way trying not to retaliate, because I do not propose to retaliate, to keep within the amenities of debate and do what is fair and just towards hon. members on this side of the House. We have an important duty to perform, namely, to criticise the Estimates. I can appeal to the House and the country that so far we have not gone beyond the bonds of fair criticism. We have dealt fairly with hon. gentlemen opposite, for we have felt that hon. gentlemen opposite have been charged for only a short time with the responsibility of administering public affairs and could not be expected to have mastered the details of the various departments, and it appears to me that we have a right to expect courteous replies to our inquiries, and in fact we have been kindly disposed towards hon. gentlemen opposite and have allowed items to pass that under other circumstances would not have been allowed to pass so rapidly. Sometimes when we have asked for explanations regarding items we have been told that the Estimates were prepared by our friends, and that we should be satisfied. Although these may be the Estimates of our own friends to a large extent, they never were examined by Parliament to such an extent that members were enabled to make inquiries and obtain necessary information. But hon. gentlemen have assumed the responsibility of defending those Estimates. If those Estimates were wrong, it was their duty to have them corrected. It is not in my opinion a poorer reply to make that because those Estimates were prepared before hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, we must accept them as they are. If so, I would suggest that we pass the Estimates en bloc and save time, or only criticise items in which a difference appears between the Estimates submitted last session and those now before the committee. But as I understand the position, hon. gentlemen opposite have become responsible for the Estimates before the House to-day, each Minister for his own department and the Ministry for the Estimates as a whole, and we are entitled to ask for such explanations as are necessary, whether the amount asked is right or wrong, much or little, and whether it is going to be properly or improperly expended. That is all we expect; we do not wish to delay the work of the House, but we expect to receive replies courteously from hon. gentlemen as becomes Ministers of the Crown. We do not expect that every few minutes some hon. member will rise and abuse this side of the House when we ask these questions in all courtesy and fairness, and I hope it will be a long time in the history of this Parliament before we see another exhibition such as that presented before six o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not have troubled the committee with any remarks on the subject that has occupied so long the attention of the committee except for a reference made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) respecting an alleged charge contained in a Halifax newspaper against the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Lambton either did not know the facts——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. This discussion has gone far enough, and this is a proper time to stop it. I ask the hon. member to speak only to the item. There has been a charge of insinuation made by an hon. member of this House, but that charge has been withdrawn. I think it is time the committee got down to business and discussed the item now under consideration, and I will ask hon. gentlemen to confine themselves to a discussion of the item.

Mr. WOOD. I rise——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is my ruling.

Mr. WOOD. I rise to make a suggestion to the Deputy Speaker, having had some experience in the Chair, and it is that all attempts at stifling discussion in the past have proved dismal failures, and the best way of expediting business and preventing motions, which can be made by any member of the committee at any time, is to allow this debate to go on so far as possible without checking unnecessarily any statement made by an hon. member in the course of it. I undertake to say that there will be nothing in the nature of opposition or undue obstruction, for I do not approve of that in any case.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Give them plenty of rope.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to inquire, Mr. Chairman, whether you intend to prevent the hon. member for Halifax replying to a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton in this debate, a very important statement, which the hon. member for Halifax is in a position to speak to authoritatively.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that complaint has been made against the hon. member for Lambton that he made charges against some members of this House. That hon. member has withdrawn the charges he made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is my ruling. Consequently, I think the discussion has already gone too far, and we must now confine ourselves to the item under con-

sideration, and I will not allow any discussion outside of that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I move, seconded by Mr. Foster:

That the Committee do now rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, if I had been allowed to proceed one moment ago, I think you would have seen, Sir, that it was not necessary to interfere, because I was about to address myself, not to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister) before Six o'clock, but to the alleged explanation which he made when the House resumed after recess. The statement which the hon. member (Mr. Lister) then made was that a charge had been made in a newspaper in Halifax respecting the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), in somewhat the terms which he (Mr. Lister) used. The hon. member (Mr. Lister) cannot have investigated very carefully the newspaper article in question, nor the legal proceedings which were taken in consequence thereof, or he would have found out this: when legal proceedings were taken, the editor and the proprietor of that newspaper were the very first to disclaim that they had made any charge. Their defence was, in the first instance, that they had not published the charge, and we had to call every printer in their establishment, and to call experts all over the city of Halifax, and to occupy the time of the court for between two or three weeks before we could establish the fact of the publication at all. Their defence, when they did come to open it, was, not that there was any justification for the charge, but that they had a right to publish it in the public interest, whether it was true or not, and counsel for the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) publicly challenged them in the course of that investigation to prove that charge, and publicly offered by his counsel, in open court, to give every possible facility to them, if they should see fit to set up the truth of that charge as justification. They did not take any step in the course of these proceedings which indicated their willingness to accept that challenge, but they sought rather to defend themselves on technical grounds, first, that publication had not been proved, and second, that, under a clause in the criminal code, they had a right to publish this charge in the public interest, whether it was true or not. I think it would have been better for the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) to have investigated that fact a little more fully before he saw fit to make in this House the statement which he did make in regard to it. I understood from some remark of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) that he insinuated that the proceedings in that prosecution had been delayed at the instance of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I wish to repel that insinuation in the most emphatic terms. The prosecutor's case was closed some time ago, and the reason that the proceedings have not been brought before the higher court is due to the fact that the cause is now pending for the purpose of putting in whatever evidence the defence may require to produce. That is the fact so far as these proceedings are concerned, and that fact is within my own personal knowledge.

Now, I do not desire to unduly criticise in any way the remarks which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has made, but I do venture to think that, if every member of this House saw fit to indulge in tirades such as we have been favoured with from that hon. gentleman, the public business of this House would be very much obstructed. It would be easy for all of us to give way to our feelings sometimes and to indulge in recrimination of this kind, and I suppose that every member of this House is more or less capable of doing that very thing. So far as I am concerned, and whatever the provocation may be, I do not intend to indulge in it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) did me the favour, on a former occasion, to refer in somewhat strong terms to myself, but I shall not attempt to answer him now. He did me the honour to state that my address to the House resembled an argument in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must not refer to a previous debate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, but it has been done several times in this House, and it has not been ruled out of order. I have known that rule before I came to the House, and since I came here I notice that it has been much more honoured in its breach than in its observance. I think the hon. member (Mr. Davies) must be as well aware of that fact as any other member in this House.

Now, I have the honour to belong to the same profession to which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) belongs, and I have had the honour to meet a great many representatives of the bar of the province of which he is so distinguished a member, and I regret to say that I cannot return the compliment which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has bestowed upon me. I have heard a great many very eminent counsel from Ontario address arguments to the highest court of appeal in this country, and in no case did those arguments, in tone, in style, or in character, in the least resemble any remarks which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has ever seen fit to address to this House in my hearing. The hon. gentleman has ventured to say that he is a member of this House of some fifteen years' standing. If, after fifteen years in this House of Commons, which is supposed to improve the tone and the morals of hon. gentlemen, he

makes such an exhibition as he has made on various occasions since I have been here, I am almost tempted to inquire what must have been the style of the hon. gentleman's remarks, when he first came into this House. I do not think, Sir, that incidents of this kind add to the dignity of this House, and I must say that, in common with some other members, I was a little disappointed at what seemed to me the somewhat flippant manner in which the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Daives) treated this incident. An incident like this, which certainly tends not to increase the dignity of this House, is not, I think, to be described by a Minister of the Crown as a "sparring match." I do not believe that is a proper term to apply to it, and I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) might very well have taken a course which would have added a little more to the dignity of the House than by using the remarks which he has seen fit to offer. I have ventured to take up the time of the House to this extent, only because I thought it necessary, in view of what I personally knew of the case to which the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister) referred to after dinner, to-night.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I presume the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not intend to press his motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For what purpose should the motion be pressed? The object of it has been accomplished, I understand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I moved the adjournment in order to test the sense of the House as to the attempt of the Chairman to interpose his ruling and establish a precedent of this kind. Past experience in this House is that an attempt on the part of the chairman of a committee of this House to introduce the closure at pleasure, and to stop discussion when he, in his judgment, thinks fit, is a course that an Opposition discharging its duty as it ought to discharge it, is bound to take notice of. I do not hesitate to say that if the opportunity had been denied, as the Chairman was disposed to deny it, I should have felt it necessary to appeal from that ruling to the Speaker of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman does he propose to test the opinion of the House on this point?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman does, it is just as well for us to know it. I understand that the hon. gentleman said he had a certain object in view.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the object has been attained. A very important statement has been made, in reference to the charges which were made, and which were ruled to be withdrawn, but to an incident connected with that charge which had not been withdrawn—a statement which it was necessary should come from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). That object having been attained, I am willing to withdraw the motion.

Motion, that the Committee rise, withdrawn.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I have been waiting for the hon. member for West Lambton, or some hon. Minister for him, to retract in full the insinuations and direct charges he made against our leader and the ex-Minister of Finance before dinner. This has not been done. Unless it is done, I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the hon. member for West Lambton is again in his place. He has stated that he did not wish to impute any corrupt motive to me in the charge which he made this afternoon, and which he repeated to-night. I now ask, as a mere matter of fairness to him, that he will leave the general ground, which it is so easy for him to take, and do me the kindness of specifying what loan he refers to, what information I refused to give, and the occasion on which I refused to give it. He has not taken away the onus when he simply states that he does not impute a corrupt motive. He has left the insinuation and the charge that I kept in the dark what I ought to have revealed, and I would like the hon. gentleman to give me the opportunity, by making a specific statement, so that I may look into the matter, and be able, if I think it necessary, to make a statement to this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak now.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the hon. gentleman proposes to leave myself and the House in the dark completely on a general charge, which, if it does not imply direct corruption, implies that there was something I wished to conceal. I leave it in the judgment of the House and of all fair-minded men if that is gentlemanly and proper treatment.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. McMULLEN. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, whether a second motion of that kind can be made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would say to my hon. friend that that motion is not in order, a similar motion having been just made and nothing having since intervened.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just wish to say to my hon. leader that if I understand parliamentary rules, his motion was that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, while mine is that the committee rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I rule this motion out of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the only motion competent to my hon. friend to make is that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I do not know what motions have or have not been made; but I think I went through a parliamentary experience of this kind, and I have no objection to giving hon. gentlemen opposite the benefit of it. I think it was published, when we were discussing a very important matter some years ago, that the same motion cannot be made twice in succession; but the hon. gentleman may move that the committee rise and report progress, and if that is voted down, he may move that the committee rise; so that, if you want to know how to obstruct the business of the House, you may continue motions of that kind alternately as long as the physical endurance of the committee will permit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With all respect to my hon. friend's experience, the correct motion, I believe, is that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not necessary even to make that motion. We can discuss the question. The hon. Postmaster General has joined in the insinuation that members on this side of the House are bent on obstruction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not either join in it or suggest it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said that if hon. gentlemen want to obstruct, they can go on moving motion after motion. That insinuation was made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they knew that the question had been discussed in caucus, and that they had decided that the session should not close within 30 days.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; take it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will not take it back. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have admitted that it was discussed. I say that from the commencement of the session every disposition has been shown by the Opposition to close the session within the shortest space of time possible. If any obstruction has been raised, it has been raised on the other side of the House, as it was raised this afternoon, first by the hon. member for North Wellington, and then by the hon. member for West Lambton. The day has been more than half occupied by hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Government making charges which were foundationless, and then refusing to take them back, and apologizing according to parliamentary rules. The hon. member for West Lambton apologized after dinner for the charges or insinuations he had made against hon. gentlemen on this side; but he has not in my opinion made that full and ample apology which is due to those hon. gentlemen to whom he imputed dishonest and dishonourable motives; and until that is done, I do not think it would be fair to those hon. gentlemen that this item should be allowed to pass. That hon. gentleman being now in his place, and having been requested by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance to do the thing that is honourable, when he does so the passing of the Estimates will go on as fast as the members of the Government desire. But until the retraction is made as fully as it ought to be made, I do not intend that the items shall be allowed to pass. I move that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Motion negatived: yeas, 51; nays, 75.

Governor General Secretary's Office..... $13,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the foot note on page 12:

From the amounts appropriated for the contingencies of the several departments there may be paid (in addition to the amount, $600, authorized by the Civil Service Act or otherwise), a sum not exceeding $600 each for the salaries of the private secretaries of the several departments, and of the Solicitor General and Controllers of Customs and Inland Revenue, when the persons appointed are not at the time of their appointment members of the permanent Civil Service of Canada; further, that such sums may be paid notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that an increase? The amount now allowed is $600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am quite sure the hon. gentleman would not ask any private secretary to assume the functions of that office for $600 a year. Our hon. friends opposite have in most cases taken their private secretaries from the departments, and the $600 was given them in addition to their usual pay.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it the intention to take private secretaries from the outside and allow them $1,200 a year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not expect in all cases to take our private secretaries from the permanent civil service, and we certainly ought to be allowed the privilege to bring in from the outside gentlemen who hold close and confidential relations with us, when we do not feel warranted in taking them from the civil service as at present constituted. In some cases, we may take our private secretaries from the civil service, and in these cases shall be free to use the allowance of $600 in addition to the usual pay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As the law stands, all the salary that a private secretary can receive is $600 a year. It is perfectly true that a person in the civil service may be appointed private secretary and

have that allowance of $600 in addition to his usual pay, but the result of this change is to change the law by raising the salary of private secretaries from $600 to $1,200. That is rather a startling change.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can see at a glance that it is much preferable for a Minister to select his private secretary from the service, but if he does not, and if there is not a vacancy in the service in which to put him, all he can pay his private secretary is $600 under the law. I think it would be better to estimate for a second-class clerkship than to make this innovation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The practice followed by the late Government was to take the private secretaries from the permanent staff. He would be generally a second-class clerk, and if you added the $600, you would have the salaries of your private secretaries ranging from $1,200 to $1,700. And it was not put plainly and squarely before the House as it is in this case. Take my own department, for instance. There was no vacancy to which I could appoint a man. I have either to take one of the existing officials in the office and make him my private secretary, or ask for this special grant, or in some way try to get around the Act. We thought that the last course was imprudent and improper, and that it was better, as there was no vacancy, to let the private secretary have a salary of $1,200, which was less than was paid to most private secretaries under hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. While this has some commendable features, it is not to be forgotten that it allows the appointment of fourteen or fifteen clerks more than are in the establishment at this time. Heretofore, to give a secretary what was considered a fair salary he was made a third, or, sometimes, a second-class clerk, and given besides $600 or some portion of it. I can see the force of what is now proposed, because we have no power to appoint third-class clerks. If this plan were not taken, I suppose that what would be done would be what I understand my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works proposes to do—to appoint his secretary a second-class clerk giving him the minimum salary of that position and also whatever portion of the $600 the hon. gentleman pleases, which, I suppose, would be the whole. Under the circumstances, the matter of economy may be fairly well provided for. Is it perfectly saved by the clause that the extra $600 or any portion of it shall not be given to any man in the service?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Contingencies—Queen's Privy Council for Canada ..... $ 7,900

Mr. FOSTER. I notice a change in the form of this estimate, and I would like to ask why it is adopted. Hon. gentlemen who have been in the House for a considerable time will remember the persistent criticism made on this side because the contingencies, instead of being voted in a lump sum, should be divided into their component parts, so that the whole amount of the contingencies could not be used, say, for clerical assistance, but that there should be a fair estimate made of what each of these would probably cost. I thought there was a good deal of force in that criticism and I adopted the suggestion, so that, for the last three or four years these estimates for contingencies have been divided in that way. Now I find that hon. gentlemen opposite in some of the departments are lumping "sundries" with "clerical and other assistance." In this case the Minister would have the power to employ clerks up to the amount of $4,900. That is not the best thing for a Minister, I think, because when money is available, he is always open to urgent applications. I would like to know why these items are combined in this case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general rule adopted was to make three items —"clerical and other assistance," "Printing and Stationery," and "sundries." I notice that in the case of the Privy Council the amount of this is divided into two items only. I confess I can give no reason for it. I think it is a mere accident.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I notice that as compared with the first series of estimates brought down, there is an increase of $300, the total being $7,600 instead of $7,900 as it is here. Where does that increase come in?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman thinks the point of importance I would ask him to wait until the Premier is present. But this is a very little baby, and I think the explanation might be postponed until concurrence.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no objection.

Department of Militia and Defence..... $7,100

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask that this be allowed to stand until we can get the decision of the Government—unless the Minister of Militia is prepared to give it now—as to whether they will bring down Major General Gascoigne's letter to the Commandant of the Royal Military College. This is a matter of supreme importance, as every hon. gentleman who will look at it dispassionately will see.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am quite willing that the item should stand.

Department of the Secretary of State.... $5,500

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask that this item also be allowed to stand. I propose to ask the Department of Secretary of State to make provision for the services,

the very valuable and efficient services of a clerk who performed a large amount of work in the Secretary of State's department, who had not passed the examination, but who was willing to do this work subject to being paid after having passed the examination. This gentleman, a very experienced man whose services were absolutely necessary in the work of the department was willing to run the risk of having his remuneration left over until he had made himself eligible for payment by passing the examination. Under these circumstances I would like to see some person who would be in a position to answer for the Secretary of State's Department, that that matter would be favourably considered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman state the name ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Blount. He is the gentleman who is appointed by the Speaker to act as my private secretary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The item might pass, and there could be a special item in the Supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, we cannot enlarge this ; it might come in the supplementaries. We have undertaken to pay the $600 extra to each of the private secretaries out of contingencies, and in most cases contingencies have not been enlarged, because it was thought the amount was sufficient to enable us to pay the $600. But in this case it was felt the $600 could not be met without some corresponding increase, and we have added half of it to contingencies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman would undertake favourably to consider the case I have stated, and bring it under the notice of the Secretary of State, I would be obliged to him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise the hon. gentleman to inquire ; I can go no further than that.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the private secretary of the Secretary of State ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Kehoe.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not a civil servant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is a reporter on the "Free Press."

Contingencies—Office of the Auditor General ....$ 3,500

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $500 for clerical and other assistance ; could the hon. gentleman tell us why this is ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may reply, but I am afraid the hon. gentleman won't accept it as a good reason that this amount was placed in the Estimates by my predecessor, and I am advised that in that department the previous appropriations were found to be short, and the increase was necessary.

Contingencies—Department of Finance and Treasury Board $6,800

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $350 for clerical and other assistance ; what does that mean ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The reason is the same as in the case of the Secretary of State's Department, that is to say, the provision for the private secretary will make an extra charge on that item, and we have increased it. But we have reduced it in sundries, so that both appropriations remain the same.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the private secretary in this case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My own private secretary is Mr. C. B. Burns, barrister-at-law. He is not a member of the civil service.

Contingencies—Post Office Department...$ 44,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. There seems to be an increase here of $4,000 in clerical and other assistance over the estimates in the first series.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The estimate is for the staff as it was left by the hon. gentleman, and as I find it. The hon. gentleman remembers there was a reduction in the estimates for civil government by a reduction in the staff. I find that the late Government, in the last year, after those estimates were passed, made some eight additions to the staff, making an increase of some $2,200.

Mr. FOSTER. Could my hon. friend say in what those increases were made. Were they in temporary help ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the strength of the staff, as it was left by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was spent last year $20,500, that is, they had the advantage of getting the whole amounts up to the end of the fiscal year.

The POST MASTER GENERAL. I do not think you appointed them until the close of the year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The sum asked for in the first series was $18,800.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The following are the classes :—Temporary employees, 48 at 400 each ; 1 at $320 ; 2 at $1 a day ; 15 at $300. Then add the statutory increases of $15 each on the 48, and 4 at $7.50. Then for a number of vacancies in the third class, promotion, messengers and packers, $1,700. That is the staff as it is to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that he is not quite meeting the point. Temporary help is help which was not added to that department, but continued longer than the thirty days. We appointed, so far as my recollection goes, no temporary help to go longer than the end of the fiscal year for which we were making the Estimates. There was no appropriation for the fiscal year 1896-97, and consequently that temporary help was not appointed except for the end of the term.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were not dismissed.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be true. I desire, however, to state the practice of the department and of the Treasury Board. The permanent temporary help is appointed twice per year, on 1st December and 1st July. So that on 30th June all temporary help really lapsed in so far as appropriations and appointments were concerned, and although a great many recommendations came over to the Treasury Board, they were all kept back awaiting an appropriation to be made. So on 1st July there were no appointments necessitating $5,200 extra. The only ground on which this money can be asked is that it is necessary for the work of the department. Although hon. gentlemen opposite take great credit for a decrease in the main Post Office estimates, they have added $5,200 to the item of contingencies under clerical help alone. Hon. gentlemen opposite were very strong in their denunciations of the unnecessary number of civil servants employed on the Hill. I find, however, that the Estimates brought down provide for exactly eight clerks less than were provided for before, this being the result in a total of 811 clerks employed in the permanent service of the departments.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman include what he calls permanent temporaries ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. I repeat that in a total of 811 clerks, hon. gentlemen opposite have made a reduction of only eight. So when the extra amount of $5,200 for clerical help is divided up, giving $300 to each clerk, hon. gentlemen opposite will employ a larger number than last year. In a word, the Estimate provides for a larger number of permanent and temporary clerks on the Hill than was ever before known in the history of the country.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) states that the number has been decreased by eight ; but he omitted to mention that the number will be increased by 17 private secretaries, thus making a net increase of nine. With respect to the estimate for the Post Office Department : in 1895, $18,900 was required for clerical and other assistance ; this year $20,500 will be expended, which of course is very extravagant, but the Postmaster General has increased that amount by $3,500. I should like an explanation, as it is necessary to practice economy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will see that the item was passed the other evening, under civil government, for the Post Office Department, involved a reduction altogether of $4,300. The resolution now before the committee involves an increase of $1,700.

Mr. WALLACE. That is on printing and stationery, but I am talking about clerical assistance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman says I am increasing the expenditure in the department. If he refers to clerical assistance, I desire to say that I understand from my deputy that the increase is on account of the reduction in the other items, that there have been changes in the staff under recent legislation. I am now dealing with the staff as I find it. The ex-Minister of Finance says the staff was increased in 1896, and that increase was intended to be terminated on the 1st July, and he gave the committee to understand that the reduction had taken place, and also that I assumed office on 1st July. I did not assume office until 13th July, and up to that time the previous Government had not shown any disposition to change their policy by discharging temporaries. Those men were on duty, and they are there to-day. I repeat that while I am led to believe that the staff in my department will in the public interest require to be reasonably reduced, I want to be allowed to proceed in an intelligent way, and not with cruelty or harshness to anybody concerned. I have not had an opportunity of studying the needs of my department, and so I have not felt at liberty, in justice to those in the service, to summarily dismiss them because some one said they were not required. If hon. gentlemen wish me to act in a harsh way, let them proceed with their criticisms. Those men had been in the department thirteen days in July. What do hon. gentlemen opposite want me to do ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will not stifle criticism by using the threat that if his department is criticised, he will dismiss employees. The country will judge as to the hon. gentleman's action with respect to dismissals, and hon. members are here to criticise the Estimates. I wish to commend to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who voted for the Government because he wanted economy carried out, and also to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who is a great stickler, the fact that this great effort of the new Government to economize has resulted in an actual increase in the permanent and temporary employees on the Hill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. ex-Finance Minister or any member of the late Government is sufficiently familiar with the Post Office Department to say that the present staff will stand a reduction of so many men, I will consider the matter with a view to at once reduce this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. All I have to say is that I am not here as adviser of the hon. gentleman as to the number of men that should be employed in his department. He has to assume that responsibility.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will take it before the money is all spent.

Mr. SPROULE. The suggestion of the Minister is hardly justifiable or defensible. If the ex-Minister of Finance said that this vote should be reduced by a certain amount, and the Minister forthwith reduced it, he should be dismissing men whether they were efficient or not. I agree that the hon. Minister should have time to consider where the reductions could be made, and thus do justice to the civil servants and to the department. The criticism was mainly directed, however, to the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite before they came into office that such reductions could be made without injury to the service, and now when they are in power, they find they cannot be carried out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a little too previous; you must give us time.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not objecting to give you time, nor so far as I am personally concerned, am I saying there are too many in the service. I think it is wise that you should look into the matter carefully, but I think it unwise that the Government before they came into power should make injudicious criticisms with regard to those departments, and now be under the humiliation of admitting that they did not know anything about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not admitting that we did not know anything about it. We found a number of gentlemen in our department appointed by our predecessors and we could not dispense with them without at least inquiring. An hon. gentleman has remarked that we added our private secretaries to the expense of the department. Well, I suppose if we wanted to pursue an ungenerous course, I might say that an officer of my department should be dismissed to make way for my private secretary. That would neither be fair nor generous in my opinion. We ought not, therefore, be charged by hon. gentlemen opposite with adding that large number of officials to the service.

Mr. SPROULE. The private secretaries hitherto have done some work in the department in addition. If you take in 17 or 18 new private secretaries who have nothing to do but act as private secretaries, you are adding so much more to the service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The duties of a private secretary to a Minister are very laborious, and generally speaking if a private secretary attends to his duty as such he has very little time for departmental work.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No time at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to the additional vote, but I am pointing out that additional officials are asked for, and that additional expenses are being incurred by those gentlemen who condemned the large number of civil servants when they were out of power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only alternative would be that we should dismiss the gentlemen appointed by our predecessors, and we do not wish to dismiss them without inquiring into their efficiency.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish you to do that at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister would not follow precedent if he did.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose we could put it on the ground of efficiency in the public service, and do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Certain conditions of the law would have to be fulfilled before you could do that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is provided to pay these private secretaries out of contingencies, and we might ask the Government to promise that when vacancies do occur, instead of appointing new men, they should appoint their private secretaries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The effect of that might be to give to some private secretaries a larger income than the Minister might desire. They would then become members of the permanent services.

Contingencies—Department of Agriculture $14,500

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say a few words which I would have said on the general estimate in connection with this department, but which I did not say because the Minister of Agriculture was not present. He is not present to-night, but the item is a small one and I do not wish to ask to have it stand, so I prefer to say what I have to say, and to ask the gentleman who is now leading the House to call the attention of his colleagues to it. There is a rumour which I have seen given currency to, that a gentleman who is at present in the Department of Agriculture as Deputy Commissioner

of Patents is about to be retired, and another gentleman appointed to take his place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is his name ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Pope is the present occupant of that position. He is a gentleman who has been a long time in the service, and if the Government felt like retiring him upon a superannuation allowance, there could be no possible objection to that Indeed I may say that was the policy which I had the informal authority of Council to pursue, after I had explained the position of the matter in connection with that gentleman : but it was only upon this condition : that if he were superannuated no appointment should be made in his place. I think the experience of the department has shown clearly, that the deputy of the department might well be asked to occupy the dual position of Deputy Minister and Deputy Commissioner of Patents as well. That is a return to the old system, and I would strongly urge hon. gentlemen, if they do retire the present Deputy Commissioner of Patents, that instead of making a new appointment they would pursue the policy which the late Government intended to pursue, and appoint—with some small additional remuneration if you like—the Deputy Minister of Agriculture for the time being to be Deputy Commissioner of Patents.

I would also call the attention of the Government to the fact that there was a reduction proposed by the late Government in connection with the Department of Agriculture. These present Estimates, the contingent, for 1895-96, being $16,500, it was proposed by the late Government to ask only $14,500. If the hon. gentleman refers to the main Estimates, he will find that the late Government affected a saving of about $6,000 in them, and in contingencies about $2,000, both of which are to be credited to the late Government, and not to the present Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not claiming any credit to ourselves.

Mr. BERGERON. We are voting a large amount of money for printing and stationery, and I think the people of this country will be very glad to know how this printing and stationery is acquired. There is something for every department ; but one would imagine that one department might be charged with the buying of all that is required for all the departments. I would be very glad if the Minister would explain whether this is obtained by tender, whether the contract is made each year, or for how many years, and whether the paper is bought from some of the paper factories in this country or is imported from abroad. If I am not mistaken, a good deal of the paper is imported, though I am told we have in this country paper factories which will compare very favourably with any foreign factories.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that a very considerable portion of the paper is purchased in this country, but some portion is imported. I believe no new contracts have been made, and the arrangement now existing is the one that has existed for some time past. If the hon. gentleman wishes additional information, he will find in the Auditor General's Report a very detailed statement of these expenditures.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not for myself that I want the information. I would like to have it brought out in Parliament, so that it will go to the public. I had a conversation some time ago with some gentlemen on this subject, and I found that there was generally complete ignorance in regard to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose this Government will pursue the practice of the late Government of letting these contracts by tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no change at all.

Mr. BERGERON. I would not object if I found that the Government was buying its paper from our factories in the country instead of importing it. I notice that the paper in the trunks we get at the beginning of each session is mostly imported. I understand also that the inks have been bought from the same house for many years. If that could be changed, and we could get equally good ink in this country, I think it should be got here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Mr. Tarte). I know that we buy in Canada the greatest portion of our paper.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. Minister of Finance will ask the Queen's Printer for a statement which he gave to me a little while before the late Government resigned, he will find it to give very succinctly what my hon. friend has been asking for. I had the curiosity to get that information, and I asked the Queen's Printer for the statement ; and the reasons he gives for the present arrangement will be found to be very satisfactory. It is impossible to get all the paper that is wanted in this country, simply because some qualities are not made here, and have to be imported. But all that we could get here has been got.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will obtain the statement, and will be happy to show it to the hon. member.

Contingencies—Department of Trade and Commerce $5,600

Mr. FOSTER. I think I shall have to ask my hon. friend to allow this to stand. There seems to be an ominous increase here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increase of $600 is represented altogether by the salary of the private secretary, an item we have already discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the private secretary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. O'Hara, who I believe is not a civil servant.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask where he comes from ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the pleasure of knowing what part of Canada he comes from.

Mr. HUGHES. That is what I want to know—does he come from Canada ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, he comes from Kent County, Ont.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to suggest that when this item comes up again, the Government ought to be able to make an announcement of their policy in regard to this department. We have had it given out in the ministerial press, and definitely stated by members of the Government themselves, that they proposed to raise the two controllers to the position of Cabinet Ministers, with the same salary, of course, as the other Cabinet Ministers. Is it the intention when they do that, to retain the department of Trade and Commerce ? We ought to know this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman wishes to press the question, I shall ask him to hold it over until next session ; but, if the matter is in a position to admit of a direct reply, I will call the attention of the Prime Minister to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. One plank of the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite was a reduction of the number of Ministers, and this department was especially mentioned as one likely to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A good many of these good things which we hope to accomplish, we shall have to allow to stand over until next session.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope the remark of the hon. gentleman is not an expression of his wish that they may push the Minister of Trade and Commerce out of his place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made vigorous efforts for many years to push out the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but they have not succeeded in doing so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We did not succeed half so well as the hon. gentleman who formed the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has not had the comfort of seeing him pushed out yet. The hon. gentleman will not have that comfort. If my hon. friend from South Oxford does not hold this position in this Government which he formerly held under a Liberal Administration, it is a matter of his own choice ; and if I hold the office of Finance Minister, I hold it with that gentleman's most cordial good-will.

Mr. FOSTER. After that explanation, I ask the hon. gentleman to allow that item to stand, as I have something else to say with regard to it.

Item allowed to stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As it is now very late, and we have done a good deal of business, I think the committee might rise.

Resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—REPLY TO THE ADDRESS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I beg to acknowledge with thanks the Loyal Address which you have adopted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the session.

I receive with satisfaction your assurances that the Estimates for the current year to be laid before you will be respectfully considered.

Government House,
Ottawa, 8th September, 1896.

CONTRACTS FOR MILITIA CAMP SUPPLIES.

Mr. BEATTIE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to a recent occurrence in the city of London. The military camp for No. 1 District is now being held there, and I find that in giving contracts for supplies required by

the men, the usual custom has been departed from. Instead of tenders being advertised for in the usual way, friends of the Government have been called in and given papers and asked to tender in a private way.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that the hon. member, on the calling of the Orders of the Day, is not entitled to bring up any controversial matter, and it seems to me that he is doing so. I think he must seek some other opportunity, which, no doubt, will soon present itself, to bring the matter up.

RESIGNATION OF THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government if he has been able to lay upon the Table of the House the supplementary papers relating to the correspondence with the Governor General?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say that these papers are not quite ready. I hope to be able to bring them down this evening. If not then, certainly they will be brought down on Monday.

RESIGNATION OF MAJOR GENERAL CAMERON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. leader of the Government whether he has considered the question, to which I attach very great importance, of laying upon the Table of the House the letter from Major General Gascoigne which elicited the resignation of the Commandant of the Royal Military College?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. The Government have no objection to the letter being produced. But we consider that this is a letter passing between two eminent British officers, and the moment they agree to have the letter brought down, it will be brought down.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 18) for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $446,500 required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the annual drill of the militia during the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

SUPPLY—MILITIA SUPPLIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BEATTIE. Before the House goes into Supply, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the course that is taken in the city of London in furnishing supplies to the military camp for No. 1 District, which is now being held in the city of London. On former occasions the supplies for that camp had always been advertised for, and let by public tender. I find, Sir, on this occasion that that rule has been departed from. The supplies have not been advertised for by public tender, but on the contrary the friends of the Government have been called in, and forms have been handed them, and they have been allowed to tender in a private way. When a Conservative applied for tender papers he was informed that his name was not on the list, and that there were no papers for him, and he could not get them. Now, Sir, that has happened in three or four different lines, for meat, for fuel, for groceries, and all these different items have been contracted for in that way. In one instance I know where a Conservative, not having been able to get the papers, made out a tender for meat on a blank sheet, and sent it in, and I believe it was half a cent a pound less than the price for which the contract is awarded to-day. Now, Sir, that is only a sample of a piece of political jobbery on a small scale. If it is going to be carried out in large matters, I do not know what we may expect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It has been carried out for the last eighteen years.

Mr. BEATTIE. I beg your pardon. Heretofore in every case the supplies, not only for the camps, but for the barracks, have been advertised for by public tender in a public way, and I can prove that. Under the late Government a Reformer had the contract for bread, and has had it, I believe, for the last two years, and another had the contract for groceries. And not only that, but an alien who is not a voter, an American, at one time had the contract for groceries. The House was informed the other night that the contract for these supplies would be let by tender in the usual way, and I would like to know why the Minister has thought proper to depart from the usual custom.

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) has brought this matter up, because I have had a little experience in connection with the camp that is about to be held at Niagara. Under the late Government the tenders were forwarded in the usual way, by the usual officers, and they reached the hands of the friends of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, in the usual way. When intimation was given that a camp was to be held, friends of my own who wished to tender for supplies came up to Niagara and called upon the man who had the distribution of these forms for tenders, and found that they were all in the hands of the Tories, and not a Liberal was allowed to tender for any goods for the camp at Niagara. I was fortunate enough, however, to get the Government to send forward their form of tender, so that friends as well

as opponents of the Government might have a fair opportunity of tendering for those supplies. I am very glad that this matter has been brought up and so lustily cheered by my hon. friend from the county of Welland who sits behind him (Mr. McCleary). He knows how these things were done under the regime of the hon. gentlemen whom he supports, and what nice fat contracts for timber for canals and other things he got at fancy prices. I am glad to see him cheering now, as showing that he is glad to see things being continued in the same way as in the past. I remember well when he said how proud he was of the late Minister of Railways and Canals, of the leader of the Opposition, and of other gentlemen of the Concervative party. Why, of course, such favours would make any man loyal to the Tory party. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend from London say that the contract for groceries had been given to an alien. An alien has no vote, as I understand it, and consequently he cannot be said to be a friend of the Government.

Mr. BEATTIE. Excuse me, I did not say it had been given to an alien.

Mr. GIBSON. Why should not an alien tender ?

Mr. BEATTIE. I did not say an alien had it.

Mr. GIBSON. You mentioned an alien. What did you say ?

Mr. BEATTIE. I said that on former occasions the contract had always been let by tender, the Conservative party had allowed any man to tender, and that in fact a Reformer who is an alien had the tender lately—not this year—under a Conservative Government.

Mr. GIBSON. The Conservative party took good care that no Liberal ever got a contract in the last eighteen years, to my knowledge, whether by public or by private tender. I think the hon. gentleman from the city of London has, perhaps, been shown that the party who is in power now have been far less considerate for their friends than the party which the hon. gentleman supports. If the present Government had been as considerate for their friends as the Conservative Government were for their friends, none of the Tories residing in the several districts would have had an opportunity to tender for supplies. But an opportunity was given to them, and forms were sent from the department here to people who had been in the habit of distributing these supplies before. I found that the mode of getting hold of these forms for tenders was something like this: one gentleman really intended to tender, and perhaps there were half a dozen forms on which five or six other people might be given a chance to tender. This man would get his other five friends to go down to the office and get their forms of tender, but never intending to put in a bid. Then when the parties who really wished to bid for these supplies went to the office and asked for a form of tender, they were quietly told that the forms were all gone, but in order to give some colour of competition another put in a bid. I am delighted to have this opportunity of explaining how the late Government have been looking after their friends in the Niagara district. Now, let me say that I think it is the right of every man on either side of the House, when the party he supports is in power, and all other things are equal, he should be given the contract. All other things being equal, I should give the preference to my friends and not to my political opponents. My hon. friend from London has had some military experience, he holds the rank of major, and I would like to have him state now, from his political experience in the city of London and from his experience as a military man in that district, if he can name one Liberal who ever received a contract for the supply of goods to the camp in that district, during the whole of the time that he has been connected with the militia there.

Mr. BEATTIE. In reply to the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make another speech, but he may answer a question.

Mr. BEATTIE. I was asked to give a name. Johnson Bros. hold a contract to-day, and have for the past two years, for the supply of bread to the permanent corps stationed in London. They are the most bitter Grits in the city. If the hon. gentleman wants more names, I can give him some.

Mr. McCLEARY. I can hardly understand why the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) should make the attack upon me he did a moment ago, particularly as that hon. gentleman himself has grown fat and rich out of public contracts practically let without competition. I want to hurl back in the face and teeth of the hon. gentleman the insinuation he has thrown out that the firm of which I am a member have received, at the hands of the Conservative Government or any other Government, one dollar's worth of supplies for which we did not have to compete with other dealers in our line of business. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove his assertion.

Mr. GIBSON. Give me a chance.

Mr. McCLEARY. The hon. gentleman will have plenty of chances to prove the assertion if he can. I know he cannot, and he knows himself that he cannot. The firm to which I belong have supplied for some years back the material required for repairs on the Welland Canal, but we have never yet got those supplies without competition with

every one in the same line of business along the canal or living numbers of miles away from the canal. Advertisements were inserted in the Toronto and local papers, and in competition with all Ontario for those supplies, he had held the contract for some years. My hon. friend has referred to the camp at Niagara. I live near that camp, and I know something about it. The hon. gentleman must be aware that tenders were asked for by the department this year, and those tenders were to be opened in Ottawa at the department last Tuesday. But there have been some supplies required, as I understand, for which tenders have not been called for publicly as they might have been. There were tenders put in for carpentering work, of which my hon. friend may know something. A certain Conservative put in a bid for the work. One of my hon. friend's supporters in the town of Niagara, went to a Liberal, who had put in a bid as well, and told him that this certain Conservative tenderer was the lowest, and if he would do the work for the same sum he would get the job. Of course the Liberal friend said. "All right. I will do it."

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. McCLEARY. The man showed an official letter from Ottawa: he told the Liberal who tendered that as he was a supporter of the hon. member for Lincoln he would get the job, and he got the job. Hon. members are aware that in tendering for supplies to the Niagara camp offers were received from Liberals and Conservatives alike, and Liberals have frequently been awarded the contract. This is a fact of which I am well aware. The hon. member was very unfair in his attack on me this afternoon. The Liberal party has always declared that the Conservative party did not act on principle in considering tenders, and letting contracts, and hon. gentlemen opposite, if they wanted to live up to the principles advocated by themselves when in Opposition, and when they attacked the Conservative party for their administration of public affairs, should have come out openly and manfully and advocated impartial tendering for those supplies. When the papers are brought down, hon. members will be able to learn how, why and where contracts were let for supplies to the Niagara camp as well as to other camps.

Mr. INGRAM. I feel surprised at the hon. gentleman declaring that the policy of the Government was to grant contracts to Liberals only. I have always understood that the practice was to give the contract to the lowest tenderer. Having had some experience in this line——

Mr. LANDERKIN. No doubt, for a number of years.

Mr. INGRAM. Having heard what my hon. friend from London stated as to the way in which tenders are granted, I desire to say this, that previous to the declaration of the Conservative Government that No. 1 District camp should be held in London, the camp was held in different places, but the late Government decided that it should be held permanently in London. In 1891 the camp of Military District No. 1 was held at St. Thomas. I know that a number of tenders at that time were put in for furnishing supplies to the militia, including bread, meat and other articles, and I was then told by the Minister of Militia that the lowest tenderer would receive the contract. I was not told that the lowest tenderer or any tenderer would receive the contract because he was a Conservative, but I was simply told that the lowest tenderer would in any case receive the contract. I am sorry indeed to hear that hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their policy, as is evidenced from the statements made by the hon. member for London. If that is to be the course pursued, it is well that we should understand it. If not, I should like to hear from the Minister of Militia. I do not understand that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is called on to speak for the Government, but in my opinion, they should speak for themselves.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The invariable practice followed by the Department of Militia during the several years I was Minister was that all supplies should be given out on tender. Tenders were asked for. I have never known since the time I took an interest in militia matters any time when the supplies for the camps were given out without tenders being called for. This is a practice which is altogether new, as the hon. gentlemen will ascertain by referring to his own department, and if a change has been made, it is a departure as regards the practice in the Department of Militia. At times it was found inconvenient, from the fact that tenders were sent in from a distance from where the camp was held, but even then we considered it necessary that supplies should be made to the various camps on tenders called for and opened in the Department of Militia. I am quite correct in saying that there is not one instance within my recollection where that rule was departed from.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The late Postmaster General limits his observations to supplies for militia camps. I happened to be present when investigations were made under oath before the Public Accounts Committee as to the methods adopted for supplying the militia with clothing, when it was found that hundreds of thousands of dollars and even millions of dollars of contracts were given without public tender. The hon. gentleman may shake his head. I challenge him to state the contrary. The system the hon. gentleman adopted has been the occasion of gross

frauds on the public treasury. He submitted an application to a few favourites, perhaps three manufacturers in Montreal, to supply the department with militia overcoats. The hon. gentleman knows that I am speaking by the book when I tell him that in the department he has left the letting and reletting of contracts without tender has been the occasion of loss to Canada of hundreds of thousands of dollars. When I come to give figures, as I shall in the near future, hon. gentlemen will find the amount of the loss occasioned by departing from sound principles. At this very day, what have we to do? Every day in the department it is cancelling frauds committed by my predecessor in the department which I preside over.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who has addressed the House has distinctly charged fraud.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I charge fraud. I will give an illustration.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to charge fraud against an hon. member, he should specify the hon. gentleman, and then the matter could be dealt with by the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give hon. gentlemen an illustration, and they will see whether I was right or wrong.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) in speaking as he has just done, has charged me with fraud. I say that the hon. gentleman is in the habit——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) is speaking to the point of order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is arguing the point.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am speaking to the point of order. I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is in the habit of making statements on the floor of this House which he cannot——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) in speaking to the point of order, must be careful not to get out of order himself.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not wish to be out of order, but I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) in making the statement which he did, is altogether out of order and should not be allowed to make it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) of course will not make a charge of fraud across the floor of this House, against another hon. member.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said it was a fraud against the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) considers that the Postmaster General has made a charge of fraud against him. I wish the hon. the Postmaster General to make it clear that he has not made that charge, and if he has made it, to withdraw it. The hon. the Postmaster General of course may state what facts he considers affect the public interest in the discharge of official duties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My first remarks were addressed to the methods——

Mr. FOSTER. Chair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am about to put myself in perfect order if you will allow me. My first observations were directed to the practices of the member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) when he was Minister of Militia. My subsequent remarks had no reference to him or to his practices. The remarks I made in which I referred to fraud, had reference to the system of re-letting and letting mail contracts, and the sentence in which I made that statement was, if I recollect rightly, as follows: That my predecessors in office——

An hon. MEMBER. No, you said my predecessor.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said my predecessors.

Mr. FOSTER. You said my predecessor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said my predecessors in office. I said I will give you an illustration of whether it is a fraud or not, and I said that my predecessors in office had by their method of procuring the discharge of part of the public service, occasioned frauds upon the public service of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I want to know whether the Postmaster General is or is not bound to obey the ruling of the Chair, which was that the hon. gentleman should withdraw his remark.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That was not the ruling of the Chair. The ruling of the Chair was that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) had intended to convey the impression complained of, he was bound to take it back. The words of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) were: That the system of administration by his predecessors had led to the bringing about of fraud on the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) made no charge of fraud against any hon. gentleman opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He did.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the whole difficulty would be settled by the Postmaster General saying that he did not, as he says he did not, charge the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) with fraud. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) attacks the system he is at perfect liberty to do so, and the hon. gentleman can put himself in order by doing that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, you have quite appreciated, Sir, the manner in which I desired to express myself. I say, and I repeat it, that the result of my investigation has convinced me that the system—we will say the system, for I am not saying that any hon. gentleman for personal gain did these things, although I say that they resulted in an injustice to the country—I say that the system entailed the expenditure of far more public money than was necessary for the public service. It may have been strong language to use, and perhaps I should not have used language so strong as calling it fraud. But, it would be regarded in a court of equity as a breach of trust if any trustee should misapply trust funds and expend a larger amount than was necessary for the proper discharge of the trust. In that sense I used the term, and in that sense I believe it is parliamentary. I said I would give an illustration, and I had it in my mind at the time to do so. I said, that day after day it has been my duty to cancel contracts that have been made, for small sums in their way, but nevertheless to cancel them, because I had reason to believe that they had been let without regard to the true spirit of the law, without tender, and at improvident prices. I proposed to quote this illustration. One of my last administrative acts to-day before coming to this Chamber was to give instructions for the cancellation of a contract, let many years ago but renewed from time to time, in favour of a man named Morrison for carrying the mails between Point Tupper and somewhere in Cape Breton. This man was paid $9,000 per year for the contract, which has been going on for years, notwithstanding that there are in the department offers to carry out that service for $2,700 per year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And, Sir, there is a report of the post office inspector recommending the cancellation of that contract let at $9,000 a year, and there is the offer to carry out that contract for $2,700 a year. That report of their own official has been before the department for a very considerable period of time, I do not know how long, and no attention has been paid to it. We have been paying $9,000 a year for that little transaction which could have been done for $2,700.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I was a little surprised at the remarks made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie). A few days ago I had a communication from a friend in London, asking me to interview the Minister for the purpose of endeavouring to get him an order for the furnishing of some supplies. In order to accommodate my friend I laid the matter before the Minister of Militia, and the Minister informed me that no supplies would be purchased unless under tender. Then, in connection with the Postmaster General, a friend wrote asking me to endeavour to have this contract continued for delivering the mail from Melbourne to Middlemiss. It is only a matter of $150 a year and he wished to have it continued without tender. I laid that matter before the Postmaster General and he also informed me that no contract would be continued without tenders. I am consequently greatly surprised that the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) should say that the Government are in favour of giving contracts to their friends without tenders.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Mr. Speaker, I was not present when this discussion was started, but I understand that an hon. gentleman has complained that some irregularity has taken place in the department over which I preside, in the giving of contracts for supplies for some of the camps. If the hon. gentleman had given me notice that he intended to bring this matter up to-day—as he ought to have done, but perhaps as a young member he is not aware that there is such a custom in the House—I would have been able to give him the information which he wants. I may say to him, however, that no departure has been made, so far as I know, from the rule of the department. I will tell him further than that: That everything that has been done by me has been done under the advice, and by the advice, of the officers of my department and so far as I know in every case, the contract has been awarded at the lowest prices offered to the department. I shall be very glad indeed to give, when the Estimates of my department come before the House, all the information required with reference to these contracts. My hon. friends on the other side of the House must not be disappointed, if under the new regime, the Liberals of Canada get a fair chance. I am not going to make any unpleasant reference to the regime of the gentlemen who preceded me in this department, but I must say, that they must not be disappointed if in future, Liberals, at least get a fair show with Conservatives. I shall make it my business to see that they do. But my Liberal friends will not expect from me, nor will they receive, anything more than fair-play.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure no person can find any fault with the statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia. It would be very hard indeed if under a Liberal Government the members and supporters of the Liberal party did not receive fair-play; but the hon. gentleman will remember that when the House consented to give the vote for the militia service, it was distinctly stated that the supplies required in connection with the expenditure of that money would be obtained by tender and contract. Now, the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) has made a statement to the House which, if it be well-founded, shows that the pledge made to the House by the hon. Minister of Militia, and upon which this money was granted, has been departed from. The hon. member for London states distinctly that these supplies were not asked for by open tender and contract. I do not make an important point of that, however, because it may be that the time was short, and that it was not convenient to do so. But if it be true that a party was prevented from getting a contract because he was a Conservative, though his tender was at a considerably lower price, this is a statement of very grave import, and one that deserves the most careful consideration of the Minister and of this House. I think the hon. Minister owes it to himself that he should investigate that statement, and be able to state to the House on a future occasion what the facts of the matter are. I can understand certain cases in which supplies may not be obtained by public tender and contract. There may be cases in which certain persons are in the habit of supplying certain articles, not as middlemen, but directly to the department, and in which that course may be adopted without injury to the public service, because it would prevent middlemen coming in who are not in a position to furnish the supplies themselves, but who would levy on other parties from whom they would be obliged to obtain them. But if it be the fact that parties are to be prevented on account of their politics from competing fairly and openly for the furnishing of supplies, that is a very important question, and one which I am sure the Minister of Militia will feel it due to himself to meet frankly and fully.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would point out to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that it would greatly save our time and conduce to shorten these discussions if hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for London would state to the Minister, whose proceedings they propose to impugn, what they intend to do. The hon. leader of the Opposition knows that no mortal man can carry in his mind all these details, and a great deal of time would be saved by hon. gentlemen giving notice. I merely make the suggestion in the interest of proceeding with our business.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) displays a great deal of righteous indignation, stating that he never heard of letting contracts without tender. Let me call his attention to the celebrated case of the farm in Sussex which was bought under his administration for military drill, and for which $7,000 was paid.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much was it worth?

Mr. DOMVILLE. It was worth more money. It was a good purchase. I will give credit where credit is due. I merely wish to point out what the hon. gentleman who now finds fault did in the same line. That farm, which cost $7,000, was leased away without tender for seven years for $25 a year. That is within my actual knowledge, and I state it without fear of contradiction. I know that the hon. gentleman is very apt to contradict things, but the proof is not far off. The very hay on the farm was this year sold at auction, standing, for $300 odd by the man who leased the farm. The farm was leased to this man at $25 a year, because he was a political adherent of the hon. member for York, and one of his strongest friends. When I was supporting the other Administration this man was my strongest friend; but like a great many around him, he was a Liberal when it suited him to be a Liberal, and a Conservative when it suited him to be a Conservative. Nor did the matter end there. The hon. gentleman placed a caretaker on the farm, a sergeant in the militia, at one dollar a day, besides allowing him $180 a year to pay his lodging in a house in the neighbourhood, when he could have obtained a cottage for $50 or $100, and the man is still there for the moment under that pay. I do not hesitate to say that that farm could have been leased away for $300 or $400 a year. The former Government also undertook to build a house on the property for this caretaker. All this was done under the direction of the member for York.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The member for York next.

Mr. FOSTER. I scarcely know, Mr. Speaker, who has charge of the House. Sometimes I think it is the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin).

Mr. GILLIES. I was considerably surprised at the statement of the Postmaster General this afternoon, in reference to the mail contract existing between Port Hawkesbury and the town of Sydney, and I wish to draw his attention for a few moments to that matter. I will not dwell on this at as much length as I otherwise would, or as I may when the papers are brought down. I am quite sure that when the hon. Postmaster General made the statement he did this afternoon, he did so in pure ignorance of the facts; and if the statements made by him are based on any representations

made to him, then I venture to say that the information communicated to him was a thorough misrepresentation of the facts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Made to me by my deputy.

Mr. GILLIES. I do not care from what source it came, I make bold to say there is no information in the hon. gentleman's hands that will warrant him in making the statement that the service could be performed by any responsible party for $2,700 a year. If there is any information in the Postmaster General's hands to warrant him in making the statement that the service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney can be performed, as it is now and has been for the past thirty years, at such an amount as $2,700, I will be content to withdraw the statement I now make. I may be permitted to tell the Postmaster General the facts. When I came here in 1891, I found the matters were existing then precisely as they are now. Mr. Morrison was the contractor for the mail service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney, a distance of over a hundred miles, and he performed that service daily each way. The Postmaster General shakes his head, but he will permit me to know better about this than he does. The service goes through my county some sixty odd miles and through the adjoining county some thirty-four miles. That service has been performed since 1860, when a daily mail was established over the route, and the firm of Lindsay & Co. were the contractors, of whom Mr. Morrison was a partner. They had the contract from New Glasgow to Sydney, and when the railway was completed to the Straits of Canso, Mr. Morrison took the stage line from Point Tupper to Sydney at a subsidy of, I think, $5,700. It was performed by a two-horse stage line, once each way daily. In 1890, after the railway was opened, most of the travel went that way; but inasmuch as the railway was no accommodation whatever to the territory covered by this stage line, it was considered advisable and necessary that this stage line should be maintained for the accommodation of the people on the southern side of the Bras d'Or Lake, without which they had no means of communicating with the railway, particularly upon the close of navigation. The stage line was continued, as it is now, but Mr. Morrison, having made his calculations under the conditions then existing—that is before the railway was opened—tendered at $5,700 for the service, because he carried all the passengers. After the railway was opened, however, they took away the passenger traffic, and the contractor was running into ruin. These facts were represented to the department, and a temporary arrangement was made, by which Mr. Morrison was to continue his service daily each way for $9,000 a year. This went on a couple of years. In the winter of 1893, some time before Morrison's term of contract was up, the whole service was offered by tender. Every newspaper in the eastern part of the province, and I believe every newspaper in Cape Breton, had advertisements for this route. Notices were posted up in every post office from Point Tupper to Sydney calling for tenders. The tenders were filed in the Postmaster General's office, and there were only two to perform the service as required. One was for $7,000, filed by Mr. McInnes, of Hawkesbury, who afterwards was unable to find the security which the department required, and the other tenderer was Mr. Morrison, the present contractor, for the sum at which he had been performing the service for years past. There were two tenders, one for $7,000, of Mr. McInnes, who was unable to find security, and the other was Mr. Morrison's, who did find the security. The department accepted the tender of Mr. Morrison, it had no other alternative, and from that day to this the service has been performed daily between those two points, a distance of over 100 miles, from Sydney to Port Hawkesbury, according to the strict letter of the contract as to equipment and distance to be covered per hour, &c. Where, then, is the fraud? Where are the tenders to do the work for $2,700. Why were they not on hand when the tenders had been advertised for weeks and weeks? My hon. friend will agree that great caution must be exercised in letting large services of that kind, which have to be performed with good sturdy horses and coaches and equipments necessary for the successful carrying out of the service. It is not every man who owns a broken-down horse by the wayside, or a broken-down carriage, who should be given the contract for a service of that kind. The department very wisely demands that good and sufficient security be supplied for the fulfilment of the contract. Mr. Morrison furnished the security, and he was the only one of the two who did so: and there was not the slightest fraud perpetrated on the country. I do hope and trust that the Postmaster General will pause before cancelling a contract for a service that has been so satisfactorily performed. The hon. gentleman must at once see that a wrong has been done some one by the remarks he has made. Since the Postmaster General has stated that the papers will be brought down, I trust they will be brought down immediately so that the House will have full information on the matter. And I assume that the hon. Postmaster General, since he was so specific in his statements and seemed to be so certain of their accuracy, must be speaking from information contained in public papers and that he will lay these papers forthwith on the Table of the House.

Mr. FRASER. It will be within the recollection of hon. members who were members of the last Parliament, that I brought this matter up. I did so at the urgent request of some of the best people of the county re-

presented by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies).

Mr. GILLIES. At whose request? Who are they?

Mr. FRASER. I will tell the hon. gentleman who one of them was. He was a very important man in the county, who was going to oppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies), but through the intercession of the leader of the Opposition, who went down there, matters were smoothed over and the way prepared for the return of the hon. gentleman. This gentleman was a Conservative of the Conservatives, and had at one time represented the party in this House. This matter of carrying these mails became a public scandal. Why, more was given to Mr. Morrison for carrying that mail than was given previous to the building of the Intercolonial Railway, when the mails were carried from Point Tupper to Sydney. And it all arose from the fact that Mr. Morrison found it convenient to change from being a strong Liberal to being a strong Conservative and a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. Contemporaneously with his change of faith, came a large addition to the amount he received for the carrying out of this contract. And the hon. gentleman will find, when the papers are brought down, that only three or four days were given to all the parties in Cape Breton to tender for carrying the mails on this route, and that the only other man who tendered was bought out. For all practical purposes, it may be said that no opportunity was given to any person except Mr. Morrison to secure the contract. It will be found, also, that this gentleman, when he went into provincial politics, found it convenient to get the Government to transfer the contract to his son, who was not then living at home, and he carried on the work, notwithstanding. The coach used to carry the mails and passengers and to have three or four horses, but, for three or four years past these mails have been carried by a single horse. And so bad was the whole transaction, that the post office inspector of Nova Scotia, previous to the incoming of the present Postmaster General, reported in favour of calling for new tenders. The inspector, Mr. McDonald, is a strong Conservative, and was an official under the late Government, but he is a fair man. It is a very strange thing that, when the inspector reported that the contract should be cancelled and new tenders called for, the late Government did not take action. If that kind of thing is to go on, then I mistake the temper of this Government and of this Parliament. It is very well to say that the contract cannot be carried out for less than the sum now paid. It can. Responsible parties say it can be done for less, and actually offer to do it for less. Is it well to pay $9,000 for a mail route that previous to the building of the Intercolonial Railway cost only $5,000 or $6,000? I speak from memory, and am not sure of the figure, but, at any rate, the amount was much less than the $9,000 now paid. And it must be remembered that almost all the mails that go to Sydney are carried on the Intercolonial. Another reason why this contract should be cancelled is that it covers the whole roof. Anybody who knows anything about Cape Breton, knows that to carry the mails on the railway to Sydney and bring them out from Sydney towards Loch Lomond would not only be much cheaper, but also much better, because the parties on the eastern end of the route along which Mr. Morrison goes, would receive their mail earlier. Moreover, everybody knows that, when you break up a mail route into shorter portion than this, you get the work done more cheaply, because then the man doing each part of the work can stay at his own home, thus saving expense.

Mr. GILLIES. You want a one-horse arrangement.

Mr. FRASER. That is what you have now: but, following the other plan, you would have three or four horses, according to the number of portions into which the route was divided. It is better to have a distance of 100 miles traversed by four stages than to have one poor laggard horse crawling over the route. Such waste as this is a direct injury to the public service. I know many places in my own county, and all over Nova Scotia, where little post offices are wanted. In one place they have a school and there are a hundred people living there, and they have to travel six miles, over a very poor road, to get their letters. Would it not be much better to have a small post office there, and, if no better arrangement could be made, to have a man carry the mail? I do not know the parties who have offered to carry out this contract for $2,700, but I have it from responsible men that a contractor can be got to do it for $3,000 at the outside. It seems to me the Postmaster General takes the right way to find out the truth. By cancelling the contract and calling for new tenders under such circumstances as will give all who desire to do so, an opportunity to compete, he will ascertain what the work can be done for. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) rises and says there must be some explanation, and tells the Postmaster General that he knows so much more about it than the hon. Minister does. But the fact remains that the post office inspector for Nova Scotia, whom everybody knows not to have Liberal leanings—except, I am bound to say, that he will do what is fair—reports that it can be done for $3,000. I ask hon. gentlemen is it not plain that the Minister is doing right? If it is found that the work cannot be done for less than $9,000, it will be well enough to continue the present arrangement. I have no feeling in the matter whatever. Papers on the subject were sent to me, and I brought the matter before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. This discussion strikes me as being a little unfair to the House. The Postmaster General has access to certain official papers, he has gone over those papers, he has had the report, as he says of his deputy, and he has taken action upon that. Now, he comes down to the House and pitches into a member on this side, and into the Opposition generally, for what he denominates fraudulent practices in connection with the carrying on of post office contracts under the late Administration. He has the advantage, himself, of having studied the official papers, of having had the report of his deputy; and probably the hon. gentlemen sitting behind him may also have had the advantage of access to those papers. He brings this matter into the House, and tries to influence the House by this attack, and by his quotations from those papers and his decision upon it, and he has not had the courtesy to lay those papers on the Table of the House. Now, I submit that that is not fair to the House. My hon. friend has no right to refer to official papers unless those papers are where other members of the House can see them; and I ask my hon. friend now if he will lay those papers on the Table of the House while this discussion is going on.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not aware that the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) proposed to open up a line of argument of this kind, and it is by the merest accident that I rose to my feet to reply to the assertion made by the late Postmaster General. He began by alluding to his practice in the Militia Department, and happening to know that the practice he referred to had not been his practice, I ventured to take part in the discussion, and I was called to order by the hon. gentleman when I had asserted that public moneys had been squandered. Having been challenged for it, I then, for the first time, thought of the illustration to make good my statement. Therefore, I claim that it was from no lack of courtesy, but simply because of the unexpected manner in which the point came up, and I was not prepared with documentary evidence. I will take steps at an early moment to produce all I have in the department in the way of evidence on this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is not quite——

Mr. SPEAKER. Is this on a point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is quite clear that when a Minister refers to public documents which are in his department, he should, at the request of any hon. member, lay them before the House on the first convenient opportunity. I do not suppose the Minister carries them about in his pocket. I would also say to the House that I have not interfered in this discussion because I did not wish in the slightest degree to limit the undoubted rights that every member of the House has to speak upon almost any public question, on the House going into Supply. But I would point out the great inconvenience to hon. members on both sides, of discussing a question when the papers and documents relating to it are not before the House. A great deal of time is wasted, statements are made over and over again; and all I can do is to ask hon. members, when they exercise their privilege of discussing a public question on a motion to go into Supply, to remember these things. I would also suggest to the hon. member from London (Mr. Beattie), who opened this discussion, that it would probably be better, if possible, to notify a Minister of his intention to bring up such a question in order to avoid confusion, and in order to attain finality in the matter—although I admit he has a right to raise this question on Supply. But there are matters of this kind which have to be left to the discretion of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot find fault with the course you have taken, but it seems to me that an even view of events would have led you to ask the Postmaster General to be kind enough to put the papers before the House when he makes the charge.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know if the hon. gentleman has a right to speak a second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman was raising a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not spoken yet; I am speaking on the subject of the papers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman from York has not yet spoken upon this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked a question across the floor of the House once, but I have not spoken. All I was doing was to point out how utterly lacking in courtesy it was on the part of the Postmaster General to make the attack without bringing down the papers; but I am not disposed to press that unless the Minister of Militia presses it in the case of my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie). But that is not the chief point. I wish to point out how utterly lacking in constitutional rule and what is fair in debate, it is for a Minister of the Crown to come straight from his office, where he has had important papers which, as he says, will constitute a case of fraud on the part of the late Administration, and when that subject-matter is not under discussion at all, but an entirely different matter, to take the pith and substance of those papers, and his decision, and upon them to launch an accusation of fraud and wrong-doing against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and against my hon. friend behind me who has just spoken. We cannot well discuss matters under conditions of that kind, and I

have never yet seen that done in the House. My hon. friend must see, when he comes to think of it, that it was not fair to the House for him to have made that charge. The point of propriety which I intended to elaborate, Mr. Speaker himself has stated already. All I need to do is to show what is laid down by Bourinot on that matter :

It has been laid down by the highest authorities that when a Minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House, and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced.

Mr. Speaker points out that it would be extremely inconvenient for an hon. Minister to carry the archives of his department in his pocket ; but when my hon. friend came primed with a charge to make against this side of the House, he should have the papers with him, and should have put them on the Table.

But it is allowable to repeat to the House information which is contained in a private communication

That, however, was not a private communication :

When such private papers are quoted in the House there is no rule requiring them to be laid on the Table. The rule respecting the production of public papers, quoted by a Minister of the Crown, is necessary to give the House the same information he possesses, and enable it to come to a correct conclusion on a question.

Now, going from that, I want to say just one word with reference to the string of assertions that were made by the hon. gentleman who represents the county of King's (Mr. Domville). The only and sufficient answer to that, I am going to put in the form of a request to the Minister of Militia and Defence that he will bring down all the papers connected with that lease, and lay them on the Table of the House, as I am sure he will do without my making a formal motion. Those papers, when they are perused, will enlighten hon. gentlemen as to whether the member for King's was right in his assertion that the only consideration for the leasing of that $7,000 lot in the military grounds at Sussex, was $25 per year, and whether the lease was for seven years. As those papers are not down, I do not propose to go any further into that subject, except merely to say that I think when the papers are down, and the circumstances are laid before the House, the House will see one of two things, either that the hon. member for King's is very unfortunate in the accuracy with which he gets together his information, or is very unfortunate in his method of expressing what he thinks.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I was very fortunate in getting King's County.

Mr. LISTER. I think this an opportune time to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the condition of facts of which he may or may not be aware, as to the letting of contracts for the carrying of mails. Speaking for my own county, I can say that every mail carrier in that county is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the way in which the late Government have let the contracts for carrying the mail, at all events in that county, I do not know what the system may be in other counties throughout the Dominion. Contracts are let without advertisements. A form of notice calling for tenders is sent to the postmaster of the particular place, and the public at large know nothing about it. The notice is posted up in the post office, and my information is that upon some occasions it has not been there more than a few minutes, or possibly one hour, when it has disappeared. The result of that practice has been that friends of the local postmasters through the country have received the carrying of mails, while practically no tenders have been invited. I desire to point out to the Postmaster General that even in a matter of small contracts it would pay the Government to give public notice through the press, so that every person may receive notice, when tenders are called for any particular service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The law requires it.

Mr. LISTER. Then, the law is not carried out. The only way the law is attempted to be carried out is by sending notice to local postmasters and the posting of such notices in the post offices, where few people, as a rule, see them. People have written to me over and over again to ascertain when certain contracts would expire, because they had learned that such contracts had been awarded without tender. I hope, in the interests of the public service, the Postmaster General will take this matter into consideration, and, if he does so, no doubt justice will be done to people who desire to perform these services, and at the same time a very large sum in the aggregate will be saved to the people of this country.

Mr. McNEILL. This discussion arose, I think, by reason of some remarks that fell from the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie), and the question that was before the House and was being discussed, was whether or not the present Government were pursuing a certain line of policy. That line of policy, it was thought by hon. members on this side of the House, would be a very improper line of policy to pursue. We are met by the Postmaster General with the statement : "You're another." I think that the country will expect some different answer from that. I believe, if it be the case that the Government which has been lately defeated at the polls, has been guilty of improper conduct, the people will consider that to be no excuse for the pursuing of a similar policy by

hon. gentlemen who have just got into their places. So far as I am concerned, I wish to say this, that I opposed my own party when I considered they were wrong, and I am certainly not going to support hon. gentlemen opposite when I think they are wrong. I am here to give hon. gentlemen opposite no obstruction and no factious opposition. I am here, on the other hand, to give a fair and honourable support to measures which they introduce and which I believe to be good measures. I am here, as I have said before, to support principles and not men. I am a Conservative, and I naturally expect the principles which will be advocated from this side of the House will commend themselves to my approval rather than principles that will emanate from the other side of the House; but when hon. gentlemen opposite pursue a course of policy which they cannot defend otherwise than by saying that their opponents have done something equally bad, that, to my mind, will be no defence of the policy they are pursuing. That is the only defence which has been set up here today. I understood from the Postmaster General that the case he referred to was a case of renewal of contract. The statement made by the hon. member who has personal knowledge (Mr. Gillies) shows that it was not a renewal of contract, and the statement of the Minister falls to the ground. I do not wish to discuss that question, because I do not think it is right to discuss it, and the hon. gentleman probably had no desire to be unfair and was betrayed into introducing this subject into the debate, but if he was not betrayed into doing so and did it deliberately, it was a very unfair thing to do, because, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) stated, it was altogether unconstitutional, and in the face of it, it is impossible to conduct discussion fairly upon subjects such as the hon. gentleman has introduced, unless the papers are on the Table.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. McNEILL. An hon. gentleman calls "Louder." I do not occupy a great deal of the time of the committee. That hon. gentleman is not likely to save time by rudely interrupting an hon. member who is honestly, and fairly, and in a spirit of kindness discussing questions across the floor, as I am trying to do at this moment. But, if the hon. gentleman desires that special kind of controversy, he will get lots of it.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. McNEILL. We are not inclined to be dictated to by gentlemen of the calibre of the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me. He may consider that as evidence of statesmanship—I was going to say of nascent statesmanship, but it has been so long about growing, I am afraid that, if it has not budded before now, it will not develop, and I cannot, therefore, call it nascent statesmanship. It will never grow. Whatever may have been the cause of the interruption, it was not very courteous, and was not that kind of interruption which will assist the hon. gentleman's friends in getting their Estimates through the House more rapidly than would otherwise be the case. I wish to say, once for all, that my desire is to give no factious opposition to hon. gentlemen opposite. My desire, on the other hand, is to give every fair and reasonable support to measures they may introduce which I believe to be for the public welfare, but I will never accept as an excuse for improper conduct on their part the statement that hon. members on this side of the House, when they were in power, did something just as bad.

Mr. QUINN. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen are wandering away from the original subject under discussion. The hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) very properly, I think, directed the attention of the Minister of Militia to a course pursued, as he said, in the city of London, and which, from some information I have received, is being pursued in other parts of the Dominion where camps are being held. The excuse offered by the hon. member for London was that it might be quite true that such things were being done, but they had been done on former occasions by the Conservative party, when it was in power. The Postmaster General seems to find that a good defence, and he referred to what he called a gross outrage concerning the carrying of mails to some place in Cape Breton. Now, there is one thing that must strike the hon. members of this House in connection with these two explanations, and that is, the prompt action of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) in the "you're another" defence, and the prompt manner in which the Postmaster General points out another injustice that is being done by him, for the purpose of covering up the one which is charged against the Department of Militia. In other words, the Postmaster General does not hesitate to tell this House that having formed an opinion, on ex parte statements made by some individuals unknown to this House, whose names are not brought before this House, on evidence which he does not think fit to bring before this House; having formed an opinion in this way he is prepared to do an act of injustice to a man who has occupied the position of a public contractor for years, and he has offered that as a justification or an excuse for the injustice which is to-day being done in the Militia Department. That seems to me to be not only an illogical, but to be also unfair and unbusiness-like way of dealing with the question which has been brought up by the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie). The Minister of Militia has said that it is not usual for hon. members to bring up subjects of this kind without first giving notice to the Minister under

whose department the matter comes. I did not know as a young member that such a thing was necessary. I thought that an injustice of this kind was a matter with which the people of this country had to deal, and not a Minister in his private office, and I believed that if such an injustice has been done, it was the duty of any hon. member to whose notice such a fact came, to bring it before the House, in order that a public explanation might be given for the benefit of the people of this country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) will allow me to interrupt him for a moment. When an hon. gentleman brings an accusation against a member of the Government, he does it, I presume, with the hope that the member of the Government so accused will be able to make a satisfactory explanation. Now, if the member does not give notice beforehand he cannot expect to get as full an explanation—or perhaps not a sufficient explanation at all—as he would if he extended the courtesy to the member of the Government beforehand, of telling him that at a certain time he proposed to bring a certain matter up. That is the reason why it has been customary in this House to inform a member of the Government that some explanation was to be asked with reference to the manner in which matters were being conducted in his department.

Mr. QUINN. My only object in mentioning this was to say, that I do not believe that my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) intended to make a personal charge against the Minister of Militia. But, what he did intend to do, and what I think he had a perfect right to do, was to draw the attention of this House to the fact that contracts had been awarded in the city of London for the supplies for the camps about to meet there; without public tenders being called for. That is not a charge against the Minister of Militia. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) means that the Minister ever intended such a thing to be done, but I wish to say now, that strict inquiry has been made, not only in London, but in the other camp centres, Kingston and Montreal, for the purpose of discovering—and I think it has been discovered already—if a system could not be adopted in these places for the purpose of giving contracts to the friends of the Government. The question is not: whether this course had been pursued by the Government which was lately defeated. Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that they have succeeded to power—as one hon. gentleman said the other night—not so much on their own merits, but on account of the irregularities which existed under the late Government. Are these irregularities to be perpetuated by the present Government? Is the same course to be followed by this great Reform party which they denounced when followed by the Conservative party? What was the object of the people of this country in throwing out the Conservative Government and bringing in the Reform party? Was it to leave the giving of public contracts in the condition in which the Reform party alleged they found it at the time they came into office, or was it to give the present Government an opportunity of bringing in these measures of reform which they had been boasting about for so many years? Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be the last time, that when a charge is made from this side of the House, or an inquiry made from any part of the House as to misconduct or supposed misconduct on the part of any officer or any department; I hope it is the last time that we shall hear the answer given from the Government benches: We are doing simply as you did before. The Government should remember that they pose as a reform Government, and that great reforms shall be expected from them by the people; reforms which will ameliorate, or improve at any rate, in some way the administration of such public matters as the giving of contracts by public departments.

Mr. TISDALE. Before the motion carries there is a matter that I feel it my duty to bring to the attention of the House, and I also wish in that connection to ask the Minister of Militia to bring down some papers. I find in the "Globe" newspaper of yesterday the following:—

> When the political campaign was at its height and when the late Government was on the outlook for election funds contracts were granted by the departments in the most irregular manner. The Militia Department, for instance, renewed a number of contracts and made others extending from one to three years with parties for militia clothing. Among those who got these contracts were Mr. Shorey, of Montreal; Sanford & Co., Hamilton; Mr. Boisseau, of Toronto, and a Peterborough firm, the manager of which was a Tory candidate in one of the Peterboroughs. The questions as to the legality of these contracts have all been referred to the Minister of Justice and he has decided that the department had no power to grant such contracts. They will, therefore, be annulled. One of the contracts was made to commence July, 1897, a year ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two important matters in that statement. One is as to the annulling of important contracts in the Militia Department, and the other is the allegation of corrupt dealing in some manner in the letting of these contracts by the Militia Department. I propose to give a denial to the one part, and then I propose to ask the Minister for the production of some papers, and if he is willing to postpone the discussion until we get these papers, it will, I think, much shorten the discussion of this matter. In regard to the contracts, I wish to say that they were neither let in an irregular manner nor at an irregular time. We asked for tenders in the usual way and the tenders were brought in, and the contracts

awarded while my predecessor (Mr. Desjardins) was Minister of Militia. That applies to the contracts given to the gentlemen named in this statement. There were other contracts for supplies, which came into the office and which were awarded by the officers of the department while I was there, but the tenders for which had been called for before I was Minister. The Hon. Mr. Desjardins and the officers of the department had awarded the other contracts, and I signed them. The officers of the department are the same now as they were then, and I think they properly discharge their duties. They have the confirmation of both Administrations at all events. They have been some time in the department and I believe that probably the hon. Minister (Mr. Borden) found them of such a character that he has retained them. I asked my deputy and the other officers who have charge of opening the tenders, the Board of Control, and they told me before I signed the contracts, that they were in proper order and had been awarded to the lowest tenderers in the usual way. Of course I was entirely new to the department and had presided over it but for a short time. Under these assurances, which I believed to be correct, I signed the contract. With regard to the other contracts which were awarded during my time in the department, a list of them was sent to me by my deputy, and he said that the invariable practice of the department was to award them to the lowest tenderers, and he asked me to put my initials in such places as I saw fit in that connection. I did not know the name of a single gentlemen in the contracts which I awarded, and I do not know the politics of any of the gentlemen to whom the contracts went. I simply put my initial upon the lowest tender and returned it to my deputy, who subsequently prepared the contracts. I asked him the same question, if they were in the form that had been usual in the department, and he assured me that they were, and I signed and executed them. These are the whole circumstances. The contracts were awarded at the usual time, I understand, that is at as early a date as possible after the close of the session of Parliament. The reason of that, I believe, is that if the contracts are for one year, the money is on hand, having been voted by Parliament. In this particular case the money had not been voted; but if the contracts had not been made and executed it would have been impossible to get the supply of clothing and other articles which it was necessary for the department to get. I make that explanation, and I do not propose to protest any more about it, because these are the facts. I make this statement in justice to the department, to the party to which I belong, and to myself, and in order to give the proper information to the country. Now, I want to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if it is true that these contracts have been annulled? If they have been, I wish to ask him without any more formality if he will bring down promptly the tenders, the contracts, the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and all other papers or letters connected therewith. If the hon. gentleman will kindly do that at my request, I would suggest that any further discussion of the question be deferred until the papers are here. Then we can take it up and have one discussion on the whole matter. The papers will develop such facts as will put the matter properly before the country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). With the permission of the House, I will briefly reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman. It has been usual, I think, in the past for Governments to require a regular motion of the House to be carried ordering papers before they have been brought down. I know that our predecessors have been in the habit, very properly I think, of sheltering themselves behind that rule. This is the second or third occasion this session on which I have been asked by my predecessor in office, without motion, to lay papers on the Table of the House. I have complied with his request, and I have no objection in the present case, so far as I can see at this moment, to bringing down all the papers he asks for. I may say, however, that when I came into the Militia Department I found that some large contracts had been let—one for three years from the 1st of July, 1896, and another for two years beginning the 1st of July, 1897—for clothing which was not required, which my officers informed me would not be required until after the 1st day of July, 1897.

Mr. TISDALE. I would call my hon. friend's attention to what I said, because I am sure he does not wish to be unfair. I said that except for denying any charges of corruption, I did not propose to discuss the matter at present, and I ask him to pursue the same course until we have the papers before us. He can see at once that if at this time he makes statements with regard to what led to the action that has been taken by his department—I do not know what that action has been—I might have said something about the contracts. But if the hon. gentleman will oblige me by keeping within the rule, it would save discussion until we see the papers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman asks me a certain question. He wants to know if certain contracts have been annulled, and he wants me to say why I have taken the course which I have. I will not delay the House very long; but I think it is only fair for me to state the circumstances which led up to the action that has been taken. I was going on to say that those contracts

were let without tenders, having been asked for by public advertisement. Notices were sent to several individuals, who were asked to tender; but the public press never contained any advertisement of these contracts; and at least a dozen leading men in Canada who deal in the same class of goods have called on me since I came into office, and have stated that they never heard of tenders being asked for, and knew nothing about them, although they had been anxious to get an opportunity to tender. When I found the contract for the supply of clothing after the first day of July, 1897, I thought that was an extraordinary condition of things, and I said at once to the officers of my department that I thought that contract ought to be annulled. My deputy advised me not to take any action without first consulting the Department of Justice; and that is what led me to send the contracts and all the papers over to the Department of Justice for their opinion. The Department of Justice have had the matter before them for some weeks, and within a few days they have sent a carefully prepared opinion to the Militia Department stating that that department had no authority whatever to make any of those contracts; and upon the strength of that advice I have proceeded to annul the contract which agreed to supply goods after the 1st of July, 1897. I take this further view with regard to the three-year contract. The opinion of the Department of Justice, which is very clear and distinct, is that the Department of Militia had no power to enter into a contract for three years, or even one year, unless the money was voted, and that, had the money been voted for one year, the contract would be good for that year. Now, although the money was not voted, I am giving the contractors the benefit of the first year. I assume that the money will be voted this year, and we are actually receiving the goods, as they are required, and I propose to accept the contract from 1896 to 1897, subject to the will of Parliament. I shall be very happy to bring down the papers.

Mr. TISDALE. With the consent of the House, I would like to say a few words with regard to this contract. I make no objection whatever to the very proper remark of the hon. Minister. Of course, so far as I am individually concerned, I had no responsibility in the matter, for it had been arranged before I took office. I took office in the heat of the election campaign. All I propose doing at this time is that business men will understand that you can contract for three years at considerably less than for one year, and that is at all events one justification of what was done. And, to avoid the legal difficulty to which my hon. friend has referred, each contract contains the clause that, unless the money is voted, it falls to the ground. As my hon. friend has kindly consented to bring down the papers without further notice, I shall defer any further comment until then.

DISMISSALS FROM THE INTERCOLONIAL AND MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to call attention to one or two matters as briefly as possible, so that, when we come to deal with the items to which they relate, there may be no unnecessary delay. On the 28th of August, I called attention to some of the dismissals that had taken place in the county of Pictou on the Intercolonial and also in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I asked the hon. gentlemen who had charge of these different departments, to kindly take a note of the facts, and have an inquiry made, so that, when the subject was next brought up, they would be in a position to speak with accuracy as to what had been done and what steps, if any, had been taken subsequently. I want particularly, as we are making some progress in Supply now, to call attention to those cases again. I want to call attention to the cases of Roderick McLeod and Roderick McLean, who were working on the Intercolonial and were summarily dismissed and others put in their places. No charge was made against these men, and no reason was given for their dismissal. The other cases had reference to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I will mention them, so that the hon. colleagues of the Minister in charge of that department, who is not now in his place, may bring the matter to his notice. I wish now to call the attention of the Minister of Railways—who also, I observe, is not in his place, and whose colleagues, no doubt, will advise him—to certain other dismissals on the Intercolonial, not particularly in the county I have the honour to represent, but mostly in the county of Antigonish. While the men who were dismissed from service might technically be called temporary hands paid from day to day, they were practically permanent employees. I shall give their names, and the years when their employmen began:

John G. McDougall	1880
R. McLean	1882
Hugh McPherson	1884
D. A. McDougall	1887
James Landry	1888
John Morrell	1888
D. R. McLean	1890

These men held comparatively humble positions on the Intercolonial, but nevertheless are entitled to the same treatment as any other Government officers, high or low. So long as they did their duty faithfully, the same care and caution should be shown in removing them and the same fair treatment given them as to others who hold more im-

portant positions. I am informed that these men were removed in this way. I do not make the statement positively at this stage, but merely want to give the hon. gentleman in charge of the department the opportunity of carefully looking into them. The information placed in my hands is to the effect that these men, who were employed on the tracks, and whose services are dispensed with every year from some time in December until April, as not being necessary, were employed on the track in connection with the repairing of bridges and fences and work of that character, and have been employed in that way permanently since the years respectively I have mentioned. They were laid off, as it is termed, for the first time in that season, since their services had been employed, at the end of July, and the only reason for their removal was that there was no work for them to do. That would seem, at first, quite reasonable, but it is extraordinary that every other year, considering the nature of the work, these men were continually employed. What has happened ? According to my information, after being laid off for a few weeks, other men were employed in the place of these men, who have done no wrong and who are not offensive partisans, and who are not charged with any offence. It was supposed, and no doubt correctly, that they voted, as they always have done, for the Conservative party, but no charge has been suggested against these men that they were, in any sense, negligent of their duty or even active workers in connection with the political party with which they sympathize. But I am informed that the places of these men have been filled by men who voted Grit at the last election, and who were recommended by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). Of course the hon. gentleman will see in "Hansard" just what I have stated. But since he is in his seat I may say that my object in mentioning this matter is that when we reach his department in Supply there may be no delay in finally discussing this subject. The hon. Minister of Railways has given, as far as I know, no evidence of a desire to deal in a harsh way with the employees of the Intercolonial. I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) is responsible for the action—so far as responsibility goes—respecting the bridge men at Pictou, because it happened while he was Minister of Railways that, without reason assigned, these men were turned away and two Liberals put in their places. My point is this—and I hope I do not misunderstand the Minister of Railways' own ideas of what is proper under the circumstances—these men who have served on the Intercolonial, whether engaged by the day or the month or the year, who have served the public for a period long enough to have become practically permanent men, are entitled, no matter whether their position be high or low, to equal treatment all around. That is to say, these men should not be capriciously discharged ; they should not be discharged because they did not vote the Liberal ticket or anything of that kind, but should be recognized as coming under the rule laid down in a previous discussion that there shall be satisfactory evidence that they were offensively partisan before they shall forfeit their positions. In fact, I claim the same treatment for these men as is to be meted out to other officers in the public service ; and I do not think that the hon. Minister, when he looks into this matter will desire to make a distinction against these men because they happen to be paid by the day, if they have practically won the position of permanent officers. I would like also to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a case that has been brought to my notice and that may come up at a later stage, so that he may answer any questions with regard to it. I refer to the case of the lightkeeper at Port Medway. I find that the Liverpool "Advance," a paper, as the hon. gentleman knows, in sympathy with the Government is pressing for an investigation into the dismissal of the late lightkeeper, and pressing, practically, for the dismissal of the present keeper. I would like the hon. gentleman to look that up when it is convenient, as the probability is that the question will be asked whether he contemplates taking any action in this case.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). While this matter is before the House, I will take the opportunity of referring to some dismissals on the Prince Edward Island Railway, which, as I am informed, are of the same nature as those that have been referred to. Section men who have been on the road for years, some, perhaps, temporary hands, and some regular hands, have been dismissed. But whether temporary or regular they have been so engaged on the road now that they have become efficient men. They have large families depending on their earnings, they have no other occupation for the support of their families and nothing is charged against them except that they polled their votes for the Conservative party. They were not men who took an active part in the election in any way or could be called offensive partisans. They merely recorded their votes, and for that they have been dismissed and men not so competent put in their places. Now if this principle is to be followed and people who have given good and faithful service to the country are to be dismissed in this way without any charge being brought against them, the results must be injurious to the public service. One case that has come under my notice is that of a section man at Cardigan, Prince Edward Island, named, I believe, Livingstone. This man Livingstone has a large family and is dependent altogether upon his earnings on the road for their support. And now, without a moment's warning and

without any good cause that I can learn, he has been sent about his business. There is another case also, that of Alexander McConnell, at Georgetown, also a section man. Without notice and for no cause except that he polled his vote for the Conservative party, he is dismissed. Wm. McDonald at the same place also has had notice to quit, as well as others I might name. As to this last named man, I am not aware that anybody even knew how he voted, so little part did he take in the elections. And yet, on the supposition that he did vote for the Conservative party and for no other reason that I can learn, he has been dismissed and another man put in his place. If this principle is to be acted upon in every case and dismissals made in this way, I fear that some day it will lead to reprisals of the same kind, a thing which is much to be deplored in the public interest. I could also refer to other cases of men in other portions of the Prince Edward Island Railway, who have been dismissed in the same manner as those I have mentioned. But I do not wish to take up the time of the House, and merely refer to the matter now because it has been brought before the House. I understand that notices have been sent to other officers in other departments of the public service asking them if they had taken part in the late elections and, I suppose, calling in question their right to do so. I think that it is nothing but right that, if it is charged against an officer that he has taken an offensive part in elections, he should have an opportunity of explaining whether he did or not, instead of being summarily sent about his business as in the case I have mentioned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture in his place so I suppose it is not likely that the Estimates for his department will be taken up to-night. But there is a matter upon which I think the Government ought to be prepared to give us very full information when we come to these estimates. Some little time ago, when the Minister of Agriculture, after full consultation with the officers of my department and upon their report, I decided to re-organize the veterinary service of the Dominion. In agreement with the report, a number of gentlemen were appointed in the various counties of Canada to act as the local officers of the department for the purpose of protecting our flocks and herds from disease. I understand, though my information is not definite or positive on that point, that these appointments have been annulled. My information is only definite with reference to a few. I have concluded that it cannot possibly be for the reason that these gentlemen took a prominent and offensive part in the election, that they have been notified that their services will not be required. Some of the gentlemen to whom I refer were warm and ardent supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite; so I conclude that the Government, on the representation of the present Minister of Agriculture, had decided to change the policy in connection with veterinary surgeons. If so, I think, before we pass a vote for quarantine, the Government ought to be prepared to give us the fullest information with regard to their decision on this question.

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to the matter brought up by my hon. friend, I may say that just before coming down to my parliamentary duties a rancher out north of Regina came in and told me that his herds were all tainted by some disease that he did not understand, that he had been to Mr. Creamer, who had been one of the men appointed by the Agriculture Department to look into these matters, and that Mr. Creamer told him that his position had been cancelled. I at once telegraphed the Minister of Agriculture, who did take some action in regard to my telegram, but whether successful, I do not know. I think he got a veterinary from the Mounted Police to attend to it. But I would say that I do not think that in that vast territory you can depend safely upon a veterinary surgeon from the Mounted Police to attend to all the cases that may arise in regard to our herds in the North-west Territories. The matter brought up by my hon. friend from Haldimand is a very important one to us in the Territories.

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

(In the Committee.)

Salary of the Deputy Speaker..... $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to have some explanation in reference to this matter from the leader of the Government. If I remember rightly, when some years ago it was proposed by the then Government to appoint a Deputy Speaker, there was a very decided expression of opinion by the then Opposition, at the present time the Government, with reference to the necessity for such an office, it being held, I think, by the great majority of the party that such an officer was not necessary, that the expenditure was a useless one, and that it was not advisable to load up the taxpayers with a salary of $2,000 a year when we could go on as formerly, and when an hon. gentleman from either side of the House could temporarily take the Chair or preside over committees. Is this an instance of the conviction that comes after a change from one side of the House to the other? Is it the policy of my hon. friend now to hark back upon the assertions and the strong arguments of a few years ago? It seems that now they are convinced that our way was the better way?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have no hesitation in giving to my hon. friend a very frank answer, all the more frank and sincere because he never heard me utter a word in any place or at any time against the office of Deputy Speaker. There has been, I know, in the ranks of our party, and perhaps also in the ranks of the Opposition, some differences of opinion as to the advisability of appointing a Deputy Speaker. The hon. gentleman having appealed to me, I will give him the views which I always entertained. I never said a word in my life against the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. On the contrary, being a strong admirer of the British constitution in every particular, I thought it was always well to keep as close to it as we could; and as the bulk of business in a country like ours is fast increasing, the conclusion, I suppose, has been come to that although at one time the office of Deputy Speaker was not thought to be necessary, at the present time, in view of the increasing business, and of the example of the mother country, we are justified in trying the experiment, or rather continuing it for some time to come.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad my hon. friend has expressed so frankly his individual opinion. I imagine that as leader of the Government, he has brought those recalcitrant members who were so outspoken against this appointment into a proper state of discipline. I congratulate him on coming to this conclusion, as I think it is a wise one. I was rather sorry, however, to hear that one of the grounds upon which he proposed to carry out the policy was the increase of business. That may not only mean in the duties of a Deputy Speaker, I suppose, but it may also mean an increase in the Estimates from year to year.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must tell my hon. friend that I am too modest a man altogether to accept the compliment which he has paid me of having brought recalcitrant members to my way of thinking. We have seen so illustrious an example of that kind of influence before, that I do not think I can accept his congratulations at all.

House of Commons—Salaries..... $72,012 50

Mr. SPEAKER. The increase of $600 is made up in this way: There are thirteen statutory increases of $50 each, $650; a decrease of $50 on account of the retirement of the assistant law clerk, and his successor's salary being $50 less, making a net increase of $600.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does this include the messengers' salaries?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, the higher offices.

Mr. FOSTER. In this set of officers coming under this estimate, have there been any dismissals since Mr. Speaker has taken his place?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, there have been no changes or dismissals.

Expenses of Committees, Sessional and extra Clerks, &c..... $13,600

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask what officers have been dismissed who are paid under this item, door-keepers and messengers, for instance?

Mr. FOSTER. To make the question inclusive, as we are now upon the vote for expenses of committees and for sessional and extra clerks, I wish also to ask for information. The committee would like to have a statement from the Speaker as to any dismissals of sessional clerks or extra clerks that have been made and the reasons for those dismissals, and also whether or not the places which have been made vacant have been filled, and whether it is proposed to fill them.

Mr. SPEAKER. On entering upon my present position I found there 25 sessional clerks and five sessional translators. The report of the Committee on Internal Economy adopted by the House, I think, in 1884, and approved by hon. members on both sides of the House, fixed the number of sessional clerks. Before that time, I believe the number had been very largely exceeded, and it was considered by a special commission which looked into the matter that it was a scandal that so many sessional writers were appointed. It was thereupon decided to reduce the number of sessional clerks to 25, and of sessional translators to five, or a total of 30. It was also practically decided to place these men on the permanent staff. That was the position when I was elected Speaker. I felt this, that the officers of this House ought to keep out of politics if they wished to retain their positions, and of those men to whom I referred there were four who frankly admitted to the Clerk of the House, who shared the responsibility with the Speaker in this matter, that they had actively engaged in politics.

Mr. FOSTER. Four of which class?

Mr. SPEAKER. Sessional clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Four of the 25?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, of the 25. Those men were not re-engaged. One gentleman did not admit to the Clerk that he had actively engaged in politics; but complaints were laid before me against him, and I investigated the complaints, and then he admitted to me that he had been actively engaged in politics during the late Dominion elections. I suggested to the Clerk that he should be dismissed, and he was dismissed.

Mr. FOSTER. Will Mr. Speaker give the names of those clerks?

Mr. SPEAKER. The name of this clerk whose case I have investigated was Béchard.

His place has been filled by a gentleman of the name of Cloutier.

Mr. FOSTER. And there are four others ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They were Chagnon, Desrosiers—who were from Quebec—while Aubé was from Ontario—Béchard, from the county of Kent, Ont., who is replaced by another French gentleman ; and then there was Letson.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who did not admit his offence guilt ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Letson did, but Mr. Béchard did not admit the offence to the Clerk, and I investigated his case, and he admitted to me that he had taken an active part on the stump. I considered that was sufficient to disqualify him from being a servant of the members of the House, who politically, certainly, differ.

Mr. MILLS. Of course the new men are not active politicians.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is brought to my attention that they are active politicians they certainly will be dismissed. I desire also to state that there are at least three other clerks against whom complaints have been made to me, but so far I have not been able to satisfy myself that the evidence is sufficient to dismiss them. If it is so, I shall dismiss them ; if not, I shall not. That is the position in respect to the sessional clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. If Mr. Speaker would not think it too much trouble I should like him to give an answer to two questions. One is, for what length of time are the sessional clerks paid ? Another is, are they supposed to be here twelve months in the year, or are their duties confined to the time when the House is in session ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are paid by the session, at so much per day.

Mr. FOSTER. And after the session they go to their homes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I assume, however, that they have the character of permanent clerks, who have a right to come back here if they do not misbehave themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. The course of proceeding may be all perfectly right, but undoubtedly it is a sort of Star Chamber proceeding. Those poor fellows were hauled up either by letter or personally before a high court judge of the Star Chamber and put through their facings, and when the evidence submitted appeared to be sufficient to justify the Speaker in dismissing them, the order was given : "Off with their heads." They are after all officers of the House, and it seems to me that so far as those men are concerned the House has a right to know what was the charge brought against each of them and the evidence on which they were severally dismissed. It certainly was not on the ground of malfeasance of office. I want to make that point plain before the House. Those men are simply paid for attending on members of the House while the House is in session, it may be two, three or four months, and they have the rest of the year for themselves. They can engage in printing, in carpenter's work, in digging potatoes, in writing for magazines, in working on newspapers or in any other pursuit. I do not see what the Speaker of the House has to do as to what those men outside the session follow as their profession or do as their daily work, provided they do not make themselves objectionable on the point of morals or something of that kind, which would make it inadvisable for them to be employed in the service. Does the Speaker, and in fact do members of this House mean to subscribe to the principle that because they employ a man and pay him by the day for a period of, say, three months in the year, and the clerk maintains his character and reputation but takes it into his head to espouse the cause of any political party, he has not a perfect right to do so ? He may, however, in the course of his perigrinations have even said something particularly offensive to a member of this House, and that hon. member might object to being waited on by a man who had personally offended him. That would have great weight with me in deciding the matter. But nothing of that kind occurred, for they have simply done what every citizen of this country has a right to do without being fined for it, that is exercised the right of franchise, and given a free expression of their opinion so long as they do it in decorum and as gentlemen should. But, to say that this House, and Mr. Speaker, are to hold Star Chamber inquiries over men of this kind, and deprive them of the rights of citizenship, is something that I will never subscribe to. I do not believe that the doctrine is right, and I think it is a small thing for this House, and for the Speaker of this House to be engaged in. If they have said anything offensive, if they have done anything against the laws of the country or offended against good morals, then dismiss them. But, when they are not employed in this House, if they chose to support their political party and to do so in an inoffensive and gentlemanly way, in the name of goodness what fault ought we find with them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Has my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) always acted on that ?

Mr. FOSTER. Your hon. friend has always acted on that, and I hope always will. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) may smile an incredulous smile if he pleases, but I am on record before the country so far as that is concerned, and I propose to act on that principle in the future as I have acted upon it in the past. We believe that according to

Mr. Speaker's view he has done exactly what is right, but after all it is only the opinion of one member of this House, dealing with officials who are the servants of the whole of this House, and is it not right that we should have a statement as to what these men were charged with, and the evidence upon which they have been beheaded. That at least ought to be placed before this committee so as to satisfy us that a proper course was taken in their discharge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask, whether in the case of the officer who did not admit himself to be in fault, there was any formal inquiry, or how was it conducted ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was no such officer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the hon. the Speaker to say, that in one case he inquired into, the officer had not admitted his guilt.

Mr. SPEAKER. The officer did not admit it to the Clerk, and when I inquired into it he admitted it to me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In that case was there any records of the inquiry, or was it merely a conversation ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It was a conversation. I sent for him a number of times.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Speaker say what the charge was, and what the admission was ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I will presently. I think I should explain what I consider to be the position of the sessional clerks. From what I could ascertain from inquiries I have made, we have to go back to the year 1878, the last year of the Liberal Administration. A very large number of sessional clerks were appointed, as I understand, then. When the Liberal Administration was defeated and the Conservative Government came into power in 1879, a still larger number of sessional clerks were appointed ; the old ones were turned out and a new set were put in. That was the practice at any rate in these matters. They were considered as simply put there temporarily according to the terms of their employment, and there was no permanence whatever in the matter.

An hon. MEMBER. They were turned out for political reasons.

Mr. SPEAKER. They were turned out without any cause whatever. The cause was the change of Ministry. I understand from the debates of the House that Speaker Blanchet complained bitterly to the House, that he had been overridden and overruled, and was forced to appoint nearly one hundred officials of that kind. The officers of the House tell me that there was no place to put them, and some of them were put down in the vaults. That became such a scandal, Speaker Blanchet felt it to be a scandal, and the members of Sir John Macdonald's Government, I believe, felt it to be a scandal, that they wanted to have that system stopped. They appointed a special commission consisting of the Clerk of the House——

Mr. FOSTER. When ?

Mr. SPEAKER. About 1882 or 1883. That special commission consisted of the Clerk of the House, Mr. Courtney, and the late Deputy Minister of Railways (Mr. Trudeau). They considered the evidence, reported it to the Committee on Internal Economy, and reported in favour of reducing the number to 25, and five translators. Although they said nothing in their report about these being put on a permanent footing, still, the observations of Mr. Blake and others in the House, and the statement made by the Clerk of the House, led me to feel that it was clearly and distinctly understood from that time forward, that they were to be put on a permanent basis as officers of a department. There has been no change of Government from that time until the present, and the thing went on, vacancies were filled in the ordinary manner when they occurred, and all of them I have no doubt were filled by persons appointed for political reasons. The position I had to face was this, and if I am wrong the House will probably censure me, and if I am right the House will, I suppose, sustain me. I was glad indeed to be able to treat these officers as a permanent staff, because I felt that their permanent position would promote the efficiency of the service of this House, and promote a sense of responsibility amongst them. I thought, and I think now, that if any of these gentlemen, the servants of both sides of this House, had chosen to take upon themselves the responsibility of active interference in an election, in favour of one side or the other——

Mr. FOSTER. In favour of one side or the other ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, in favour of one side or the other, they would be unfit to be the servants of the House, and unfit to be trusted by us all as we have to trust them. I have taken that view. The position to which the House has done me the honour of electing me places me in a sort of judicial capacity, and I hope I will always be found to occupy that position worthily. So in this matter I felt that my view of the case was the correct one. I have been greatly assisted in coming to that conclusion by the views of the Clerk of the House, who is the head of this department—the Speaker, of course, has to approve of appointments or dismissals, but the Clerk really makes them, nominally at least. My view of the situation coincided absolutely with his. I believe that his opinion is the right one, although perhaps some hon. members have

probably thought I was not taking the right view. At any rate, I have resisted all pressure that might have been brought upon me to take any other view of the case. Four of these gentlemen admitted to the Clerk that they had taken an active part in politics.

Mr. FOSTER. What had they done ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They admitted to him, and they withdrew from the position. He reported to me so. There was one gentleman who did not admit that to him, namely, Mr. Bechard, of Chatham. I received complaints that he was very actively engaged in politics. He denied in a general way that he had engaged actively at the last election in the county of Kent, Ont. Then I further inquired and I got some particulars. I got a statement that he had made a strong speech on the school question at a political meeting in that county.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you get the speech ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, sit down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have a right to ask that question, and I shall ask it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen opposite may seek to interrupt me, but I have a right to ask the question, and I will have something to say on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to answer the hon. gentleman's questions. I got the substance of the speech in a general way, and I found it to be a strong political speech on the school question. I sent for the gentleman himself, and he admitted to me that he had made that speech at that public meeting against the member who now sits for that county, I thought, whether rightly or wrongly, that that was a sufficient ground for his ceasing to act as a sessional writer for this House ; and, while I have the honour to have the responsibility of dealing with these matters, subject to the direction of the House, that is the stand I propose to take.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 20) to change the name of the Hull Electric Company to the Hull and Aylmer Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Devlin.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Act incorporating the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Borden, Halifax.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay Canal and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Boyd.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Expenses of Committees, Sessional and extra Clerks $13,600

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. the Speaker, and I think some hon. members of the committee did not altogether appreciate either the position of the Speaker or the rights of the committee in regard to the item now under consideration. My interruption was not received with favour by hon. gentlemen behind the Speaker, though I am quite sure the Speaker himself saw the force of it, though he may not have concurred in the point which occurred to my mind, and which I proposed to submit for the consideration of the committee. In the first place, I agree with the hon. the Speaker in much of what he said touching the previous discussions and the position which sessional clerks should hold : and, in order to prevent a deterioration of the staff, there seems to be, as he put it, a consensus of opinion in previous sessions that this office should be regarded as a permanent office ; so that, in that sense, the office was made more important. The permanency of the office seems to me to give those officers who may have incurred the displeasure of the powers that be, perhaps a clearer right to careful inquiry and due consideration before that permanency is destroyed. I did not think, and I do not now think, that the idea the Speaker suggested in regard to the manner in which these charges should be considered, was a very wise one. The hon. the Speaker, for instance, constituted himself a court of inquiry : and, without any record, and rather hastily, as it seemed to me, proceeded to decapitate all those officers who did not willingly and without a murmur go to the block and submit their heads, and, when the hon. the Speaker mentioned, as a strong feature of the case, that one of these officers, the officer whom he tried, had made a strong speech, I ventured to ask the hon. gentleman, as was my right, whether he had read the speech. The very object of my question was apparent after what I had said. I wanted to ascertain, in order to have the subject more fully considered and discussed, how much care had been taken by the hon. the Speaker in this cursory investigation, or this very summary proceeding ; and, as far as I understood the hon. the Speaker, he had not read, or did not say he had taken the trouble to read, the speech ;

but, from the substance of it, which had been communicated to him, he was able to say that it was a strong speech. I think the rule laid down by the Speaker is hardly in line with the opinions expressed this session in regard to what should constitute an offence by a public servant during the elections. The hon. the Speaker intimated that the charge in this case was that this officer had been actively engaged in the last election. If the hon. gentleman correctly expressed himself, it seems to me that is going a great deal further than the majority of Ministers ever claimed to be their right and duty to go, in dealing with officers in the various departments. The position, however, of these officers, it seems to me, is a much stronger one, so far as their electoral rights are concerned, than that of officers in the service proper. What is their position? Outside that feature of it regarding permanency, namely, their right to come to this House every session without fresh appointment, it is clear that their services are required by the country for only a short time during the year, and during the remainder of the year they are their own masters in every sense of the word. During that time they are not servants of this House, not in the pay of the country, but are free men, with rights as complete as any man in the country with regard to electoral matters. If I were to sum up my view as to how far these officers of the House are under control after their sessional duties are over, I would say that the only length to which we could fairly go would be to see that in their intercourse with public men, in their conduct generally, they should conduct themselves as decent, respectable citizens. To say that they cannot make strong speeches and express their views as lustily and as often as they please, seems to me to be laying down an extraordinary position with regard to officers in that position, at a time when they are not the servants of this House in any particular. I trust therefore that the idea which Mr. Speaker seems to entertain with regard to his duty, as representing the House, towards these officers, will not be supported by hon. gentlemen on either side. It would be interesting if the committee were informed as to how much truth there is in the statement that most of these men were first condemned and tried afterwards. I am told that this particular officer was summoned into the presence of the Speaker after it had been intimated to him that his position was gone.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's information is entirely incorrect.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am very glad indeed that it is, and I accept your statement, Mr. Speaker. The statement I made came to me at third-hand that, after the official intimation had been received by this officer, his conversation with Mr. Speaker took place. Now we have not the speech, we have not even the subject of the speech that was considered so improper for an officer of this House to make, when not engaged in his official duties and practically not under pay. Perhaps if the rule laid down by Mr. Speaker is to be adopted, namely, that such an officer has no right to be actively engaged in an election, Mr. Speaker may consider it unnecessary to read the speech, because the very fact of making it was proof of activity during the election. I, for one, dissent as strongly as possible from that rule. It is a cruel rule, suggested in this House for the first time. I cannot find a single case where an officer of this House, since 1867, has been discharged because, when Parliament was not sitting, he took an active part in politics. Certainly the reference of Mr. Speaker to the course followed in 1879 and after that will not help, because a careful examination of the debate shows clearly that the justification then given for the dismissal of certain officials was, rightly or wrongly, on another ground, and that was their incapacity. I cannot remember a case where there was a charge made that an officer had been actively engaged in an election.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can give one, and that is the case of the two translators of "Hansard," who were charged with having taken an active part in an election; and were dismissed at the instance of Lieutenant Governor Chapleau.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I remember that case, and it is one that would not in the slightest degree make me change my views. The charge in that case was not that these gentlemen had been actively engaged in political warfare, but that they had been most grossly abusive and offensive to a Minister of the Crown during an election, and I am not defending extraordinary conduct of that kind. I was careful to qualify the rule that I ventured to suggest to the committee, by keeping such a case in view. That is not the charge in this instance. The charge which came to the knowledge of Mr. Speaker, and with which he dealt, was that of activity in the last general election and making a strong speech on the school question. I trust we will not make a rule of that character, which will render reprisals difficult to avoid in the future. The sense of the country is against anything of the kind. I therefore object to the principle laid down by Mr. Speaker, and I venture to protest strongly against that system of examination and inquiry. An officer holding a position regarded as permanent, who comes to his duty session after session, is certainly entitled to have, and the House is entitled to have, in the case of an investigation that would warrant his dismissal, a very clear and concise record of the offence, so that the judgment which Mr. Speaker exercised,

in the first instance, should be more carefully and accurately reviewed by this committee. The right to review no one can question.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There is a misapprehension about the civil service of Canada in this whole discussion. It would be well for us to understand the different position that exists in Great Britain. Up to the year 1864, no official in Great Britain was permitted to vote, and the reason was that up to that time, the officials were appointed simply as in Canada for political purposes. In 1864 a commission issued, and then, for the first time, the civil service of Great Britain was put upon the footing on which it now is, namely, that there are no appointments made by the government to any service except after a rigid examination, and the appointments are given to the candidates who have the highest points. After that rule was adopted, there was no reason why these civil servants should not be permitted to vote. So far as certain officials in Canada are concerned, that would be a wise rule. If we had the rule that exists in Great Britain of appointing no one to the public service unless he passed the examination, our civil servants ought to have the right to vote. But such a thing in Great Britain as a member of the civil service, or any man holding a position under government, going to a public meeting and making political speeches is unheard of.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was not referring to the civil service proper.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I know that, but I was only showing the different positions in England and Canada. If the same rule applied in Canada as in Great Britain, I should strongly support the position that our civil servants should all have a vote, but I would then draw the line, as it is drawn in Great Britain, at their appearing on the platform and taking an active part in elections. I would do it, in the first place, in the interests of the civil service. We want that men appointed in this country to do the business of the country shall have the respect of the community. And the moment a man becomes a partisan he loses to a great extent the respect of the community——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I beg you pardon. He loses the general respect which is necessary to enable him to carry on the business of his office to the best advantage. Suppose that an office-holder is a Liberal, and that he takes an active part in the elections. Will he be regarded by the Conservative electors with the same respect as would be the case if he confined himself to his duties? There must be a feeling on the part of every Conservative that this official is paid by Liberals as well as by other members of the community. In the second place, this is a thing that ought not to be permitted, for this reason: an official goes on the platform; there is no shorthand writer to take down what he says, and consequently you can never get an accurate statement of what he says.

Mr. QUINN. Then, why dismiss him for what he says?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I would avoid the difficulty of ascertaining what he says on the platform, by forbidding him saying anything on the platform. Is not the sensible rule to adopt that which has been adopted in Great Britain, which prevents the official from appearing on the platform at all? What is the ground of appointing a public official? Are they appointed because they belong to this party or that party? The only rule that ought to be applied is that of efficiency, and not party service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. They never thought of such a thing before. The only idea they had in making an appointment was to give these offices to men who had done good party service.

Mr. BENNETT. That is not regarded in Ontario at all.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I regret that the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) did not listen to the homily of the hon. gentleman from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who laid down the proposition—a very correct proposition—that it will not do to say, in answer to a charge of wrong-doing, that the other party did the same thing. Much less will it do to say that the Ontario government, with which we have nothing to do here, does the same thing. While I agree with the hon. gentleman from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that it is no answer to say that the other party did the same, still I admit that whoever says that, ought also to be ready, if he has given his vote and influence for the action in question, to say. Well, I cannot say anything, for I assisted it. But I say that there should be no such thing in the public service as men becoming active partisans. I would give every man freedom of opinion and freedom to cast his vote. If a man is capable and gained his position honourably—and that ought to be the case always; in fact, these appointments ought to be gained under a system of competitive examination—that is all that should be asked of him: he should be free to hold his own opinion and to act upon it. I have sometimes thought that what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, was true—that as, in our present situation, whatever party is in power, it is natural that strong partisans should be appointed to office, none of these men should have votes. That, as I have said, was the

rule in Great Britain up to 1864. While I am not ready to go that far, much can be said in favour of that view. I know it is difficult for these strong partisans, when appointed to office, to throw aside their party feelings all at once. A case occurred in my own county, which I have previously related to this House. I met at a public meeting an officer of the Government who spoke strongly against me. After the meeting, I suggested to him that it was not quite the correct thing for a civil servant, who was paid by all the taxpayers, to take such a strong part in politics in favour of one side. His answer was: I was appointed by the Government, and I am a servant of the Government; I will take my official life in my hand and work for the Government. Will it be said for a moment that a man who takes that position should be retained? Does any one believe that such a man will not do more for a political friend than he will for a political opponent? Suppose a judge in a court of law said: I was appointed by the Liberals, and I am the servant of the party that appointed me. Would any hon. gentleman on the other side feel that he could safely go before such a judge in an election case? In a smaller degree, every man who occupies an office under the Government becomes a judge. Take the case of a fishery officer. Two men are found violating the law, one a political friend and the other a political opponent of the officer. Will it be said, if that officer is a partisan and takes a strong position in elections, that he will treat those men with the same even-handed justice? Surely not. We must distinguish between the American and the English systems: I think the American system is abominable—simply dismissing every man without any inquiry because he was appointed by the other side. But, on the other hand, we must not, in our circumstances, take extreme ground on the other side and keep civil servants in office simply because they have been appointed. There seems to be a feeling on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that they must make an appeal on behalf of these men because they feel that many of them have been doing what they ought not to have done in the elections. If these men take their political fortunes in their hands, and, though appointed to do justice to all, will go upon the public platform as politicians, pure and simple, they thereby impair their own efficiency as servants of all the people, and must not complain if their services are dispensed with. I know the difficulties a candidate has had to face in my own county. There are officials who have gone to men who were appointed under the Mackenzie government previous to 1878—there are only a few of them—and said: Unless you vote for the Conservatives, you will be dismissed. The officers thus threatened have come to me and told me that they had to vote Conservative or lose their offices. I have a letter giving a curious instance of the interference in the election by a public official. There is a schooner that leaves one port in my county and goes to another. She clears as she goes out, and upon her return back again the captain enters the schooner as having returned. A telegram comes from a strong Conservative official at the point she touched to a strong Conservative official in the place where the schooner was owned, saying that captain so-and-so had left without clearing. The captain was ignorant, he thought, and perhaps did not know the law. He goes to him and says: That vessel is going to be seized, you will lose your vessel, but if you vote against Fraser there will be no proceedings taken against you. Well, Sir, that is cheered on the other side as being the correct thing to do, and still they raise their voices against putting a man out that does the like of that. That was no ordinary case. This was a man who was at once a fishery officer——

Mr. MILLS. I thought it was a fish story.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman would understand better if it was. He was a fishery officer, he held the post office, and he was also collector of customs; in fact, he was three rolled into one. Now, he did not go on a public platform at all, but his act was as bad as if he had gone on the public platform against the candidate. Now, the distinction that must be made is this: that a man appointed to any position is a servant of the public, and he must attend to that work alone. As to the case in point, I think Mr. Speaker has acted correctly. If it is more to that man to be a politician than it is to be here for three months, then let him be a politician. He is a free agent. We must remember that a clerk of this kind comes into contact with both Liberal members and Conservative members. Sometimes he is a short-hand writer, and he writes for members on both sides, and of necessity has to do work that may contain many things political that the member for whom he is writing would not like to be known except to himself and his friends. I think the rule is a safe one, and ought to be observed. I know there are difficulties on account of the number. For myself, I am not inclined to be very harsh. I know that in the county I represent, where there are a large number of postmasters, there is but one man who made himself especially obnoxious. I know others who, in conversation with their friends, were against me, I know they voted against me, but they had a right to do so. But when a man is chairman of a Conservative committee in the district in which he lives, canvasses from house to house, and tries to make an impression against a candidate because he belongs to a secret so-

ciety which is objectionable in the eyes of those who do not believe that secret societies are right, then I say I will ask the Government to investigate the matter, and I shall do what I can to remove a man like that. But a line must be drawn. I do not believe in indiscriminate dismissals. I do not believe in venting our feelings upon a man because he has solid convictions; but the solider and better a man's convictions are, if he is in a public position, the less he is going to say about them. He will understand that his first business is to the state whose servant he is, and that the exercise of his right to vote ought to be enough for a man who to-day is serving under one Government and to-morrow will serve under another.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to understand my hon. friend. When he says of a man who is in an official position that the stronger his convictions are the less he will say about them, does the hon. gentleman mean less on a public platform or less in private life?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I regret I did not make myself understood by the hon. member. The stronger the convictions of a man who is, in a public position, the less he is going to say about them in his relations with the electors with whom he comes in contact. I did not mean to go into the privacy of the family. I do not want to inquire into the discussions that take place between a man and his wife about candidates and political parties—I mean in his public relations as a citizen. Now, I believe this will be found to be correct, that the stronger, the healthier and more manly are the political convictions of a servant of the public, whether he be Liberal or Conservative, the less he will talk about them. He will exercise his citizenship by voting in a manly way, but he is not going around to say much. I know that many of the men who say most at elections to assist their party do so with the thought that they are laying the foundation for promotion, and they afterwards come to the party that they assist and ask to be promoted on the ground of having rendered political services to that party. Having been appointed in the first instance on account of their political services, they think they will serve their interests by continuing to render such services. Now, that is all wrong. I trust that ere the term for which we are elected shall expire, we will have taken an advanced step on the line of civil service reform; I trust there will be less appointments than formerly on account of political leanings. I know one Liberal official in the county I represent to-day holding an office of some importance, namely, the position of postmaster. His father held the office for thirty or forty years, and this man, who had received his position thirty years ago, was, without his consent and against his protest, reduced from a salary of $30 to $16 a year, while the man who held the office next to him, and who is a Conservative, continued to get his $30. The Liberal was told. You will have to take $16 or nothing, and he said, Take away the office. But they could not get along without the office, he was the best man, and so what did they do? The mails continued to come to his place, and he was reduced from $30 to $16 all that time. It will be understood by hon. gentlemen that the officials are quite a political force in the county, and if they were permitted to become active politicians, any one can see how much influence they may wield. They have each their fathers, and mothers, brothers, sisters, brothers-in-law, and sons-in-law, and so on all through the county. I think the judicious view taken by Mr. Speaker is the correct one. I maintain that any man who draws a public wage ought to feel that it is a public wage and not a party wage, and he should act accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have almost been convinced by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that I have gone too far in trying to keep politics out of the staff of sessional clerks of this House. I have made an earnest and serious attempt to eliminate politics from among the officials of this House. The hon. member for Pictou does not seem at all to appreciate the efforts I have made, but his criticism of the course I have taken is very severe indeed. I want to remind the hon. member that there is no law which makes the sessional clerks permanent. I will read to the hon. member the report of the Internal Economy Committee of the House of Commons on the whole question of the sessional staff, and the report was adopted by the House:

Resolved, That one or two of the senior clerks on the permanent sessional staff be appointed to take charge of the extra writing staff at a salary of $600 each.

That is the permanent sessional staff.

Resolved, That the three remaining clerks on the permanent sessional staff be continued as at present at $400 per session.

That is the permanent sessional staff.

Resolved, That five extra French translators be employed during the session at $4 per diem.

Resolved, That 25 extra sessional clerks be employed as at present at $3 per diem.

There is nothing there that binds the Clerk of the House and the Speaker, who have control of these officers, to treat them other than as sessional officers, as officers holding office from session to session. When this report was received by the House there was a general expression of opinion that hon. members were gratified that those appointments were so limited, and at the same time that the positions were made more of a permanent character. The Clerk, who is the head of the department, is very desirous

that the staff should have a permanent character. It is no doubt very much in the interest of the service of the House that it should be so, and I was perfectly willing, when I was elected Speaker of this new Parliament, to consult with him and to take that view of the case. But my efforts have not been appreciated in the slightest degree by hon. gentlemen opposite. They know perfectly well that every single one of those clerks was appointed by their political friends for political reasons; and although I have stood out against my political friends and have stated that I wanted to increase the efficiency of the service of the House and treat the clerks as permanent officers, I have not received the slightest encouragement from hon. gentlemen opposite. On the contrary, what I have most carefully done, and what I am ready to justify, has not met with any encouragement from hon. gentlemen opposite. What has been done? Four of these clerks have been by the Clerk of the House told that for reasons which had come to his knowledge, that they had been interfering in politics (which they also admitted) they would not be reinstated. One of those clerks, only one out of the whole of them, has been found guilty by me of actively interfering in politics by addressing public meetings against an hon. member of this House. I have held, and I shall continue to hold so long as I am Speaker of the House, that this disqualifies a man from properly performing his duties as an officer of this House. I will back up the view of the Clerk and endeavour to prevent this branch of the service being a political branch. But if hon. members do not desire it, I am perfectly willing to resign that responsibility, and let the majority of the House entirely control the appointment of sessional clerks. So long, however, as I hold the position I do, unless the House directs me to the contrary, I propose to act as I have done in any future cases which come before my notice, and I wish no misunderstanding on the point whatever, that I shall act exactly as I have done in the case that has been under discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I really must express my astonishment that Mr. Speaker, a member of this committee, should have allowed himself to be so worked up into a condition of excitement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And further that any hon. members in this House should accord to him the applause which generally a party leader receives. I was guilty of no discourtesy to Mr. Speaker, unless it be discourteous for a member of this committee to express his opinion in regard to the treatment of the officers of this House, and it seems from the excited speech of Mr. Speaker that he demands the exclusive right to deal with officers of this House, and he will not receive criticisms, at least at my hands, without resorting to what seems to me very nearly a threat—that he would change his action and deal very harshly and cruelly with officers to whom he thinks he has been exceedingly kind. The kindness consists of this, so far as I understand the hon. gentleman, that he cut the head off the only officer who appeared before him, and the Clerk cut the heads off the other four.

Mr. SPEAKER. There have been complaints made before me respecting half a dozen other cases.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I consider each case should stand on its own merits. I dealt with only one case. Mr. Speaker has referred to the Clerk of the House. I need not remind him that that sort of defence is something like a Minister sheltering himself behind his deputy. He has to deal with each case, and whether Mr. Speaker dislikes it or not, I shall respectfully attempt to give my opinion as to the treatment extended to these officers. I did not discuss any case but one, because that case sufficiently illustrated a principle, and without intending to use language which would be offensive to any one I took that case as an illustration of what I think an erroneous principle, and I devoted a few minutes to discussing it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to say, in reply to the hon. member, that the reason why I mentioned the name of the Clerk was because by rule 110 the Clerk is brought into the matter in this way:

> The Clerk shall employ, at the outset of the session, with the approbation of the Speaker, such extra writers as may be necessary, engaging others as the public business may require.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We were not discussing the employment by the Clerk of any one under that rule; but the dismissals by the Speaker of officers of the House. So the rule has no application to the case. I referred to one case, and I propose to keep to it, in order to enter my protest against that treatment being accorded to any man, be he guilty or innocent. That was the first objection I had to the procedure. Again, I objected most strongly to the rule which Mr. Speaker laid down as his guide, and it has nothing to do with the answer that Mr. Speaker has given me, that was that he had been exceedingly lenient and by no means severe or harsh, but that if he got intelligence from the House he would in future adopt a different course. I am sorry he has taken the suggestion in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman is not anxious to misrepresent what I said. I stated that I would not act differently, but that I was prepared to leave the

whole matter of these appointments to the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The tone of the hon. gentleman may have misled me; it was a tone of excitement; he was cheered by party cheers. I was speaking simply for myself as a member of the committee on a point which I consider an important one, and which certainly is a particularly important one to officers in the public service. After all, what I am fighting to-night for is the adoption of a sound principle—and it has been deemed so by leaders on both sides of the House—that if you want to have efficient officers you must have definite rules, so that the officers may govern themselves accordingly, not capricious acts, and changes suddenly made and without notice, yet which would take away at one fell swoop a position in which a man had proved himself to be a useful and necessary public officer. Again, Mr. Speaker took me sharply to task as to the question of permanency in these appointments. I had not said it was the law but that it was necessary or desirable to treat these clerks as permanent: I had accepted Mr. Speaker's opinion. I had accepted his statement as to the expression of opinion on both sides of the House, viz: that it was in the interests of the public service that these temporary positions should be practically permanent; that is, that those officers should come, session after session, to fulfil their duties so long as there was no good reason for dismissing them. I have observed, however, that the Speaker has not given us any case which would have weakened the position that I so strongly took, when I said that there had been no precedent for this treatment of an officer. He has given us no precedent to show that an active part taken by an officer of this House when not paid for doing any work for this House, and when not on duty, was an offence for which he should be dismissed. This is a departure laid down by Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, for the first time. The debate in 1880 shows that I was warranted in saying that it was a vicious system to frequently change officers of this House, whether they be permanent or temporary. Every old member of this House knows the inconvenience caused by changing even the pages, and in far more important cases than that, it goes without saying that officers of experience are the most useful to the House. That is, however, a selfish aspect, and I was proceeding from the point of view of the justice of the case. I was claiming for these officers a fair trial before condemnation, and objecting to the rule laid down by Mr. Speaker, that activity in politics on the part of our officers, after their sessional duties are performed, should be considered an offence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I want to oblige the hon. gentleman by giving him just such a precedent as he requires. I wish him to understand that I did not applaud the Speaker of the House in the declaration he made, because I candidly confess that I was not entirely satisfied with it. I understand that there are 25 sessional clerks, and as matters now stand I believe that 20 of these were appointed by the Conservatives and only five appointed by the Liberals. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to want the whole earth. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker was not bound to take the very liberal and generous view he did take, and had he erred a little in the other direction there would have been ample justification for him. I found on a neighbour's desk a newspaper containing an extract from a speech delivered in this House in former years, and I shall take the liberty of reading it. A few years ago a gentleman by the name of Wade was a sessional clerk in this House. I understand that a distinction is drawn here, and perhaps properly drawn, between an officer of the Government and an officer of Parliament. The hon. gentleman himself (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has drawn that distinction, and he says that these are officers of the House. If that be the case I take it for granted that interference on one side or the other is equally objectionable. In 1887, Mr. Wade was summarily dismissed from the office of a sessional clerk in this House: the very character of office we are now discussing. I find that when complaint was made about that, the hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) made a statement in the House which I shall now read. Sir Charles, in reply to Mr. Jones, said:

> I am sorry to say that he (Mr. Wade) so far forgot the position he occupied as to go out and take a prominent part in holding public meetings and denouncing the Government of the day.

Now, that is what practically was done by the gentleman whose case we are discussing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He spoke on the school question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not care whether it was the school question or any other question. The point is that this sessional clerk went out and took his place on the public platform and denounced the Liberal party.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not the Government of the day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is too logical to draw a distinction between speaking against the Government of the day, and against the party in Opposition. Sir Charles Tupper continued on that occasion:

> I think there is no gentleman in this House on either side who will say that any public officer holding any office under the Government or Parliament should adopt such a course, or if he does adopt it that he should be retained in the public service, if we are to carry on public affairs in the

way in which, I am sure, hon. gentlemen would like to see them carried on. There is no doubt that public officers, especially under the ballot, have a perfect right to go to the polls and record their vote for or against any person, as they may please, or as they may consider it their duty, but I do not believe any gentleman in the House will sustain any public officer in going out and taking an offensive course in reference to the Government of the day, whoever may be in power.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) takes the point that if these officers behave themselves during the session of Parliament, we have nothing to do with what may happen during the recess.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I qualified that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understood that to be the view of the hon. gentleman, but he says he qualified it. The view laid down by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was, that this House has a right to take notice not only of what happens during the session, but of what happens in recess, as respects the officers of the House. And, when Mr. Wade went beyond the bounds of what was regarded as prudence and took the stump in defence of one party and attacking another, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) laid down the rule that he should be dismissed.

I accept the view of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and I am willing to have that principle applied not only to sessional clerks but to the service generally. No man shall be interfered with in his right to vote, but I say that if a man, being a public officer, chooses to go beyond that; if he chooses to exercise the right of citizenship to the extent of going on the stump and discussing party questions—I will not draw the line between a proper discussion and an improper discussion, because I say that if he is a public officer he has no business there at all—if he goes on the stump and takes his place in the ranks of his party, he must be content to take the fate of his party. If it shall suit the pleasure and generosity of the winning party to continue him in office they may do so; but if in the exercise of stern justice they dismiss him, then according to the rule laid down by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) he has only received justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope that on this very important question the two sides of the House are going to come to a common understanding. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) subscribes to the doctrine I have laid down in that speech. He accepts that, as the rule and guide to be pursued by all parties in this country in relation to public officers. Now, Sir, I adhere to every word that is contained in that statement, and I only ask the Government of the day to follow the lines that are laid down there, and I shall be perfectly satisfied. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to two points contained in that statement. The one is that the party was guilty of publicly denouncing the Government of the day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is he at liberty to denounce the Opposition?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will come to that in a moment. I draw a distinction between that and the denunciation of the Government of the day, because there is a certain amount of official impropriety in a public officer denouncing the Government under whom he is serving; but I do not make that an important distinction. But the word "offensive" completes the category, and fixes the conduct of a public officer as warranting his dismissal. I do not ask the present Government to retain in the public service an officer who has been guilty publicly of taking an offensive part, whether in relation to the Government of the day or in relation to the Opposition. The public official who goes on the platform and takes an offensive part against either of the two great parties, cannot hope to escape dismissal. I, therefore, hope that we have got pretty near a point of agreement on this important question. A public official, as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has stated, enjoys a perfect right to maintain his opinions, to vote, and to freely express the opinions he forms, so long as he does so in a perfectly respectful manner; but, if he goes out on the platform and takes an offensive part against either of the great parties of the country, I do not blame the present Government, if they say: You have chosen to take your official life in your hand, you have adopted a course of such indecent assault on the party now in power, that we are not able to retain you in the public service. I did not rise for the purpose of continuing the discussion that took place while I was not in the House; but I have learned with pleasure that a leading member of the Administration, the hon. Minister of Finance, sees eye to eye with me on this important question, and that the sound policy which I laid down on that occasion, is likely to be carried out by the Administration.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I trust that the hon. leader of the Opposition did not understand me as saying for one moment that I thought an official should be free to go on the platform, because I did not. My language was specific, that he might hold his views, or vote, or express his views by saying, "I am a Conservative," or "I am a Liberal;" but I drew the line at canvassing or going on the public platform.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I want to say a word in this debate, and only one. I decline to subscribe to the distinction which the leader of the Opposition draws between the Government and the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not attach much importance to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He did not, but I wish it to be clearly and distinctly understood what is my personal view of the matter. I do not think it is the right of an officer employed by the Government to take an offensive part against the Opposition of the day, any more than against the Government of the day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are entirely agreed on that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad that the hon. gentleman agrees to that. I decline to acknowledge that it is the right of any public officer to canvass against either the Government or the Opposition. I frankly and fully acknowledge the right of any public servant to hold what views he pleases, and to vote for whom he pleases, and when he pleases, without being called to account. I decline to go one step further. In the province from which I come, outside of those in the permanent service, who, I am proud to believe, have learned the lesson of the duties of a public officer, the great bulk of the officers of the Government are the men who carried on the political work of the Conservative party. Talk about the North-west. Sir, the Intercolonial Railway, with some few exceptions, which I cheerfully recognize, is a hot-bed of political propagandism. The bitterest and most offensive partisans to be found in Canada are to be found in connection with that road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say—and I know the Intercolonial Railway pretty well—that I believe the party now in power received more support from the employees of the Intercolonial Railway than the late Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I perfectly acknowledge the hon. gentleman's right to entertain that opinion; but some of us possess a knowledge which justifies us in holding an opinion quite the contrary. I believe the vast majority of the workmen on the Intercolonial Railway desired to vote in favour of the Liberal party; I have no doubt that 75 per cent of them desired to vote for the Liberal party; but I know that the leading officers of the Intercolonial Railway did not scruple to use every power they possessed to force, and compel, and dragoon these workmen to vote against the Liberal party. It is impossible, as the hon. gentleman must see, for a political party to submit to that without making inquiry into those cases that come within the term offensive partisanship, and exposing them. What have we seen since this Government came into power? Among all the thousands of employees on the Intercolonial Railway, there has not been a man discharged, except the two temporary workmen whom the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has talked about.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly in Prince Edward Island; and I trust, for the credit and honour of the Government, that a good many more will be dispensed with. I do not want to name any man. I hope they will have a fair trial; but it is impossible for me to live in a small place like Prince Edward Island without knowing that those men were offensive, hateful partisans. I cannot use language to express it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is going to try them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman had seen men on the platform, as I have seen them, and had known men to canvass from house to house, and had absolute proof that they walked into the round-house and other places and threatened workmen with dismissal, if they dared to vote for the Liberal party, he would perhaps share the views I entertain at present. I am not blaming the workmen; I am blaming the superior officers who acted in this way. I hope they will get a fair trial, and I hope they will get, as the hon. Minister of Finance said, what they do not desire—justice. Now, I think we have approached nearer than we did at the beginning of the session towards the true rule that should govern us in dealing with public officials. I repeat, I will never be a party to interfering with any man, directly or indirectly, in the free and untrammelled exercise of his vote; but, when he goes beyond that and canvasses from house to house, attends committee meetings and speaks at political meetings, he gambles for his place, and, if he loses, he must take the consequence, and take it with a good grace.

Mr. McGREGOR. I have listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) about discharging men who hold office. The hon. gentleman heard the pleadings of Mr. Coste and Mr. Wigle about a lighthouse keeper whose son had voted against Mr. Lewis Wigle. For that reason the hon. gentleman took the lighthouse from that man, and gave it to a man named Pettypiece. Now, you can go a little further than that. There never was a more despotic man in his dealings with the Government officials in our county, in the history of this country, than the hon. member for Pictou himself. In the Customs service, the late Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) took from us the only Liberals we had. Out of 28 or 30 men employed in our county as custom-house officers, there were three Liberals, and these

were discharged without evidence and without any fault on their part, and three Conservatives were put in their places. If the hon. gentleman wants the names I can give them. There was Mr. Watson, a life-long Liberal, and Mr. Chevalier, a man about 55 years old, who was discharged, and a man some years his senior put in his place. Then, Mr. Brown, a very active and efficient officer at Essex, was discharged also, and a man brought from the east to take his place at a higher salary. In Mr. Watson's place they appointed a man named Stokes, nominated by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Roome), and they brought another man from St. Thomas to take the place of one of these men who had been dismissed. Had these men been guilty of any fault, had there been any charge against them, it would have been different, but there was none. They were discharged without an hour's notice. They were simply told that at the end of the month they would get their pay and would not be required any longer. My hon. friend, the late Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), will say that they were not required; but if so, why were Ponting, Stokes, and the man from St. Thomas brought to our county to take the places of these men? That being the case, while Mr. Wigle might have been a great friend of the hon. member for Pictou and while Mr. Coste might also have great influence in having Mr. Hackett's lights taken from him, we think it was unfair and unjust to have taken these lights from Mr. Hackett simply because his son voted against Mr. Wigle.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course the hon. gentleman does not expect me to remember off-hand these particular cases. I dismissed a great many officers, but I dismissed them all for cause. I challenge the hon. gentleman to find in the Marine Department, which is now open to him, a single bit of evidence to support the charge that I dismissed one officer in the whole Dominion of Canada because he voted for the Liberal party. He does not mean to say that in the case of Mr. Hackett, who had a peculiar contract with regard to lights which he owned or rented——

Mr. McGREGOR. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER Whose case was altogether exceptional——

Mr. McGREGOR. Not at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend that Mr. Hackett was dismissed from the service on account of political reasons.

Mr. McGREGOR. Nothing else under the sun.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman persists, I shall ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) to take a note of the case, and submit, without formality of motion, the papers on the subject, because the hon. gentleman speaks with feeling, and I am sure he will be the first to apologize after reading the papers.

Mr. McGREGOR. There are no papers. Mr. Coste simply came down, and the department discharged Hackett without any report or inquiry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must restrain himself until my suggestion is complied with and the papers are brought down.

Mr. McGREGOR. There are no papers. Mr. Coste came down and the next morning Hackett was discharged.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think that this discussion with regard to the civil service will be productive of a great deal of good in the future. I think that after Parliament has declared what course should be pursued by the civil servants in the discharge of their duties and the exercise of their franchise, and the opinion of Parliament becomes known among the army of civil servants that are to be found from one end of the Dominion to the other, and who have been nearly all appointed by the Conservative party, much good will be accomplished. The Conservative party have ruled this country for the last eighteen years, so that there are very few Liberals occupying positions in the public service in any part of the Dominion, and I am not surprised that the Conservative party should put up this fight in defence of the men who have fought their battles for the last eighteen years in every constituency in the country. It is well known that in almost every constituency in the Dominion, the civil service officials have, in many cases, been the most active workers for the Conservative party. Is it, then, to be wondered at that the Conservative party, now in Opposition, should strive to keep these men in their positions? Is it to be wondered at that the men who, after the Liberal party were defeated in 1878, repealed an Act of Parliament which carried with it several hundred appointments, and repealed it for no other purpose but to discharge the men who had been appointed to office by the Liberal Government, and who, after they had repealed that Act, reenacted it in a very short time and appointed their own friends to the positions from which they had ousted the Liberals, should strive now to keep their friends in office? We know that the Conservative party, in this and every other country, think they have a divine right to rule, but they have discovered, since the last election, that they have no such divine right, in this country at least, and they are wilting under the idea that they are going to lose the services of thousands of those civil servants who have been their active partisans in the past. I say that the new rule laid down by the leader of the Government is a rule that

ought to be strictly enforced, namely, that an officer of the Government—I do not care whether he is an officer of this House or of the inside or outside service—who chooses to take his official life into his hands and work for either one party or the other—I do not care which—ought to be dismissed. We had an illustration of this in the past, which has been referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), when Mr. Chapleau, who was then Secretary of State, took into his own hands the dismissal of officers of this House, translators of the debates. He declared that they had acted offensively in public meetings and that he did not want to be in the position of having to meet these men in the lobbies of the House. The Conservative party, on that occasion, sustained Mr. Chapleau and those men were discharged. I contend that, in the present instance, the Speaker of this House has perhaps leaned too much toward the Conservative party in the decisions he gave in regard to these sessional officers. These officers are merely temporary clerks, who can be removed at any session by the Speaker and Clerk of the House. The Conservative party have been in power for eighteen years, and these men have enjoyed the sweets of office for that time, and it is time some other persons came in and had some of the sweets of office. I contend that it is our turn now. I contend that all the offices which are not permanent, and are at the command of the Speaker of the House and the Liberal party, ought to be filled by Liberals, and I say that Mr. Speaker would have been justified if he had dismissed every one of these temporary officers. There is a great deal made out of the statement that these men have knowledge of the work they have to perform. Why, they only perform clerical services, copying and writing out documents, and any man with a liberal education can discharge those duties. Is it to be supposed that any technical education is required to discharge those duties? The idea is absurd. You could get thousands of men in this country who are capable of stepping into the offices filled by these sessional writers and discharging their duties just as efficiently as the men who now occupy those places—perhaps more efficiently. A new broom sweeps clean. If you get new sessional clerks to replace men some of whom have been there for eighteen years, they would probably work better and harder than the men who have got into the way of putting in their time in discharging their duties. I, for one, declare my opinion that Mr. Speaker did not do his full duty. He ought to have discharged every one of these men and filled their offices with men favourable to the party that secured a triumph in the last election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I know it is hard for Conservatives to feel that they are losing their influence, that they now occupy the benches that we filled for so many years: but they must realize that they do not rule this country any longer but that the Liberals rule it. I concur in the statement that has been made that any permanent officer in the inside service or in the outside service, who has discharged his duty faithfully, who has refrained from interfering in the politics of the country, who has not written newspaper articles against the Opposition or against the Government, ought not to be disturbed. But I say that every man who has been a partisan in the past, every man who has written newspaper articles against the Government in this country or against the Opposition—I do not care which—and any man who has taken a part in the discussion of public questions and shown that he is a partisan and therefore unfitted to occupy a disinterested position in the public service, ought to have his official head cut off. And that at once, without any delay. And I say that the Government will be sustained not only by their supporters in this House but by the great majority of the electors of the Dominion if they pursue such a course as this.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is probably the first time within the recollection even of the oldest member of this House that a speech such as the one which has just been delivered has been heard in a Parliament enjoying institutions that we in Canada enjoy. I should not have been surprised to hear such a speech if I had been sitting within the halls of the congress of the United States. According to the hon. gentleman's views, the change of government must be followed by a change in the civil service of this country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not wish to be misrepresented. I never said anything of the kind.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant to say——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will tell you what I did say, if you will allow me. I said that any permanent officer in the inside or in the outside service who attended to his duties and discharged them without interfering in political matters ought to be retained; but any civil servants in either of these services of the Government who interfered in the politics of this country ought to be allowed to depend upon politics for his living.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This explanation of the hon. gentleman convinces me more strongly than ever that I was perfectly correct in my interpretation of what he said. The hon. gentleman went beyond that and said that he regretted that Mr. Speaker had not gone beyond what Mr. Speaker considered he should have done and, instead of dismissing one of the servants employed in the House, had not dismissed every one of them. He said with a frankness which we ack-

nowledge to be a characteristic of the hon. gentleman: For eighteen years the Conservatives have been in power, and is it not now time that our friends should replace those that were appointed by the Conservative Government? And, though he did not say so in so many words, his whole speech meant: You cannot dismiss too many of the old civil servants to make room for the new ones.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not wish to be misrepresented; I do not wish to have words put in my mouth. I did not say that civil servants ought to be dismissed; I was speaking of temporary clerks.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman referred to the precedent when Sir Adolphe Chapleau, then Hon. Mr. Chapleau, was Secretary of State and occupied a seat in this House. According to my understanding of the two cases, there is no similarity at all between the case which has been discussed here and that of Mr. Tremblay, who was, I believe, a reporter occupying a position on the "Hansard" staff at that time. Mr. Chapleau's charge against that gentleman as a civil servant was not that during recess he expressed his opinions on political matters, but that he had gone out of his way to attack him (Mr. Chapleau) personally as a Minister of the Crown. I agree that if you can establish a charge of personal offence offered by a civil servant to one of the members of the Government, the Ministry would be perfectly right in insisting upon his removal from office.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then you will vote for the dismissal of the translators, I suppose?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Their trial is not finished.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They have admitted their guilt.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What has been the case as submitted to the House by Mr. Speaker, the first commoner of the country? The hon. gentleman, in the most judicial spirit explained the case as he believed it should be laid before the House, and said that the officer in question had been dismissed because, on one occasion he had expressed his opinion upon the school question. Where is the terrible attack upon either of the great political parties in this Parliament in the fact that this gentleman expressed an opinion upon a most important question that was discussed in this House? Why, the hon. leader of the House must remember that when he sat here as leader of the Opposition several of his own friends expressed an opinion absolutely antagonistic to his own upon that question. Why should it be thought when one of the employees of the Parliament of Canada, which itself was divided upon this question, went out as a citizen during the period of time when his services were not required in the House and expressed his views upon the question, that he had done that which justified his dismissal? There is no similarity between that case and that of Mr. Tremblay, who had gone out of his way to personally attack one of the members of the Government. I believe that in the interests of the two great parties who divided public opinion in this country we should not for one moment desire to follow the example of the American people in these matters. The civil servants should feel that, like every other citizen, they have the right of expressing their opinion upon public questions, and I believe it would be a sad day for Canada, if either party consented to permit civil servants for one moment to believe that a change of Government, whether it occurs after eighteen years or after a shorter period, would result in the dismissal of the men who had given the best years of their life to the civil service.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has pleaded very hard on behalf of Ministers of the Crown. He thinks that, if a civil servant attacks a Minister of the Crown, he ought to be rebuked and dismissed. I would like to know, from the hon. gentleman, if private members of Parliament are to be subjected to abuse, and criticism, and bitter opposition by civil servants, while Ministers of the Crown are to be protected from such attacks? Is that what the hon. gentleman means?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not at all. The distinction I pointed out was that, in the case of Mr. Tremblay, he was charged with attacking offensively one of the members of the Government. The hon. the Speaker says that the other gentleman was dismissed because he expressed his opinion upon the school question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not want to be misunderstood. I say that he expressed his opinion on a public platform against the member who sits in this House for that county, and attacked his vote on the school question. He was not merely expressing his opinion, but he took the public platform and atacked a gentleman who has since been elected to this House, for his vote in the House on the school question.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would like to call the attention of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) to one incident. In 1878, I think, the same question came up that comes up to-night, and it was in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. He found that it was not practicable to run that great work, when it was being handled by Mr. Brydges, who is now dead, and Mr. Luttrell. He knew, to the cost of his party, that he was handicapped in every position he took. I joined him, as he will admit, in

getting rid of those gentlemen as quickly as possible, in order that the Intercolonial Railway might give efficient and loyal service to the Government of the day. Now, I do not say this offensively, but merely to recall his memory to the matter. I feel strongly myself, irrespective of either side of the House, for New Brunswick and the people I represent. Those who have used every effort against us, those who have kicked us when we were down, those who have treated us in the most ungenerous and unfriendly way, should not to-day ask mercy from us. I, Sir, never asked any mercy. I feel, Sir, not as a Christian—I am afraid I am not Christian enough to submit to their dictation in the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am afraid I have not the attributes of gentlemen who call themselves Christians, gentlemen who will go behind the door to do what they won't do in front of it. But I say that we should replace those people who are active partisans, by other men. Now, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) laughs. I have seen him laugh, and I have seen him on occasions when he did not laugh, when the burning question was no joke. But I do hope, nay, I believe, that the country will demand that we take energetic action in this matter. I have only one vote in this House, but I represent a county that I am proud of; I represent a county that knows when it has got a good man. I represent a county, Mr. Chairman, that, in the days when the Liberal-Conservatives were in power, returned one of the only three members from the province of New Brunswick to support the Liberal-Conservative party, and they got little satisfaction for what they did. That same party stands behind me to-night, and I am free to give my opinion here that every man who has made himself offensive, who has said the most disgraceful things about the leader of the Government, who did not hesitate to revile him and my friends—I say, I believe the country will justify the Government in dismissing such men from office at once.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure we can afford to discuss this question in a calm and dispassionate way, particularly because it involves, to some extent, the conduct of the presiding officer of this House. I am not sure that the heat that has been imported into this debate upon the other side of the House, is a very striking evidence of the strength of their case. Now, I happen to have some knowledge of one of the cases mentioned in this debate, namely, the sessional clerk who was discharged on the alleged ground of having taken, not an offensive part in the election, but of having gone upon a platform and discussed the school question. The leader of the Opposition laid down the right doctrine some years ago, and it seems to be unreservedly assented to by the Minister of Finance this evening. He quoted some remarks made by that hon. gentleman at that time, and he appears willing to lay it down as a rule. I am willing to give the broadest assent to that rule this evening, and to have our friends throughout the country judged by it, and to take the consequences of its operation. Now, let me come to the case. I hope, Mr. Speaker will not take in bad part what I am going to say, but he is, necessarily, from his position involved in the case, and his acts are subject to the approval of the House. While he has unlimited powers of appointment and dismissal of the officers of the House, he is at all times subject to the approval of the House. Now, let me briefly state the case of this dismissal. A man named Béchard, who resides in the township of Dover, an elector in the county of Kent, is charged with having engaged in a political contest by making a speech upon one occasion. Now, while there are concurrent powers with the Speaker and the Clerk as to dismissals of officers from the House there is only one power of appointment, and the action of the Clerk, in all matters, must always be subject to the approval of the Speaker. Now, Mr. Béchard is alleged to have engaged in the campaign before the 23rd June, and some days before the assembling of this House—I am not sure but it was some weeks, Mr. Béchard received a letter from the Clerk of this House, which letter I have seen, telling him that his services were no longer required. It would, perhaps, be well, at this stage, to inquire on what information the Clerk of the House acted at that time—whether this man was dismissed for having taken an alleged part in the election, or whether it was upon the ground of inefficiency in the performance of his duties as a servant of this House. The House was not in session, and the latter could not be the reason; therefore, it must have been upon the sole ground of having taken part in the election. Now, it is proper that this House should know what was the information upon which the Clerk of the House took the action that he did. I am perfectly satisfied that the Clerk of the House had no disposition to hunt out such cases. I am also within the case when I say that Mr. Speaker, if we are to judge from the utterances of some hon. gentlemen, has been placed in a most unpleasant and trying position. The violent speech delivered by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) indicated the pressure that must have been brought to bear upon him, and in his position the hon. gentleman deserves and needs the sympathy of both sides of the House. This officer, Béchard, came from the county of Kent to Ottawa before the Speaker was elected. The rule was very properly laid down some years ago that the position of the Speaker of the House was a continuous position. Accordingly Mr. White was Speaker at the moment when this clerk received notice of his dis-

missal. Mr. Speaker has stated that no notice of dismissal was sent to Mr. Béchard. I assent to that statement. I do not believe the hon. gentleman had any knowledge of the transaction, but I wish to point out the vicious system carried out here by which, through the pressure of hon. gentlemen, the Clerk was forced into writing letters of dismissal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I appeal to the hon. gentleman on this point, and I wish to say to him that it has not been customary in this House before to make a violent attack on an officer of the House such as the Clerk of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not making an attack on the Clerk of the House. I hold that he had no means of knowing the facts, and that his action was taken on account of undue pressure brought to bear on him by hon. gentlemen opposite. I hope the rule will not be laid down that the Clerk has the right to dismiss officials, not for improper conduct in regard to their duties, but on grounds similar to those alleged against Béchard. That officer came to Ottawa, not having received any notice from Mr. Speaker White of his dismissal. He very properly assumed that he was still an officer of the House, the late Mr. White remaining Speaker until the House assembled and a new Speaker was elected, and therefore he thought he was not bound to take notice of any complaint made before a meeting of the House. Béchard came here, and after being employed eight or ten days in the service he was summoned, I understand, to the office of the Speaker. I am not finding fault with tbis action. Mr. Speaker had a right to make inquiry, and if he found that this young gentleman had been engaged actively in the contest, and had taken an improper part in the elections, the fact should be brought to light. It was quite proper to ascertain whether he had given utterance to any violent or offensive language. But this young man had discussed the school question in a very moderate and proper manner. He was invited on one occasion to go on a public platform, and he mildly stated his views on the school question or some other issue, but he did not say a word offensive either to the candidate or to the Liberal party. I hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not attempt to give a colouring to my remarks so as to make it appear that I made an attack on an officer of the House. We are now perhaps laying down the rule as to the individual with whom the authority of dismissal lies as regards some of the officers of this House. This action, I repeat, was not taken at the instance of the Speaker, but was due altogether to undue pressure being brought to bear to secure the dismissal of officials without any inquiry being made into their conduct. It is not pretended that Béchard had any trial, or that he appeared before any one in this House having the right to hear the case before receiving notice of his dismissal. His dismissal was simply due to pressure being brought on the Government of the day. I deeply sympathize both with the Speaker and the Clerk. In both instances I am not prepared to charge the slightest misconduct, but any one can plainly see that the machinery set in motion to secure his dismissal rested with hon. members, and such action cannot be safely adopted by this House as a rule, for Béchard was not properly treated because he was dismissed practically before the House assembled.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not propose to say a word more in regard to my own action on the Béchard matter. I have explained it to the House, and there I propose to leave it. But the hon. gentleman has spoken with respect to an officer of the House who is not able to defend himself, and I wish to say a word in that regard. The Clerk of the House feels most strongly upon the question of keeping politics entirely out of the staff of the House. He has authorized me to read an extract from some observations on this subject he laid before me as soon as I became Speaker. This is what he said:

> I may add that these men have always understood from me that they are not employees of the Government of the day, but of the House—and that political partisanship in any shape should be punished by their removal. So strongly have I felt in this particular that I took it upon myself to notify several men that they should not return at the present session, inasmuch as I had ascertained from reliable authority that they had taken an active and improper part in the general elections. The officers and clerks of my department should have no political bias whatever.

The Clerk stated that he had notified several sessional clerks that they had been charged with taking part in the elections: that Béchard was one of them, and he had suggested that if that were true, Bechard had better not come here. Béchard came here; he reported himself to the Clerk, and denied the charge utterly, whereupon the Clerk told him to go on with his duties. Ten days or so afterwards, when called upon, he did not deny the charge, but admitted it, and he was dismissed. That is the action of the Clerk. He had nothing to do with the dismissals. He properly notified these men, and several that he notified did not come at all, because they admitted it. Therefore, I think it was rather unfair for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) to make an attack upon the Clerk of this House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Apologize.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend asked me to apologize, but if he will allow me to

explain, it will quite answer the purposes of an apology. I stated that Mr. Béchard had received a notice of dismissal, and that is true. I say further, that it is no attack upon any official of this House to lay down the rule, that a person charged should have at least a chance of answering that charge. What is the case as stated by the hon. Mr. Speaker ? It is that the Clerk of the House had discharged Mr. Béchard upon evidence that he thought reliable.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not suggest that the Clerk had discharged Mr. Béchard. I said he had done what he says in this letter he did :

> So strongly have I felt in this particular that I took it upon myself to notify several men that they should not return at the present session, inasmuch as I had ascertained from reliable authority that they had taken an active and improper part in the general elections.

Mr. Béchard denied that he was guilty, and he came here and got his pay for the time he was here.

Mr. CLANCY. To have written to an official of the House that his services were no longer required, was a dismissal in the strictest possible sense of the term.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) a little misunderstands the case. I understand that the Clerk of the House drew Mr. Béchard's attention to the fact that he was charged with having taken a very active political part in the elections. He came here, and stated that such was not the case, and the Clerk instructed him to go to his office. The Clerk had nothing to do with his dismissal afterwards. That is the statement as made by the Speaker, and I believe it is correct.

Mr. CLANCY. The case is this as I understand it, and it seems to be perfectly clear. The Clerk wrote to Mr. Bechard telling him that he had information that he had taken an improper part in the election, and following upon that, he told him that his services were no longer required. I do not doubt in any sense that the Clerk felt that his information was quite sufficient in warranting him to do that. However, this young man came here and he denied the charge and he was permitted to go on. But the four other persons charged took the Clerk's letter as a complete dismissal, and did not come to the House requesting to be continued in the service. I wish to point out that the letter in the first instance to Mr. Béchard was a complete dismissal. It was so accepted by the other four, and they never came back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They pleaded guilty.

Mr. CLANCY. It is perfectly clear that in the first instance Mr. Béchard should have been asked to come here, and the other four should have been asked to come here and show if they could that they had not taken an improper part in the election.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take any part in this discussion had it not been for the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) as well as the few remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). Representing as I do the south riding of Essex county, I have had considerable experience of the dealing of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and of the precedents and practices which he and his friends laid down while in power. They compare strangely with the views and the opinions which they are advancing to-day when they are in Opposition. While the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), if I mistake not, was Minister of Marine and Fisheries there was one David Girardin, of the Island of Pelee, who was fishery officer, and who was compelled with a small row boat to guard Pelee Island, 21 miles in circumference. North Harbour Island, 16 miles away, East Sister Island, 12 miles away, and Middle Sister Island, 20 miles away. The hon. the Minister sent his inspector to the Island of Pelee. He was drunk in two hours after he arrived on that Island, and he made a report that Mr. Girardin had not made any seizures, and therefore that he was incompetent and unfit for the position which he held. The officer, Mr. Girardin, had asked for some kind of assistance in order that he might capture American poachers. He received none whatever, and the only excuse the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had for dismissing that man—apart from having a suspicion that he might possibly be favourable to the Liberal party—was the fact, that he was not able with a small row boat to catch a fishing schooner that could travel from 12 to 15 miles per hour. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has disputed the facts concerning the Hackett case. Mr. Hackett is a resident of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and I repeat here that there was no charge against Hackett. There was never a charge made against him by any public official or private individual, but he was guilty of the grave and serious offence that it was suspected that his son had voted for the Liberal party, although Hackett, the father, had not voted for the two previous elections. There was still another reason for Mr. Hackett's dismissal, and that was that a political party heeler of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had done the party's work in that section of the community, wanted a job, and consequently Mr. Hackett was put out and Pettypiece was put in. But that is not all. In the Island of Pelee in 1895, Mr. Walters, an appointee of hon. gentlemen opposite, who was landing waiter at the north dock, and O. D. Fox, who was landing waiter at the

west dock, and who only got the small sum of $50 per year or thereabouts, were suspected of being favourable to myself, and were dismissed. They were not political canvassers. I venture to say that neither of them ever took the political stump, nor even hardly canvassed a vote in their lifetime. If I mistake not, they were both appointees of hon. gentlemen opposite, but because they were suspected of being favourable to me, they were both put out, and a man put in who was scarcely able even to write his own name. I have sat as a new member in this House for the past twenty days, and I say that it has become nauseating to a large number of the members, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite prate about what should be done, and about what is honest and fair treatment to mete out as between man and man. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that they only considered two things when they were in power. One was, that if a Government official was opposed to them he was discharged, and the other was, that they appointed a political heeler of their own, irrespective of the man's qualification for the office. These are the facts so far as they relate to the constituency which I represent. In the last political contest in my constituency, the best workers that hon. gentlemen opposite had were men who went up and down the side lines, by day and by night, men who are the proteges of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who were appointed to office on the express condition that they should do their work in elections. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) sets forth here to-night that the proper principle to be carried out is, that an investigation in each case should take place. I suppose that if a man is capable of standing upon the public platform and making a gentlemanly speech on behalf of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) would consider that such a one had not taken an offensive part in the contest. I think I can see sufficiently far ahead, and read sufficiently between the lines to know, what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) means. The hon. gentleman knows what a very dear political friend of his was guilty of in the last contest. He is afraid in regard to this friend that his political head may go into the waste basket, and so he rises in this House to put in his spike in order to save that friend if he can. I refer to Mr. Killacky, who is assistant collector of customs at the port of Windsor. Mr. Killacky comes from West Kent adjoining the constituency of the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). If I mistake not Mr. Killacky stumped for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). The hon. member received the benefit of Mr. Killacky's services——

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. COWAN. Then if he did not go to the constituency of the hon. member for Bothwell, he got along the edge of it and the fringe of it, whenever the opportunity offered.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman knows that if Mr. Killacky did not do so in the federal contest, he did so in the last provincial contest in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was engaged. Mr. Killacky, as the hon. member for Bothwell knows, was the candidate of the Conservative party in 1891. Mr. Killacky was appointed on the 11th May to the position of assistant Collector of Customs at the port of Windsor. He was to take possession of his job on the 1st of June. He stumped for Mr. Ball, the opponent of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), and he stumped along the line of the constituency of Bothwell. If I mistake not, he was in the constituency of Bothwell. At all events, he derived advantage from the political work he did. Although he was to take possession of his job on the 1st of June, he did not take possession of it until the 25th of June; he was in that position only five days; but he filled out his pay-sheet for the full month, and hon. gentlemen opposite paid him for the services he rendered. If we are to submit in this country to Government officials going on the stump in the interest of a political party, working five days out of thirty, and then drawing full pay, then I say there will be great and serious disappointment from one end of this Dominion to another.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) led this House to infer that the late Government discharged a number of Reform employees of the customs department in Windsor, for the purpose of putting Conservatives in their places. Now, I would like to draw the attention of this committee to a few facts. Mr. Chevalier, who was stationed at Belle River, is a strong Reformer, who never missed an opportunity of taking an active part on behalf of the Liberal candidate in Essex. This gentleman was taken from Belle River, and placed in the custom-house at Windsor at a higher salary. Mr. Watson was a customs employee at Windsor, and so was the other gentleman the hon. gentleman mentioned. He also referred to the case of a person who went from East Elgin to Windsor two or three years ago. As far as Mr. Yearsley is concerned, he has proven himself to be an efficient officer, and has given entire satisfaction to the department. The hon. gentleman must not accuse the Conservative Government of displacing Reformers, and putting Conservatives in their places. I simply rose to correct these statements, because they were unfair statements to make to the House, and not borne out by the facts.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to say a very few words in regard to this matter. It seems to

be understood now that we have got thus far, that a man may hold strong opinions, he may vote, he may express those opinions in the strongest manner in private——

Mr. McGREGOR. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, we have had that laid down by high authority in the Government; but he must not on the public platform express himself offensively.

An hon. MEMBER. No, nor canvass.

Mr. DAVIN. In my own constituency up to the present time two men have been dismissed, though they have never taken the least part in politics. They have been faithful public servants; there is not a single charge agaist them of having taken a part in politics; and now that we know that a man may hold an opinion and vote, and if he takes no part in politics he is scathless in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, I hope these two men will be re-appointed. Now, I want to say one or two words in regard to a case that has been referred to in this debate, and to call attention to an opinion given upon it by the hon. leader of the House. The charge against the translators who were dismissed in 1888 was that they had been guilty of personal and offensive language in regard to the Hon. Mr. Chapleau; and the hon. the present leader of the House (Mr. Laurier), who took an interest in those gentlemen, in the course of an eloquent speech which preceded the resolution in regard to them, laid down opinions which in my opinion are just. In describing the offence the hon. leader of the House said:

> In fact, the complaint which was made against them is not in reference to their services as officers of this House, but the charge is that they went out of their proper sphere of action and grossly insulted some members of this House.

After reading the charge, the hon. gentleman said:

> Now, I must say at once that it seems somewhat singular, and it is, I think, improper that officers of this House should be allowed to engage actively in politics. I have no hesitation at all in making that statement, but if these gentlemen declare that they took an active part in the political campaign, they also declare that in doing so they had the sanction of this House. They state that the House had appointed the translators of the debates—I am not yet speaking of the other officers of the House, but of the translators only—with the understanding that they should be allowed to take part, not only in political campaigns, but in active politics in all circumstances. This matter came up incidentally in 1884. At that time it was stated, without contradiction from any quarter, that the translators of the debates were permitted to be engaged in active journalism, and, therefore, to engage in politics.

Then he went on to refer to the position taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when the question was discussed in 1884:

> On that occasion the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was a member of the Debates Committee, spoke, I must say that the matter came up upon the question of increasing the salaries of the translators, and the hon. member for Norfolk stated that he was opposed to an increase of salaries, because the translators were actively engaged as newspaper correspondents. He said:
>
> I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not.

Later on in the course of the same speech, the hon. leader of the House distinguished, and very properly distinguished, between the position of the reporters and the position of the translators:

> The official reporters stand in a completely different position from the official translators, because the reporters have been made permanent officers of the House and they cannot engage in any other work; their services are at the disposal of the Government after the session, and their appointment expressly says so; but the translators are appointed to translate the debates and nothing else, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, who is Chairman of the Debates Committee, that it was always understood that during a part of the session they could engage in any other work they choose to engage in. Therefore, there is no parallel between the two classes of officers.

On another occasion, the reference to which I have not at hand at present, but which I distinctly remember, the hon. gentleman differentiated the position of the translators entirely from the position of the reporters, holding that the former were free to do what they chose outside of the session. I cannot find the reference at present, but I have a distinct recollection of the statement, and at some other time, if this question should come up, I shall be able to find it. As this illustration has been referred to by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), I thought it would be just as well to put before the House what the charge was, and also the position taken by the leader of the House on that question. Let me repeat what I think it is of very great importance to the public service and the country at large that we should have a principle laid down on which public officials are to act, and according to which they are to be treated. When a Government lays down certain principles of action to be followed in the management of the various departments, there should be no exceptions to the rules of conduct thus laid down. In my own constituency, two humble men, one a teamster and a man who took no part in politics whatever, but who was, I believe, a Conservative, and who, I have a strong impression, voted for me——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If he did, he saved your election.

Mr. DAVIN. Therefore, I should be doubly grateful to him; but the man never took

any part in politics or on the platform, and never canvassed. And in the case of Mr. Lambert, to whom I referred the other day, he also never canvassed or took any part in politics; and so I hope that with regard to these two men, the rules laid down by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, will be followed out. Speaking generally, I think the opinions which fell from the Finance Minister, are opinions that commend themselves to gentlemen on this side of the House, and it would be well if those enlightened views are carried out. The vengeful spirit shown by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) lent wings to his eloquence. I have often heard the hon. gentleman in his dithyrambic moods in this House, but never heard him rise to such an imperial flight as he rose to when calling for vengeance on these unfortunate men. I hope that no such appeals as these will be listened to by the Government. No doubt, after such a fight as we have had, hon. gentlemen may find it difficult to turn a deaf ear to such appeals, but I would recall to them what was said by their leader, when he was at the head of the Opposition, and when the case of the French translators was under discussion. I remember the hon gentleman making an appeal to the then Secretary of State (Mr.Chapleau) not to be carried away by the spirit of vengefulness, and not to let such a spirit guide his ministerial conduct.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken, referred to the fact that two of his supporters had been dismissed from office. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Minister of Public Works intimated to that gentleman that these men had been dismissed from office because there was no work for them to do. If the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) supposes that the new Government is going to keep in its employ men who have no work to do, he is very much mistaken. Does he want this country to pay for the services of men for whom the Government cannot find employment? The hon. gentleman has no ground whatever for complaint, and it is wrong, on his part, to ask the Government to retain men in their service for whom they have no work.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented my position and also what the Minister of Public Works did say. What the Minister of Public Works said was that he dismissed Lambert, under the impression that there was no work for him to do, but I understood him to take this position, that he would inquire into the circumstances, and, if he had dismissed Lambert under a mistaken impression, he would restore him. In regard to the other case, that of a man named Young, he was not in the Public Works Department at all, but in the Department of Interior, and he was dismissed on the morrow of the election, and a member of the Liberal party put in his stead.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it would have been well had the Opposition accepted the statement made by the hon. Premier, a few days ago, that he would deal generously with the members of the civil service. But we can see that, no matter how generously he may deal with the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, he is to be attacked and misrepresented, as he has been by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davin). The hon. Minister, the other evening, told him that the man he had referred to had been dismissed because there was nothing for him to do, and he added that if, on inquiry, it was found that injustice had been done, he would do what was right. Could anything be more frank and satisfactory? But to-night the hon. gentleman takes up a long time in referring to this dismissal.

Mr. DAVIN. I was just referring to it, and am quite satisfied with the position as it is at present.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot expect the Premier and his followers to be more than human. With the statement made by the First Minister that he did not intend that anybody should be dismissed without good cause, they ought to be perfectly satisfied. This discussion has gone so far that, if we were to follow the precedent laid down by the late Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), there would be very few members of the civil service left. It may be true, for all I know, that there was some sufficient reason for dismissing the four men in North Essex: but I must say, to use the hon. gentleman's own language, it is very peculiar that the only four men in the county of Essex who were Liberals, should happen to be dismissed. And the statement of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) that there was no investigation and no opportunity given them to defend themselves and that they were men of good character, who attended to their duties, their dismissal seems still more peculiar. It will be hard to convince any one that they were dismissed for any other reason than because they were Liberals, or suspected of leaning in that direction. When the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) took office, in 1878, he declared that he could not take the responsibility of holding the position he did, unless he dismissed from office the leading men on the Intercolonial. Any person must feel that a Minister taking charge of a great department as the hon. gentleman the present leader of the Opposition did at that time, if he had not confidence that he had the loyalty of the men holding the highest positions in his department and in connection with the great public works, would almost be justified probably in making the change which he stated he had to do before he could conduct the department to his satisfaction. And I

am sure the members of the Opposition must feel, after several days discussion of this matter and after the Ministers have declared that they are anxious and willing that every man in the service, from the Deputy Minister to the lowest in the department, should have an opportunity of proving his faithfulness and loyalty to them that the subject has been exhausted. They do not take the position taken by the leader of the Opposition at the time I have referred to and declare that they will summarily dismiss these men because they happen to be members of a party to which they do not belong. With regard to this matter, we have the evidence, which has been made public in Ottawa during the last few days and which is probably taken more notice of than what anybody in this House may with regard to the subject. We found representatives of the great labour organization in their meetings publicly declaring in regard to this matter that they wished every man in the employment of the Government should have an opportunity of defending himself if a charge was made against him. That is only fair. They went further, these men who included in their ranks both Conservatives and Liberals—a majority of them Conservatives probably—and representing 6,000 or 7,000 of the workingmen of Canada. They said they had no defence to offer for officials in high positions who were guilty of interfering with the men voting as they wished to vote. If that is the position of the representatives of the railway organizations themselves, hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be satisfied with the generous treatment these officials are receiving from the leader of the Government and his colleagues, for it is well known to every man on either side of this House that prominent officials did take a very active part in influencing the votes of the men. These men knew it themselves, and that is the reason they in their councils referred to this matter and declared that they did not desire to defend leading officials who undertook to coerce or influence improperly the votes of the men under them. And I think that every true Canadian must be inspired with the same feeling, that every man, no matter what his position may be, has the right to exercise his franchise freely without influence from those who are in official position over him. I think that those who do seek thus to influence Canadian citizens ought to be punished. After the declarations of these men and after the declaration of the Premier the other night, it seems to me unfortunate that we should spend hour after hour and day after day over such trifling matters. The Premier made a declaration. It was time enough to find fault and criticise and misrepresent and abuse this gentleman and his colleagues when he had failed to carry out the declarations he made to Parliament and to the country. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) said he did not want us to follow American precedents in these matters. I quite agree with that sentiment. I think the Government would be quite justified in taking the precedent of the Conservative party while in power. If hon. gentlemen opposite would agree to that, we might put an end to the discussion. But I do not think that they are anxious that this Government should follow that precedent. For my part, I think it would be unfair, as I have said, to treat the members of the civil service so harshly. It would not be just to many men in the service who have conducted themselves properly. I agree with what has previously been said that those officers who have taken an active and improper and offensive part in politics must take the consequences. I cannot for a moment agree with the declarations made here that the Government party is in a different position from the Opposition. I contend that when the Parliament is dissolved all the candidates in the constituency, no matter which side they are on are equal, and the man who is being paid out of the taxes of the people has no more right to abuse a man on one side than he has to abuse a man on the other side. Parliament having been dissolved the candidates of the Government of the past have no better standing, so far as the civil service is concerned than those who happen to be running in the interest of a previous Parliament. I feel that in the interest of all these gentlemen who hold these positions—and I suppose the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite hold ninety-five per cent of them—it would be better that an opportunity should be given to the Government to carry out the policy that has been declared by the leader rather than to bring about by recrimination and improper attacks a feeling that I would not like to see existing in this country between the party in power and the members of the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be a pity, if, after this lengthy discussion, preceded as it was by consideration of the question of dismissals a few days ago, we should not get somewhere where we could understand each other and understand thoroughly the principle which is to be adopted in these matters. All that we want, I think, is that there should be definiteness and uniformity. This discussion has been with regard to the officers of the House, who occupy a different position in this respect from the general membership of the civil service. We have had statements from different prominent members and from his honour the Speaker with reference to the principle to be followed with reference to this business. Now, any one listening dispassionately and calmly must have noticed that there was not uniformity in the enunciation of the principles upon which the practice is to be based, and that, in the next place, there is not a definiteness such as would put an end to the discussion and let every man know just about

the principle which is to be carried out. The confusion is in the minds of some hon. gentlemen themselves. Take my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He read a statement made by Sir Charles Tupper some years ago as to the principle which would actuate him and which did actuate him and actuated the Government of which he was a member in making certain dismissals. In that statement—I call the hon. Minister's attention to this fact—two principles were laid down. One was that a civil servant should not be allowed to denounce the Government of the day. I am not going to make any distinction between his denouncing the Government of the day or denouncing the Opposition of the day. But he went on a platform and denounced one of the political parties. Now, the second element that ran through it was that he not only denounced them, which in itself has an element of violence, but he was also offensive in his canvass. Now, the Minister of Finance said: There is a rule, it was laid down in 1878 by Sir Charles Tupper. That is the very thing we are arguing for, and upon which we propose to proceed to-night. But before he sat down the hon. gentleman undertook to lay down the practice which should actuate him, and departed from that rule in both particulars. Whilst he assented to that as a theory, when he laid down the rule of practice it was this, that he would allow a man to vote, but a man should not canvass, and a man should not go upon the platform nor express his opinions publicly with reference to either party, whether he was entirely guiltless of denouncing anybody, or whether he was perfectly void of anything like offensive language. Now, everybody sees that these two cases are as wide apart as possible.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all, they are on all fours.

Mr. FOSTER. I state again that the principle we contend for is this, that a civil servant is first of all a citizen of this country, and has a right of citizenship. We have not by law or by practice robbed a citizen of his rights when we have given him a salary to do the country's work, whether for the whole year or a short period. A citizen, to be a full and perfect citizen, ought to have opinions of his own, and he ought to be free to express them. The statement of Sir Charles Tupper was that this man's opinions were not only expressed, but they were expressed in denunciation of a party, and expressed offensively. Now, is there not every difference between those cases? The leader of the Government shakes his head as if in negation of that sentiment. Let me state a concrete example. Here are two men, both citizens and both civil servants. Both hold their opinions from a party point of view with reference to the best policy of the country to pursue, as every good citizen ought to hold. One of these men goes about his business, performs his work to the perfect satisfaction of the state. He holds his opinion as to the best policy in the interest of the country, and expresses that opinion as a gentleman should, in his private conversation, in his public conversation, in letters that he may write, and in speeches that he may make, and he does that without offence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Without offence, does he?

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend find fault with?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That when an official, as I know dozens of them, at the head of a department undertakes to express opinion in that way, he consciously and knowingly influences the votes and opinions of the large body of subordinates who are under him, and he does it for the purpose of influencing them.

Mr. FOSTER. I am going on with my argument. I suppose that when any citizen holds an opinion, he has a right to express it, and in so far as the weight of his opinion and the scope of his expression go, he influences his fellow-citizens. I suppose that a man who is an officer of a Government has a right to do the same. I am talking of a man who expresses his opinion in a manly, honest, courteous and calm way, without denouncing anybody and without in any way being offensive.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or intended to influence the election?

Mr. FOSTER. Why, how can a citizen express his opinion unless it is intended to have its effect?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is it.

Mr. FOSTER. You must not take away that primary right of a good citizen of the state simply because the state employs him to do certain work for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As in the case of a judge?

Mr. FOSTER. We have argued that, and my hon. friend knows that there is no analogy at all between the case of a judge and others. Why does not my friend and his Government pass a law to have every civil servant put in the same position as a judge, and disqualified to vote? They do not do it, consequently they do not hold that opinion. Now, I have tried to describe one person. Here is another civil servant who holds his opinion just as strongly, and goes upon a public platform to express it, writes letters, talks to his friends. But in doing that he is violent, he denounces the party whose policy he does not believe in, and

does it in an offensive manner. Does my hon. friend the leader of the Government say there is no difference between these two men ?

The PRIME MINISTER. A difference in degree, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I have my hon. friend receding from his position of negation, and saying there is a difference in degree. Now, my contention is, and I think it was the contention of Sir Charles Tupper in 1878, that the dismissal took place then because the man denounced one of the parties of that day, and did it offensively. He comes under the second category and not under the first. Now, are we to understand that the Government are going to take the policy laid down by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), whom I do not see present, who held the opinion that not only had a civil servant a right to hold an opinion, but he had a perfect right to express it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What are you thinking about ?

Mr. FOSTER. Because there is no unanimity on that side of the House. If the dictum of the member for Guysborough was taken, that a man has a right to his opinion and to express it——

Mr. McMULLEN. By marking his ballot.

Mr. FOSTER. That was not the expression of the hon. member for Guysborough, that was not the meaning he intended to convey. If the dictum of the member for Guysborough is subscribed to by the hon. gentlemen opposite, then we have nothing more to say.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is his opinion of a civil servant who joins a political committee and canvasses during the election against either party ?

Mr. FOSTER. I can easily answer that question, because I stand upon a certain principle, namely, that you ought not to depose a man from his citizen's rights so long as he does the duty properly which the state puts upon him, and carries out the duty of a citizen decorously and temperately in expressing his opinion, and I say that he has a right to enforce his opinion by talking to his neighbours. That is the answer, and it flows directly from a principle. If you do not stand on principle, of course you cannot answer the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend say that the Conservative party have acted on that principle ?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that that is the line upon which Sir Charles Tupper's statement went explicitly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend claim that the Conservative party have acted upon that principle during the later years of their rule ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, I am amazed.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it does not take much to amaze my hon. friend.

Mr. LISTER. It is your ox that is now being gored.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not depend upon whose ox is gored. I say that is the rule that was laid down in 1878, and it is the rule upon which the Conservative Government has acted. Hon. gentleman may find an occasional instance in which that rule appears to have been violated. But there are two sides to every case, and one man's statement does not dispose of the case from an ex-parte pont of view. Now, with reference to the case that is before us, we have not the least evidence that Mr. Béchard, or any other of those sessional clerks went beyond a fair and courteous expression of opinion on the public questions of the day. Mr. Speaker has heard the case, and has decided that he should be dismissed, but he has not given the evidence to the committee. While we have every desire to agree with the judgment of Mr. Speaker, he is yet one man, and it is not unfair that the speech upon which the hon. gentleman decided his action, the substance of which he thinks was objectionable and which he used as a reason and a cause for the dismissal of the man, should be presented to the House. Why should it not be presented ? It does not mean that we do not believe in the judgment of Mr. Speaker ; but this man Béchard is an officer of the House, and the evidence on which he was dismissed at present lies in the breast of Mr. Speaker and is not known to members of the committee. It is not unreasonable that the speech complained of should be laid before the House, so that this committee may know on what kind of evidence he was dismissed. If we could come to an understanding, in five minutes time the leader of the Government could dispose of this question so far as the principle is concerned. He could state it to this House definitely.

Mr. McGREGOR. Don't you do it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman feels dubious ; he does not like the leader of the Opposition to go into the matter.

Mr. McGREGOR. We want to treat you exactly as you treated us, neither more nor less.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman has stated that he wishes evidence with regard to the language used by Mr. Béchard in the speech in question. I should like to ask if there was any evidence offered with respect to the speeches delivered by the

translators who were dismissed because they were offensive to Mr. Chapleau? I remember the circumstances, and there was no statement made as to the language used by those men, but there was only the statement that they were offensive to Mr. Chapleau. If there was no evidence required then, how is it that the ex-Finance Minister requires evidence at this time? He was quite ready to vote at that time that the men should be dismissed; now he wants evidence.

Mr. McGREGOR. Béchard was working in the constituency for six weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. My recollection in regard to circumstances connected with the dismissal of certain translators is not perhaps so fresh as that of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), who may have looked over the record; but I imagine if the matter is looked into, it will be found that there was a conclusive statement made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The statement of Mr. Chapleau.

Mr. FOSTER. The words themselves were heard and were stated to the House. To-night we have not a single word stated that is alleged to have been uttered. We have nothing but that Mr. Speaker saw a speech, from the substance of which he thought it was sufficient to cause dismissal, and he consequently dismissed the man.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not say I had read any speech. I was told that this clerk had delivered a speech. I asked if a speech had been delivered and as to its character, and Béchard admitted that he had on a public platform at the last elections opposed, on the school question, the men who represents that county in this House, and that is why I thought he should be dismissed.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, we have got down to something that is clear. The principle on which Mr. Speaker acted is this, that if it is stated to him, and that statement gains his belief, that a man has opened his mouth on a public platform and opposed the policy of a certain party or upheld the policy of another party, that is evidence sufficient in his mind, without taking into account the character of the speech, to dismiss the man.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is very nearly my view. I did not, however, say a speech for one political party or for another; but I hold for a public officer to take part in a political campaign against candidates for this House, whether rightly or wrongly, unfits that officer to serve this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no desire to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but I simply wish to get at the facts of the case. Stripped of all its verbiage, is not the statement this—that it was made evident to Mr. Speaker, and was afterwards admitted by the man himself, that the man had gone upon the platform and had explained his views with respect to the school question——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). He made a political speech.

Mr. FOSTER. And those views were in opposition to the candidate who is the present member.

Mr. McGREGOR. He canvassed the constituency, from house to house, for six weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not that a fair statement of the position?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have made my statement distinctly two or three times.

Mr. FOSTER. So I think Mr. Speaker agrees to that. Béchard had strong views, or certain views at least upon the Manitoba school question.

Mr. McGREGOR. And on every other question.

Mr. FOSTER. We are taking the evidence that Mr. Speaker has given to the committee. Béchard appeared on a public platform, and expressed his views. Those views were not in accord with the views advocated by the candidate who is at the present time member for that county. On that state of facts being made know to Mr. Speaker, he decided that Béchard should be dismissed.

An hon. MEMBER. He was right.

Mr. FOSTER. The principle on which he has proceeded is this: that whenever a person in the employ of the Government, whether partially or for every day of the year, goes on a public platform and expresses his views on any public question which is in dispute at the time, he is to be dismissed from the service. My hon. friend the Prime Minister nods his approval of that doctrine. The simple thing to be given to a civil servant is to vote and to keep quiet.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, we have it plainly and clearly that the Prime Minister and the Liberal party intend to go on this principle, that henceforth and so long as they have power, every civil servant in this country who has done anything more than simply vote and vote quietly is liable to be dismissed from his office. That is the statement. I thank my hon. friend for having come down at last to what is clear and definite. I have no hesitation in saying that I dissent from that principle and any practice founded on that principle, and I do it because it is not treating the civil servant fairly as a citizen of this country. The hon. gentleman takes that view. He is going to carry out that policy, and I leave his policy and his views with the country. They will be discussed and widely discussed. I simply state my dissent from them, and I say on behalf of

the civil service and good citizenship that that is not a principle which the Liberal party should adopt and endeavour to carry out in this country or in any other. The principles of Liberalism as I have read them :

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What do you know about them ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not boasted every other hour that I am a Liberal of the old school, and of the English school, but I think I do understand, by reading and by experience of Liberal principles, and also of Liberal practice. But for Liberals who believe in the freedom of the individual and in the freedom of the citizens of the state—for them to apply the gag rule to every citizen who takes a dollar in the employ of the country, and for them to tell such a man : You must be mum ; you can vote, if you like, but you shall be a mere cypher in the body politic ; you must not express your views—for them to lay down that principle is certainly extraordinary. Under that rule, any one who happened to whisper to his neighbour that he thought one policy was right and the other policy wrong, leaves himself liable to dismissal. That is the rule that the hon. gentlemen wish to have adopted, and they do it because the great body of that compeling cloud which started from Vancouver about the same time as the hon. gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. McInnes), is coming onwards to Ottawa, demanding that it should have its share of offices. That compelling cloud has already begun to gather in this city. It is close to the Ministers. It is behind them and about them every day that they live, and they felt that they are not powerful enough to stand on a broad, comprehensive principle, but that they must give way to the compeiling cloud which is close by.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The case that we have before us is the case of a man named Béchard. He was an employee of this House, but he was not a permanent employee. It is admitted that he took part in political contests, and that he made a speech.

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, and canvassed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a clear case. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has just said that he belonged to the English Liberal school——

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought he wanted to be that.

Mr. FOSTER. I must correct my hon. friend. It was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) who sits in front of him, who I said was the one to proclaim that he belonged to the Liberal school, to the old English Liberal school. But my hon. friend the Premier, in 1884, had very strong language to say about men——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order,

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had very strong language to use about men who were not born Liberals ; for he declared his sentiment, that no man who was not born a Liberal could be a good Liberal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whatever may be the school of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), the facts of this case are very clear. We have before us the case of a man who has admittedly taken part in a political contest. We have heard a great deal about the practice of this and of that party. Perhaps it would have been well, at the beginning of this debate, to look a little into what the book says on this subject. A man may be a great man in the opinion of some hon. gentlemen, but I take it that the books and the authorities are not, after all, very bad things to look at. Well, Sir, what is the law on this subject ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is generally made by men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and able men at times. If you look at Todd, vol. I., page 612, you read as follows :

> The most important rule of modern times in regard to the civil servants of the Crown is that whereby they have been divided into two classes political and non-political, of which the former is supreme and the latter subordinate.

Speaking of the latter class, namely, the non-political officers of the Crown, Todd says :

> Their exclusion from the political arena is the price they pay for their tenure of office, being virtually that of good behaviour.

I do not want to weary the House by a long speech, but it seems to me that the quotations I have read, and the one or two quotations which I intend to read, are the clearest evidence that my hon. friends on the other side of the House have been wrong in this matter from the very start. We have discussed this question on two or three occasions, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have laid down the rule that a public officer can take part in a political contest, provided he is not offensive. Well, Sir, what does the authority say about that interference ? At page 630, Todd says :

> But while every Government must necessarily possess the abstract right of dismissing any of its servants who may hold their offices during pleasure whenever they consider that such a step is required by the exigencies of the public service, it has nevertheless been recognized as a rule that persons holding non-political offices under the Crown should only be dismissed for incompetence or misconduct. Dismissals on other grounds are highly objectionable and inexpedient, more especially if they spring from political considerations. Doubtless an active in-

terference in politics, on the part of a non-political office-holder, would be a case of "misconduct" sufficient to justify his dismissal.

Now, listen again, Sir, because the word "offensive" has been used a great deal in this debate:

It is a well understood rule of constitutional government that all such functionaries should abstain from taking an active part in a political contest observing a strict neutrality therein.

Is there anything clearer under the sun than that—"observing a strict neutrality?" Sir, it seems to me that, when a man makes up his mind to go into the public service, he should also at the same time make up his mind that he is not going to be a politician. As far as I myself am concerned, I must say that I entertain most liberal views on that question; but, if the views that have been offered on the other side of the House were going to be put into operation, I am very much afraid that not many of the civil servants of the day could be consistently kept in office by us. I have found in my department—I have the written evidence of it; I have the clearest evidence that nearly every one of my employees has been, to a large extent, active political partisans. Partisan may not be the word. I mean to say that nearly every one of my employees has interfered; but I want to draw a broad distinction. I know that a great many of the civil servants have been obliged to interfere against their will. With these men I have no quarrel. I have evidence that men in high places have gone to my department, and have insisted on my employees doing things against which their feelings have revolted, but which they were obliged to do. For instance, what did I find? I found that $500 had been charged to dredging in the city of Ottawa. I said, "How is this? What dredging has taken place in the city of Ottawa?" I inquired into the case, and I found that a man high in position had gone to my department and insisted that a number of men should be employed at any cost; and that so-called dredging was simply the removal of a small building, which you may see to-morrow morning if you like. I have no quarrel with my employees as to that, because they were ordered to do it. But I say this—and the House, I am sure, will agree with me—that a public employee who takes the stump without having received any orders from the Minister, and makes himself obnoxious, has no right to expect, if the political power against which he has fought comes to power, to be retained in office. Although I must add immediately, speaking for myself alone, that perhaps on many occasions it would not be wise to dismiss men who have interfered in politics. There are able men in the civil service who may have made mistakes. My hon. friends opposite have been long in power; I have been pretty long with them myself; and public employees have been brought up in the idea that they were free to interfere. To-night we have heard my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance stating that they were perfectly free to interfere. Well, Sir, drawing the line between what is fair and what is not fair, I say that this Government is prepared to deal liberally but at the same time fairly with the public serivce. I hope that the civil service will not take the law from my hon. friend. It would be a great mistake on their part to do so. We are prepared to deal liberally with them, but we expect to be served loyally by them. I speak the more freely on this point, because in my own department I have no complaint to make so far. Allow me to say one word more. It seems to me that each Minister should have some discretion. The manager of a great corporation, when he takes charge of its work, makes changes. Take, for instance, the case of Mr. Hays, who has been entrusted with the administration of the Grand Trunk Railway. He has made changes, and it seems to me that a Minister of the Crown should at least have the same liberty. How can I be held responsible to Parliament for my administration if I am not free to choose my own servants? I could read the book again to show that this is the law. The Ministers should be free to choose their own employees. In that choice they must of course be guided by the English rules, which my hon. friends opposite should adopt. My hon. friends are not doing to-day what they should do. They are trying to raise the feeling of the civil servants against us. It is not fair. If the civil servants were to take the cue from them, there would be a kind of revolution in our public service—a revolution which we should not desire, because, as I have said, we have a great number of good public servants. I would not have taken any part in this too long debate had it not been for the unholy rules that have been propounded on the other side of the House. The civil service, if it is going to be efficient, must be independent of both political parties; it must belong to the House and to the country, and not to one political party.

Mr. McNEILL. I have heard with very great pleasure very much of what has fallen from the hon. Minister of Public Works. I think he has expressed himself very fairly from many points of view. But there is one consideration that I would like to impress upon the minds of the Government with regard to this matter. It is this: that when the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat says that the members of the civil service have been taught to believe that they may take reasonable part in politics, he gives away, in my opinion any excuse there might be for dismissing men who have taken part in politics inoffensively. If the hon. Minister says, as he did say, that the present members of the civil service have been taught by the Conservative party that

they may take a reasonable part in politics, then I say as he himself has said, that surely it would be a very harsh thing and a very unfair thing to dismiss those men for doing not only what there is no rule against their doing, but what they have been taught for eighteen years they were at liberty to do. I am glad to see the Minister of Public Works bow his head in acquiescence with what I say. In view of the fact that there has been in this country no distinct rule whatever notifying the civil servants that they had not a right to take a reasonable part in politics, to dismiss any civil servant because he did take an inoffensive part in politics would be a great act of injustice.

Mr. LISTER. Inoffensive ?

Mr. McNEILL. I used the word inoffensive because a distinction has been drawn by the hon. Minister of Public Works between the case of a man who modestly, quietly and inoffensively expresses his views on politics, and the case of a man who loudly, abusively and offensively takes part. I simply put the thing from the point of view of British fair-play and justice, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavour to place themselves in the same position as that of a civil servant, who has, for eighteen years, been lead to believe that he might take a part in politics without doing anything to endanger his position.

Mr. LISTER. He was badly informed.

Mr. McNEILL. It does not matter whether he was or not, it was the information he had, and I agree with the hon. Minister of Public Works in considering that this is a matter which ought very strongly to weigh with the Government. There never has been in this country any such rule as that quoted from Todd, namely, that civil servants are not allowed to interfere in politics. That quotation from Todd, therefore, is altogether wide of the mark. If the Government, or both sides of the House, determine that civil servants should take no part in politics whatever, and that they should not even vote, well and good, let it be so understood. If, on the other hand, it is understood that they may vote and do nothing more, that they must be careful even in expressing their opinion to their neighbours on political matters, let it be so understood. Let it be understood that a civil servant is not to open his lips on politics, and that, if he does and it is brought to the notice of the Government, he will receive his dismissal. But it is difficult to draw a line in the matter. From my point of view, I think that, from the views that have been expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, by far the best thing to do, in the interests of the civil service, would be to say that they could not vote and should take no part in politics whatever. Short of that, I do not see how any civil servant is to be safe, if the rule which some gentlemen, sitting behind the Government, on the back benches, have urged, is to be put in practice.

Mr. FLINT. Has the hon. gentleman heard any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, from the beginning of the debate to this moment, say that civil servants should not be at full liberty to express their views privately on any occasion whatever ?

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he means by privately. Are the civil servants to go round privately from house to house and discuss privately with those they know, what ought to be done in the coming election ?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The last speaker said that the Government had educated the civil servants for the past eighteen years into the belief that they had a right to take part in elections.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not make any such statement. I said that the Minister of Public Works had said so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is a fact that for the last eighteen years civil servants have been educated by hon. gentlemen opposite to believe that they had a right to take part in the discussion of public questions on the platform and in the press ; but, while these hon. gentlemen permitted their followers to take that course, they insisted that the Liberals should not express their opinion on public platforms under any circumstances. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) shakes his head, but I can bring to his recollection one instance which proves the correctness of my statement. He will remember that, when the late Sir John Macdonald led the House, Mr. Ratté, an official of this House, made speeches in Carleton, and Sir John Macdonald discharged him as soon as he discovered that he had done so. It is all right for the Conservatives to maintain that civil servants shall have the right to speak, and write, and act against the Liberals, but when they come to find out that a civil servant has exercised the privilege of going on the platform and speaking on behalf of the Liberal party, then the leader of the Conservatives is the first man to kick him out. I do not believe it is well to say that we are justified in doing a certain thing because men on the opposite side did the same in former years. I do not rest my case on that at all, but I say that the interests of the public and of the civil servants themselves is that they should be prevented from taking such action ; and I hold that the man who speaks in favour of the Government, has just as much right to be suspended as if he spoke in favour of the Opposition. I agree with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that it would be a good thing for the civil service of this country, if they were not even permitted to vote. I know that there is a large number of civil servants in Ottawa who would prefer not to vote at all, just for

the reason stated a few moments ago by the Minister of Public Works. They have been compelled to vote to keep the late Government in power for years, against the desire and opinion of many of them that it was high time they were turned out of office. They were driven to support the late Government because they were afraid their positions would be lost if they did not. I think that the civil service will understand, after this debate is closed, that they must, whether Liberals or Conservatives, keep their skirts entirely free from any discussion in public with regard to one party or another, and they will then be in a position better than now to discharge the duties of their office. I certainly think it would be better if they had no vote at all.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not at all wish to suggest that a civil servant should be dismissed for anything he might say on the platform. It may be that the person to whom he referred made himself an offensive partisan.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it is only right that I should say to the committee, before the item carries, a word with reference to the speech of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan). He made a very forcible speech on entirely erroneous information. Not only do I challenge the accuracy of the information upon which he bases his attack upon my administration of the Marine Department, but I also desire to resent the very serious reflection upon his predecessor (Mr. Allan), who never lifted once his voice, that I remember, on behalf of Mr. Girardin, or attacked the late inspector of fisheries, Mr. Kerr, I think it was, of being drunk on duty. That was stated across the floor by the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) for the first time; and, on behalf of my predecessor, as well as on my own behalf, I wish to challenge the information on which the hon. gentleman based his rather heated statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope there will be no charge made from one side of the House against the other of having obstructed business, for I think this debate has been about equally divided. I merely wish to say that when, fourteen years ago, I came to this House, I found here an officer of the House whom, I am sorry to say, we do not see here to-day. That gentleman was, in my opinion, and, I think, in the opinion of every member of this House, a servant who rendered valuable services to the members of this House, and whose absence to-day puts us all to considerable inconvenience. I refer to the tonsorial artist, Mr. Napoleon Audette. I think he was employed as a messenger, but had his quarters below, in the lower part of this building. He is not there to-day, and I would like to know for what reason he has been removed. I never heard of his having spoken on a public platform or taken part, offensively or otherwise, in an election.

Mr. McMULLEN. He shaved too close.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know I have to go away down town to get him to perform the shaving operation upon myself, and, while there, I see members of the other side of the House there as well. I believe that every hon. member regarded him as one of the best officers of the House, and everybody had a good word for him. I would like to know why he has been removed and why somebody else has been put in his place, as I understand to be the case, although I have not been down to see, because I have followed my friend Napoleon to his quarters down town, at considerable inconvenience to myself.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to make an explanation, in view of what has been said. The Government of the day have laid down the rule that any civil servant who engages in election contests is unfit for a position in the service. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the case of Mr. Cloutier, who has taken the place formerly occupied by Mr. Béchard. I desire to call attention to the fact that Mr. Cloutier was an active partisan and spoke against the late Government, as I contend he had a right to do, and he was appointed for the very reason that he was a partisan.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that if statements of that kind concerning Mr. Cloutier, now that he has been appointed, come to my knowledge and are proven, he will be dismissed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman is not a sessional clerk, and the question will come up more properly in another item.

Estimate of Serjeant-at-Arms as approved $33,832 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to take this opportunity to draw attention to this matter of the messengers. I understand that the approval in regard to this matter rests with the Speaker of the House. I had the pleasure of nominating a messenger from the county of Cumberland, from Advocate Harbour. I speak of Mr. Edson Morris, a young man, and son of a very respectable farmer in that place. I am quite sure that every member of the House who has come in contact with Mr. Morris will say that his duties were discharged in a very efficient, attentive and courteous manner. Members will recollect that he occupied the position at the doors of the Speaker's apartments. Of course I was absent for a long time while he continued to perform his duties here, but I recognized him at once as the person at the door of the Speaker's apartments, and he must be well known, there-

fore, to hon. members. He received this note, dated 14th July, 1896:

I am directed to inform you that unless notified to the contrary, your services as sessional messenger will not be required at the approaching session of Parliament.

Yours truly,
L. DUBE,
Chief Messenger.

I wish to know by what authority the chief messenger of this House, whose salary is now under the notice of the committee, on the 14th July, before the Speaker of this House was elected, notified an officer of the House who had performed his duties in a satisfactory manner that he was not to come here. I do not go into the question whether Mr. Morris supported the late member for the county of Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) or not. It may be that if he had a vote he gave it to Mr. Dickey, but I am quite sure that it would be done in a quiet, orderly and civil way. I am satisfied he took no active part in the election.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I can explain to the House exactly how that occurred and can show that it was a proper thing to do. A letter of that kind was written to all the sessional messengers I believe, on that day. At that time the messengers of the House—the whole staff of messengers and pages—were under the control of the Serjeant-at-Arms, alone, as there was no Speaker. I happened to be in Ottawa at that time. It had been mentioned in the press that I was likely to be the Speaker of the House. The chief messenger and the Serjeant-at-Arms mentioned to me that it was the practice to send a notice of that kind out at the opening of new Parliaments. Here is a copy of the notice that was so sent on the 2nd March, 1874, at the opening of the new Parliament:

Sir,—I am directed to inform you that you are not required to attend as messenger unless ordered to do so. By order.

Your obedient servant,
A. LEROUX CARDINAL,
Chief Messenger.

I find that the practice was repeated on the 14th January, 1879, in these words:

Sir,—I am directed to inform you that unless notified to the contrary, your services as sessional messenger will not be required at the approaching session of Parliament.

Yours truly,
D. W. McDONNELL,
Serjeant-at-Arms.

Now, this notice was shown to me unofficially; but the Serjeant who was responsible for the matter, I suppose out of courtesy, told me that he had been in the habit of doing it, that he had authorized it to be done and approved it: "By Order, Approved, Henry R. Smith, Serjeant-at-Arms." That is the notice sent out by Mr. Dubé on the 14th July. Although I had no voice or control in the matter any more than any other member in the House, I thought the reason he gave a very good one, namely, that it would be a pity for all these messengers to come up here unless they were going to be re-employed. He said he had been in the habit of doing it, and that is the reason he did it. I think he was wise in doing it. I thought so then, and I think so now. Now while speaking about that, I want to say that when I became Speaker, one of the very first things I had to do was to see that the staff of messengers and the staff of pages were at once put in good shape. I took up the matter and spent a great deal of time and pains in carrying that out. I felt the importance of it, and I carefully took advice in every individual case of the old men who were on the list, and the elder boys who were on the list of pages. I consulted with the Serjeant, who is the responsible officer of this House, and with the head messenger, and the head pages, as to the fitness and qualifications of the subordinates, and I acted upon their advice. I nominated some twenty-one of the old messengers, and I think eleven of the old pages, and I think I have selected a staff which is exceedingly efficient. It has been so reported to me. As to the messengers, and as to these boys in this Chamber, I hope the hon. members will find that they are going to have a very good service. Of course in the case of the pages, a great many boys become too old to be reappointed. Some two or three of them that were here last year, from my personal knowledge were not efficient, and they had to go. In their appointment I acted upon the general principle which has been adopted by all Speakers, that of appointing children of widows, or of people who would be benefited by the little sums these boys would earn. But I have always been careful to try and appoint boys who were fit for the service. As to the servants, I may say that none of the permanent servants were changed.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not refer to the eight permanent messengers, the door keeper, and the permanent messengers of the reading room.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have here the printed list. There were thirteen on the messengers' staff, and none were removed. The night watchman was not removed, the carpenter was not removed. Then as to the others, I took the advice of the permanent officers of the House, the Serjeant and others, and I acted upon my best judgment. I feel I am responsible to the House, but I don't think I should be criticised as to the qualifications or otherwise of those gentlemen.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker has satisfactorily explained, I frankly admit, what occurred to me as an anomaly, that before the election of a Speaker this communication should have been sent, and he has given a sufficient reason to justify

it. But I fail to see any reason why the messenger whose case I have brought under the notice of the House, Mr. Morris, was not called upon subsequently to resume his duties, which I believe he had faithfully and courteously performed for several years. No explanation has been given why he should have been omitted. I would like to inquire if there was any charge against Mr. Morris, or what was the reason that prevented his being called upon to resume his duties ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not want to say that there was any specific charge against any specific man. Mr. Morris was appointed in 1886, he had performed ten years of service ; and while it did not make him any the worse, it did give him a good share of the messengers' pay. However, I do not remember Mr. Morris's case in particular. I went over the old list with the Serjeant and the Chief Messenger, and I appointed the best men on that list, on their advice. Special reasons were given for not appointing some of them, though I cannot remember any special reason in the case of Mr. Morris.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there any special reason why Mr. Patchell was left off, who had been for fifteen years a messenger in the employ of the House, and had always performed his duties well ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was a special reason, which I can tell the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It could not be political, for he was a Liberal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My attention has also been called to the case of Mr. Samson, doorkeeper. He was one of the permanent messengers, I believe.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, he was only sessional.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know as much about him as others do, but as he requested me to refer to his case, I would like to know if there is any reason why he was not continued.

Mr. SPEAKER. There was a special reason reported to me in the case of Mr. Samson. I remember it distinctly, and I can tell the hon. gentleman what it was. Mr. Samson was good enough to threaten me that the matter would be brought up in the House, which I see has been done.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it a political reason ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Nor in Patchell's case ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there investigation in the case of Samson ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was no investigation at any time, I acted on the information given me by the officers.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My attention has been drawn to the case of Mr. Coffin, who was employed, I think, in the basement, and who had been a civil servant for eighteen years. I should like to know if there was any complaint made against him, or any special reason why he was left out when the messengers were called upon to resume their places. There was also a man from the district which I represent, Mr. Charles Guérard. I remember well when he came into the House as a messenger, and the older members of the House will remember him as being one of the most faithful, respectable, and hard-working messengers we had. We had very few messengers from Quebec, and I thought that Mr. Guérard should have been kept in his position unless there was strong reasons to warrant his dismissal.

Mr. SPEAKER. These two gentlemen were in the position of Mr. Morris. I cannot remember the particulars in their case, as I do about Patchell and Samson. The permanent staff reported against them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems at first blush that a man who has been for eighteen years in the service, should not be dismissed without some strong reason, if he has faithfully performed his duties.

Mr. SPEAKER. They were not reappointed. All this was done before I was Speaker. Certain of the messengers were not reappointed and 21 were reappointed, and those who were not reappointed were left off for some reason, but I cannot remember the reason in each case.

Mr. SPROULE. Something occurred tonight which has taken place for the first time in my experience in this House, and it is an occurrence which I very much deprecate. When Mr. Speaker made an explanation with respect to how he managed the business entrusted to him—it seemed to me a very fair and reasonable explanation and appeared to show that he had endeavoured to do his duty faithfully, and there was no reason to complain, at all events in my opinion—there was a demonstration of applause from the Government side of the House when the hon. gentleman sat down. I have heard several Speakers of this House on an occasion like the present give explanations with respect to the way in which they have discharged their duties, but they were always received by hon. members on both sides of the House with silence and respect, as they should be. It should be remembered that the Speaker of the House represents one side no more than the other side. There has been no reason to complain of the conduct of Mr. Speaker, and I should be very sorry to believe that an impression has been created on this

side of the House that the hon. gentleman was not otherwise than what a Speaker ought to be. With respect to the messengers and pages, I hope there will be a fairer distribution of patronage in the future than there has been in the past. I have been a member for eighteen years, and I have never succeeded in getting on even a sessional clerk, messenger, page, or a civil servant about this House. The large percentage of these employees are taken from the Ottawa district, some from the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces, and a large portion of Ontario is entirely overlooked. I do not care who controls the patronage in my county, but I claim it has a right to a share of that patronage, whether exercised by a Reform member or by any other party.

Resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

RESIGNATION OF THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to ask the leader of the Government if he has laid on the Table of the House the additional papers he was good enough to tell me he expected to produce, to complete the correspondence in regard to the matter respecting the Governor General.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry to say that I have not been able to lay the statement on the Table to-day. It will be ready for Monday, but I will send an advance copy to my hon. friend to-morrow.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not quite catch the statement the leader of the Government made with respect to the letter which elicited the letter from the Commandant of the Royal Military College, and which I understand he intends to lay on the Table of the House. I ask if he will endeavour to take measures to have that letter laid on the Table, as the correspondence is incomplete, and I am sure if the hon. gentleman will read the Commandant's letter he will find it of a character that makes it absolutely necessary to the consideration of this question that we should have the letter that was sent by the direction of the Government, I presume, and which elicited the Commandant's letter. Will the hon. gentleman take measures to obtain that letter and place it on the Table of the House? I cannot imagine any possible reason why it should not be produced..

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have read that letter and my colleagues have read it, and the Government have no objection that the letter should be placed on the Table of the House. But this letter is a private letter addressed by General Gascoigne to General Cameron. We consider we have not the authority to compel the production of a private letter from one gentleman to another. But, if General Cameron and General Gascoigne have no objection to the production of this letter, the Government is certainly quite willing to place it on the Table of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that General Cameron is most anxious that the letter should be laid on the Table of the House. He considers it absolutely due to himself that that letter should be produced, and I would like to ask my hon. friend if he would endeavour to obtain the consent of General Gascoigne, if he thinks that is necessary for the submission of the letter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it would be more proper if the communication were to come from General Cameron himself to General Gascoigne, than from the Government to General Gascoigne. Since General Cameron has no objection, let him signify his willingness to General Gascoigne, and so far as the Government is concerned there will be no objection at all that the letter should be laid upon the Table of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That a Select Committee composed of Messieurs. Bain, Borden (Halifax), Bourassa, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Clarke, Davies, Davin, Foster, Flint, Fraser (Guysborough), Laurier, Lount, McNeill, Monk, and Scriver, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library; and a Message was ordered to be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Act respecting interest.—(Mr. Quinn.)

EMIGRATION TO BRAZIL.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if there has been anything done in respect of the matter to which I called his attention the other day, and towards preventing any of our people from making engagements with the Brazilian authorities, or rather with persons who call themselves authorized to engage people in Canada to go to that country. I see by the Montreal "Herald" of this morning that about one thousand people are booked for the voyage. They are all married people; the agents will not accept unmarried people, probably because they fear they would not remain very long; and they engage only married men, and women and children. In view of the fact also, as mentioned by the same paper, that great efforts have been made by the British and Italian Governments to prevent their people from going to Brazil, I would like to ask the Premier once more whether anything has been done with the object of preventing our people from joining that unfortunate class who have been there before but who, with the exception of those who have left their bones in that country, have returned through the assistance of the governments of the various countries.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I thank my hon. friend for calling the attention of the Government to this matter. The Government have done everything they thought advisable to do in order to prevent Canadians from leaving this country for Brazil. We have given instructions to the immigration agent at Montreal to communicate with intending emigrants, and to warn them of the danger to which they are exposed. Hearing that efforts are being made especially among the French Canadians in the parishes of the diocese of Montreal, we communicated with the episcopal authorities of Montreal, advising them to communicate with the curés, and to ask them to warn their people against the dangers which emigrants to Brazil are incurring.

INTERCOLONIAL TIME-TABLE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways if he has done anything in regard to the matter to which I called his attention a few days ago, respecting the inconvenience to which the people of the whole district of Quebec are subjected under the present dispositions of the Intercolonial Railway time-table. I would like to know if he has made any inquiries upon the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I may say that upon being informed by my hon. friend that complaints were being made in respect to this matter, I at once forwarded an inquiry to the proper quarter, and as soon as it comes to hand, I will communicate the information to my hon. friend.

DUTIES UPON MALT LIQUORS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked:

What was the total amount of excise duties collected upon ales, beer and spirituous liquors, in Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). The duty accrued upon spirits for 1895-96 amounted to $4,011,287.56; upon ales and beer, including brewers' license fees, $6,747.74. But as it is doubtless the intention of the hon. member for North Norfolk to ascertain the whole excise duty collected on potable liquors, it may be stated that the duty on malt from which the beer is produced amounted to $781,554.56; making in all an aggregate revenue of $4,799,589.86.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. DUGAS (for Sir Adolphe Caron) asked:

Is the following report which appears in the newspaper press of Canada correct:—

"That Mr. Greenway declares that no settlement of the Manitoba school question will be made which will in the slightest degree interfere with Manitoba's determination not to have separate schools, and that he is coming to Ottawa to have a further conference with Mr. Laurier on the subject."

If this report is correct, when will this "further conference" be held?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In answer to the question, I beg to say that I know nothing of the intention of Mr. Greenway, or of his declarations. The Government have received no information of the intention of Mr. Greenway to come down to have a further conference with the Government.

CAPTAIN ALFRED FAGES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked:

Did Captain Alfred Fages, of the Military School at St. Johns, P.Q., obtain leave of absence in order to go and vote at Quebec on 23rd June last? If so, what was the duration of the said leave?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the question to stand. We have asked the Deputy Adjutant General of the district for information respecting it.

ADVERTISING ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked:

1. Whether tenders were asked for during the month of February last for the privilege of sell-

ing newspapers, fruit, &c., on the several trains of the Intercolonial ; whether the tenders men tion also the privilege of placing advertisements in the several stations, and if not, why was the said privilege included in the contract ?

2. Who has the contract for the sale of newspapers on the branch of the Intercolonial between Truro and Sydney ?

3. How much does he pay ?

4. When was the contract awarded ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Tenders were invited by newspaper advertisement dated 5th February, 1896, and received on 19th February, 1896, for selling newspapers, &c., &c., on the trains of the Intercolonial Railway. The advertisement inviting tenders did not mention the privilege of placing advertisements in the several stations. It was not considered as a necessary part of a contract for the privilege of selling newspapers, fruit, &c., &c., on the trains, &c., &c., and did not form part of the contract. Mr. George L. Hannington has the contract for selling newspapers, &c., on the Intercolonial Railway between Truro and Sydney. He pays $750.00 per annum. The contract was awarded in February, 1896.

SALE OF NEWSPAPERS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

1. Who obtained the contract for the sale of newspapers, fruit, &c., on the Intercolonial Railway, from the 1st October, 1894, to 1st October, 1895 ?

2. Did the party who secured it pay the price of the contract ?

3. What amount did he pay ?

4. Was the contract renewed with the same party from 1st October, 1895, to 1st October, 1896 ?

5. If so, what was the price and were tenders called for ?

6. Was the contract cancelled in the interval, and if so, why ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). F. W. Cunningham received the contract for the sale of newspapers, &c., &c., on the Intercolonial Railway from 1st October, 1894, to 1st October, 1895. Yes. He paid the price of the contract. He paid $4,015.00. Yes. Contract was renewed with the same party from 1st November, 1895, to 1st November, 1896. The price was $4,015 for the year. Tenders were not invited. Yes. The contract was cancelled in the interval on account of the contractor failing to comply with the conditions of the contract.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

1. Who has the contract for the sale of newspapers, books, fruit, &c., in the stations of the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Halifax ?

2. When does the said contract expire ?

3. How much does the contractor pay ?

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No person has the contract for selling newspapers, &c., at the stations between St. John and Halifax.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Taylor) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of purchasing a site on which to erect a drill shed in the town of Gananoque ? Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the removal of the old shed from the site on which it is at present located, and which has been sold and conveyed to the corporation of Gananoque for school purposes ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I beg to say that both these matters are receiving the serious consideration of the Government.

EXPORTATION OF HAY.

Mr. QUINN asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to aid in any way the exportation of surplus hay this season ? If so, how ? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Government have not as yet received any communication on the subject, and the matter has therefore not been under their consideration.

LOCK 2—LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. QUINN asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of lock No. 2, Lachine Canal, this winter ? 2. If so,will such work be done by contract or by day labour ? 3. If by day labour, will the system of eight hours per day be followed ?

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a mistake in the question as printed. It should be Lock No. 1 and not Lock No. 2.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I may inform the hon. member that the whole question of the construction of Lock No. 2 on the Lachine Canal is under consideration. Nothing has yet been determined upon in respect to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) wish to have the question changed so as read "Lock No. 1" ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If so, the hon. gentleman will have to allow the question to stand until tomorrow so that I may answer it.

Mr. QUINN. Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is allowed to stand, it being understood it refers to Lock No. 1 and not Lock No. 2.

FISHWAYS IN TWO MOUNTAINS.

Mr. ETHIER asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to cause fish runways to be constructed on the North River, in the counties of Argenteuil and Two Mountains, between St. André and St. Jérome?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Government is now considering the question of the propriety of taking immediate action with a view of having fishways constructed on the North River, counties of Argenteuil and Two Mountains. The department in 1895 decided that fishways should be constructed and served the usual notice required by the Fisheries Act, but on investigation it was found that the form of fishway prescribed was unsuitable to the locality and would prove ineffectual, and action was then stayed.

THE "HARD-PAN CLAIMS."

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked:

Has any money been kept in reserve by the late Government for the payment of outstanding claims—known as "hard-pan claims"—in connection with the building of the portion of the Intercolonial Railway east of Grand Narrows, Cape Breton? If so, what amount?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Blair). Yes. The amount kept in reserve was $1,200.

THE ISLAND OF ANTICOSTI.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Kaulbach) asked:

1. Was any complaint made to the Government of Canada or to the Fisheries Department that Mr. Henri Menier, owner of the Island of Anticosti, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, claimed jurisdiction over the three-mile limit around that island? If so, what is the nature of the complaint?

2. Was any inquiry made into the matter by Commander Wakeham, or other officer of the Government?

3. If any report has been received, what is the nature of that report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes. That the schooner "Bessie A" while fishing in the inshore waters off the west point of the island was ordered to leave by the captain of the steamer "Savoy" on the ground that Mr. Menier claimed the exclusive right of fishery within the three-mile limit. 2. Yes, by Commander Wakeham. 3. That the warning off was done without Mr. Mercier's orders and owing to a misapprehension on the part of one of his employees, and that Mr. Menier makes no claim to exclusive fishing rights within the three-mile limit.

THE THOUSAND ISLANDS.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Taylor) asked:

Have the Government withdrawn the unsold islands in the River St. Lawrence (known as the Thousand Islands) from the market? If so, is it the intention of the Government to purchase them from the Indian Department and set them aside as a public park?

Mr. DOBELL. The Acting Superintendent General of Indian Affairs was advised that the government of Ontario had in contemplation a proposition for the purchase of a number, if not all, of the unsold islands in the St. Lawrence River between Kingston and Brockville, for public park purposes; and pending consideration of the subject the islands have been withdrawn from sale.

BRIDGES IN BEDFORD TOWNSHIP.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Has a petition been presented to the Government from the municipal council of the township of Bedford, in the county of Addington, Ont., asking the Government to rebuild the Fish Creek and Birch Creek bridges on the Green Bay Road, in said township of Bedford?

2. Has an officer of the Department of Railways and Canals made a report on the same? If so, did he recommend that the work be proceeded with?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to rebuild the bridges at an early day?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes. the municipal council of Bedford have petitioned the Government to rebuild Birch and Fish Creek bridges. 2. Yes, an officer of the department has reported on these bridges. No, he did not recommend that the work be proceeded with. 3. No, it is not the intention of the Government to rebuild these bridges, as it is not considered the damage has been caused by Bob's Lake Government dam.

ISLANDS IN STONY AND CLEAR LAKES

Mr. LANG asked:

1. Are the islands in Stony and Clear Lakes, in the county of Peterborough, under the jurisdiction and control of the Dominion Government?

2. Were they ever surveyed, and, if so, what is the number and acreage of each of the several islands in each lake, the cost of survey of each island and the total cost of the survey of the islands in these lakes?

3. Have any of them been disposed of? If so, to whom, at what price, and under what conditions?

4. In whose hands was the sale of these islands, if sold, placed, and what was the cost in connection with such sales, if any?

Mr. DOBELL. The islands in Stony and Clear Lakes, in the county of Peterborough, are under the control of the Dominion Government, as trustee for the Indian owners. 2. They were surveyed. Haslett's survey, which covered the west end of Stony Lake, including Clear Lake, shows that there are 75 islands therein, and that their total acreage is 668 acres 2 roods and 38 perches. Hewson's survey, which covered the east end of Stony Lake, shows that there are 94 islands therein, and that their total acreage

is 319·32 acres. The total cost of the survey of the islands was $1,298.10. The cost of the survey was not apportioned among the islands. 3. Some of them have been disposed of. The only condition of sale was the payment of the purchase money in cash. 4. The sale was in the hands of the department's regular lands agent. His remuneration is 7½ per cent on all sales effected by him.

THE STEAMER "EMPIRE."

Mr. LANG asked:

Is the steamer "Empire," used by the superintending engineer of the Trent Valley waters, the property of the Dominion? If so, when was it acquired and from whom, and what was the cost and what has been the total expense for operating the steamer since its acquirement? What is the size of the steamer, and of what material is it constructed, and what has it cost for repairs?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, the small tug "Empire" is the property of the Government. It was built by the Government in 1886. The cost was $2,100. The Government has been at the expense of operating since built. The size is 50 feet long, 10 feet beam, 5 feet draft. She is constructed chiefly of oak. It has cost for repairs about $50 a year.

THE LAKEFIELD DAM.

Mr. LANG asked:

Has the dam across the river at the village of Lakefield, county of Peterborough, been assumed by the Dominion? If so, from whom was it obtained? What was the amount of compensation, the date of transfer, and the amount of expenditure for the maintenance and repairs since its acquirement by the Government? Is there a caretaker, and, if so, when was he appointed? Who is he, and what is the nature of his duties, and what is his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, the old dam at Lakefield was assumed by the Dominion Government in 1883. It was obtained from R. C. & W. G. Strickland. The amount of compensation was $5,000. The date of transfer was 31st December, 1883. The amount for repairs and maintenance since it was assumed by the Government is $3,-527. Yes, there is a caretaker. He was appointed in the year 1886. He is one John Dinwoodie. His duties are to take care of the dam, by regulating the water, chopping ice, and looking after the wharf. His salary from the Railway Department is $240 per annum, and $150 from the Public Works Department for looking after the boom.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. LANG asked:

Has any person or persons been appointed to value the lands in the county of Peterborough acquired for the purpose of the Trent Valley Canal? If so, what lands, with number of lot, concession, have been conveyed under such provisions, from whom purchased, and the monetary consideration, and what is the name of the valuator or valuators, and the amount of their remuneration?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There have been persons appointed to value the lands, but the appointments were made by the late Government. As to the second clause of the question, I think it would be somewhat inconvenient to furnish the information my hon. friend desires, in the form of an answer to the question; but, if he will allow me, I will furnish him with the details in writing, and, if he desires that the information should be submitted in any more formal manner to the House, he can move a resolution for that purpose.

Mr. LANG. That is quite satisfactory.

CUSTOMS DEFALCATIONS AT PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. LANG asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to have a thorough and complete investigation, by an expert officer, of the books, &c., in the office of Her Majesty's Customs at the port of Peterborough, so that, as far as possible, the defalcations of the late collector, C. H. Clementi, may be ascertained? Did the Government obtain any security from the collector when appointed to the office? If so, what was the nature of the security? Is it good for the amount stated therein? Is it the intention of the Government to institute criminal proceedings against the late collector for his systematic robbery of the moneys of Her Majesty's Customs?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). A very careful investigation of the customs revenue collections at the port of Peterborough has been already made by an experienced officer, and a further investigation by a competent officer will be made, if necessary. The late collector, C. H. Clementi, was appointed to the office by Order in Council, dated the 18th December, 1890. A bond, bearing date the 14th January, 1891, for the sum of $4,000, was executed by the said collector and two sureties. The value of the bond has not been determined. The Department of Justice is instructed to take proceedings for the collection of the amount recoverable under the bond, and the question of other proceedings is under consideration.

BRIGADE STAFF OF LONDON CAMP.

Mr. TISDALE asked:

What officers were selected by the D. A. G. Military District No. 1 to compose the brigade staff at London camp commencing 8th September instant, and recommended by him for approval at headquarters? Was any change, and, if so, what, made in this list and upon whose recommendation and for what reason?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The officers recommended by the Deputy Adjutant General, Military District No. 1 to compose the brigade staff at the London camp, which assembled on the 18th instant, were as follows:—Camp Commandant, Lieut.-Colonel Smith, D.A.G.; Supply Officer, Lieut.-Colonel Jas. Munro, 22nd Battalion; Camp Quartermaster, Lieut.-Colonel John Irwin, 26th Battalion; Inspector of Musketry, Lieut.-Colonel John Stacey, 25th Battalion; Brigade Major, Capt. Dennison, R.R.C.I. This staff was approved, but Lieut.-Colonel Stacey and Capt. Dennison were made Brigade Major and Inspector of Musketry, respectively instead of as recommended. This change was made on the recommendation of the General Officer Commanding, for the reason that the corps comprising the camp are armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle for target practice, and that, as they are not familiar with this rifle, it was necessary that the officer most conversant with it should be made Instructor of Musketry.

FISHING IN LOWER RIDEAU LAKES.

Mr. WOOD (for Mr. Frost) asked:

Has the attention of the Government been called to the following paragraph which appeared in the Smith's Falls "Echo" of 2nd September:

"Considerable alarm is felt by those who are interested in Lower Rideau Lake by the announcement that the owners of Long Island, a joint stock company, are endeavouring to get hold of the lake as a fishing preserve."

Have the Anglers Inn Company, the owners of Long Island, made overtures to the Government as indicated in this paragraph? Are any negotiations now in progress by which Lower Rideau Lake will be handed over to them as a fishing preserve?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The attention of the Government had not been called to the paragraph quoted by the hon. gentleman until the hon. gentleman put his question. No such overtures have been made, and no such negotiations are known to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

FREDERICTON BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked:

Have any steps been taken to collect the interest overdue by the Fredericton Bridge Company, and if not, why not? If any move has been made, what has been done? If no move has been made, when do the Government intend to move in the matter?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The usual demand for payment of interest due by the company has been made. Beyond that the Government has not been in a position to take up the subject for lack of time.

LAND GRANT TO CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

1. What amount of land has been granted from the Crown to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

2. When was the grant made?

Mr. DOBELL. 1. The original area of land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the provisions of the Act 44 Victoria, chapter 1, was twenty-five millions of acres, which was reduced by 6,793,014 acres under the provisions of the Act 49 Victoria, chapter 9. 2. The date of the original grant was the 15th February, 1881, being the day upon which the Act was assented to by the Governor General, and the statute under which the reduction was made was assented to on the 2nd of June, 1886. The area for which letters patent have issued to the company or the company's assignees up to the end of the month of August of this year is 1,359,727 acres. These patents are usually issued from the Crown direct to the people to whom the company dispose of the land, and before patent can issue the mortgage created by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 32, has to be paid off in so far as it affects the land to be conveyed.

WILLIAM McGIRR.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked:

For what purpose was Mr. William McGirr, of the Indian Department, sent to the North-west during the recent elections? Under whose authority was he sent, and from what fund were his travelling expenses paid?

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. William McGirr of the Indian Department was sent to the North-west during the recent elections. What the real purpose in sending him is not known to the Government. There is an official record in the department on file to the effect that McGirr was instructed to proceed to the St. Peter's Reserve to effect, if possible, a settlement between certain white men and half-breeds and the Indians, of the claims preferred by the former to lands included within that reserve. He was sent under authority of the then Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; and his expenses were paid from the appropriation for civil government contingencies.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Has the Chignecto Ship Railway Company made any application to the Government recently? If so, what is the nature of it? What action, if any, will be taken upon this application?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). A representative of the company recently had an interview with a committee of Council, and asked that the subsidies

granted to the company some years ago should be revived. The matter has not yet been determined by the Government.

MOOSE JAW.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the following resolution, a copy of which was sent last February to the Government :—

Moose Jaw, Assa., February 3rd, 1896.

Council Chamber of Moose Jaw.

Moved by Councillor Wellington, seconded by Councillor Grayson, and

Resolved, That the council of the municipality of the town of Moose Jaw record with pleasure the action you have taken in calling the attention of Parliament to the position of the Dominion Government in relation to the town site of Moose Jaw.

The interest held by the said Government has been a burden on the ratepayers.

The growth of the town has been checked by the high price placed on the lots.

The taxable property is kept at a minimum by the exemption of the Government interest and the rate correspondingly raised on the ratepayers who, by their labour and improvements are adding to the value of the Government holdings.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government and the trustees have received a large sum through the sale of lots, and the only revenue realized by the town from this source has been the one-fourth interest of the trustees of the North-west Land Company which is taxable.

In asking the Government to relinquish their claim you are hereby assured of the unanimous support of the council representing the town of Moose Jaw in your efforts in their behalf, and their hope is that you will be successful in righting a wrong that has retarded the growth and burdened the present settlers of the town.

Passed in Council, the 3rd day of February, 1896.

(Sgd.) O. B. FYSH,
Town Clerk.

To N. F. Davin, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Whether it is the intention of the Government to take such action as will relieve the municipality of Moose Jaw of the grievance referred to in the above resolution ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The attention of the Government has not been called to any such resolution. My hon. friend says a copy of that resolution was sent to the Government. I must say that no record of it can be found in the department.

PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. MACKIE asked :

1. Is there any record in the Department of Railways and Canals of any letter or letters written by the late Minister to the Hon. Peter White, just prior to the last general election, respecting a bonus to be granted to the Pembroke Southern Railway ?

2. What are the contents of said letter or letters ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

3. Is there any other correspondence in said department respecting said railway bonus, and, if so, what is the nature thereof ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is no record whatever in the Department of Railways and Canals of any letter having been written by the late Minister of Railways and Canals to the Hon. Peter White, just prior to the general elections, or at any other time, respecting the bonus granted to the Pembroke Southern Railway. There is some other correspondence in the Department of Railways and Canals respecting the said bonus.

IMPORTATIONS FROM THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES.

Mr. COPP asked :

What was the value of goods imported into Canada from the Australian Colonies for the years 1890-91-92-93-94-95-96 ?

What was the value of goods of Canadian produce exported from Canada to the Australian Colonies during the years above mentioned ?

What amount of subsidy has been paid by the Dominion Government during the years indicated (showing amount for each year) towards steamship lines running between Canada and the Australian Colonies ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The following is a statement showing the value of goods imported from Australia and entered for consumption in Canada ; also, the value of goods the produce of Canada, exported to Australia during the undermentioned fiscal years ending on the 30th June :—

Years.	Imports.	Exports.
1890	$205,396	$471,028
1891	169,065	582,377
1892	264,783	436,153
1893	217,817	284,926
1894	143,317	320,952
1895	113,242	414,924
1896	197,918	513,875

The returns of imports and exports make no distinction as to the different Australian colonies, all being reported as imported or exported to or from Australia. In answer to the third question, the subsidies paid in years ended 30th June, were as follows :—

1894	$121,666 67
1895	121,666 67
1896	111,527 79

One trip not complete until July, and, therefore, made chargeable to 1896-97. No subsidies prior to year ended 30th June, 1894.

JOINT FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. GILLIES moved for :

Copies of all papers, letters, despatches and international agreements that passed between or were entered into by the British, Canadian and United States Governments referring to or respecting the appointment of the Joint Fishery Commission ; also for copies of all reports made by the commissioners respecting the rules and re-

gulations under which fishing will be prosecuted in contiguous waters, and in waters of the open sea commonly resorted to by fishermen of the United States and of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, coming from a province that sends 25,478 men down to the sea in ships and boats to prosecute the industry that forms the basis of this motion, men who pass weary days and nights on the bosom of the mighty deep, and who draw their living from the depths of the ocean; belonging, as I do, to a Dominion that employs 70,700 men in this same very hazardous, dangerous and precarious calling, and representing as I do a county that sends 2,500 men down to the salt waters that encircle our iron-bound coast, from which they seek to wrest a living, I feel justified in presenting to the House the motion which you, Sir, have just read. When I came to this House, in 1891, the hon. and senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) then held the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I had the pleasure of discussing with him the question to which I now draw the attention of my hon. friend the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). And I may say, at the very outset, that I am very pleased to find that that hon. gentleman has been selected by this Government to fill that honourable position, and I do trust that, while it be either the good or evil fortune of this Dominion to be governed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that hon. gentleman will, I am quite sure, during the currency of that period, whatever length of time it may be do honour to the distinguished position which I am glad to see him under the circumstances fill. And I am quite sure from his personal knowledge of the industry that engages the attention of our people down by the sea, that he will do them every justice in his department. As I have said, when I came to this House, in 1891, the hon. member for the county of Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) held the position of Minister of Marine, and it was my privilege and pleasure to draw his attention to the matter to which I now ask the kind attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), that is, to the question of fishing is contiguous waters and also in waters that are extra-territorial. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper entered into my suggestions in this regard with a readiness that was to me most helpful and gratifying. I am quite aware that regulations governing the prosecution of fisheries in those two waters, namely, those that are contiguous and those that are extra-territorial, can only be brought about by the joint co-operation of the several governments, Canadian, British and American. With the view, therefore, of bringing the matter to the notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of those days, I tabled the following question in 1894:—

Have the Government entered into negotiations with the United States, by correspondence, or otherwise, with the view of entering into a joint agreement by which the system of purse-seining, seining and trawling, now pursued beyond the three-mile limit with such damage and injury to the fishing grounds upon the Atlantic coast, may be rendered unlawful and prohibited in future by the joint action of the two governments.

To that question, the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) replied as follows:—

The Government has entered into a convention with the United States, which, though not dealing specifically with the subject of purse-seining, seining and trawling, contemplates a general investigation, which is now proceeding, which will deal with the subject to which the hon. gentleman refers in his question. Of course, no action will be taken until the commissioners have reported.

That was the answer of the Minister at that time, and he told me, in conversation on the subject, that after I had brought this question to his notice, a year or two before this, he immediately entered into correspondence with the home authorities and the authorities at Washington, which culminated in the appointment of two joint commissioners, namely, Dr. Robert D. Rathbun, commissioner of the Fishery Department at Washington, a man holding a very distinguished position in his own country and regarded in his line as a very eminent authority; and Commander Wakeham, an equally eminent authority in our country, commissioner for the Dominion. These two gentlemen were appointed joint commissioners to draw up regulations under which fishing can be carried on in contiguous waters in the great lakes, and under which purse-seining and trawling on the Atlantic coast beyond the three-mile limit may be prohibited. Last session, I caused the following question to be put to the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan):—

Have the commissioners of the joint convention of the Government of Canada and the United States completed their investigation into the subjects submitted to them for examination and to report upon? If so, does their report suggest that an arrangement be entered into between both governments for the purpose and with the object of preventing and prohibiting purse-seining and trawling beyond the three-mile limit upon the Atlantic coast? If the report has been completed, has it been submitted to Her Majesty's Government of Great Britain and that of the United States, and what action is likely to be taken thereon? If the work of the commission has not yet been concluded, when is their report expected by the Government of Canada?

To this the Minister (Mr. Costigan) replied:

The commissioners appointed by Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States, under international agreement, have, it is understood, completed their investigations and are at present engaged in the preparation of their report for submission to their respective governments. The action to be taken on the report or reports, is provided for in the agreement, as follows:—

The two governments agree that so soon as the

report of the commissioners shall be laid before them, as aforesaid, they will consider the same, and exchange views thereon, to the end of reaching, if expedient and practicable, such conventional or other understanding as may suffice to carry out the recommendation of the commissioners, by treaty or concurrent legislation on the part of the respective governments or the legislatures of the several states and provinces, or both, as may be found most advisable ; but nothing herein contained shall be found to commit either government to the results of the investigation hereby instituted.

Then the Minister (Mr. Costigan) went on to say :

It is impossible to say when the report might be communicated to the Government of Canada, or what suggestions may be contained ; but it is understood that it will be communicated to Her Majesty's Government, and that of the United States, in June next. The scope of the inquiry includes the whole question affecting the fisheries in contiguous waters, and in waters of the open sea, commonly resorted to by fishermen of the United States and of Canada.

That answer, Mr. Speaker, covers the whole ground of the motion, namely, that the commissioners so appointed were to deal with the fishing regulations under which fishing in contiguous waters and in the waters of the open sea should be carried on. And, as the then Minister said, that the reports of these commissioners was expected last June, I assume that the work has been completed and is now in the hands of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). However, I may, perhaps, be permitted to refer very briefly to the extent of the industry with which I am now dealing and which, I am sure, my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) must be so anxious in every way to foster and assist. We have the most extensive sea fisheries in the world. The eastern coast of the maritime provinces extending from the Bay of Fundy to the Straits of Belle Isle has a shore line of 5,600 miles. British Columbia alone has a sea coast of 7,181 miles, or double the extent of that of Great Britain and Ireland put together. These are the ocean fisheries, and when we consider their vast extent and with proper care and protection their practically inexhaustible richness, the value of this our great heritage cannot but arouse within us a feeling of pleasure and healthy pride as patriotic Canadians. Now the whole area of the salt water inshore fisheries is about 15,000 square miles. This is in addition to the extent covered by our fisheries of the great lakes, which embrace an area of some 72,000 square miles, not including the lakes of Manitoba and the Northwest. These figures may appear dry to the House, but they also must appear striking. They show over what a vast territory my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries presides and what close attention the interests covered by that territory demands. Now let me deal, very briefly indeed, with the value of these fisheries. Take the Island of Cape Breton alone and consider how immense is the fishing industry there, though prosecuted in many respects, in a very crude way. The annual catch of fish in the four counties of Cape Breton alone amounts to about $1,200,000, nearly as much as the whole annual catch of the great province of Ontario, and nearly double the annual catch of the province of Manitoba. The county that I represent, although territorially small and one of the smallest counties in point of population in the province of Nova Scotia, had a catch last year of something like $450,000. These figures are culled from the reports of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and are therefore authentic. In my own county alone we have 75 vessels and 1,305 boats engaged in this industry, manned by something like 2,500 men. The returns now in the hands of the Minister show that the value of the fisheries for the whole eighteen counties of Nova Scotia is something like $7,000,000, nearly one-third of the value of the fisheries of the whole Dominion of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we consider for a moment the advance made by way of development in this industry in the past few years, we must be struck with the rapid progress made in it. It is really a matter of surprise that, hampered as the people are with many difficulties—storms upon the coast, harbours inadequately provided, and other causes that I need not mention—such rapid strides have been taken in the prosecution of this industry. We can understand what has been done only by a comparison of the figures. In 1870 the total value of the fisheries of Canada was $6,500,000. In 1894, which is the last year for which the returns are available to me, the value of the fisheries was something like $21,000,000. That is the industry had gone up in value something like over 300 per cent in 24 years. When we consider the astounding fact that in the Dominion of Canada there are about 350,000 people dependent upon the fishing industry—about one-fourteenth of the whole population—we have a clearer conception of the importance of this industry to us, and we see that no matter how great attention we bestow upon it, our efforts will not be misspent. The fact that every great country in the world is a maritime country should spur us up to make a great effort in this direction. England owes her greatness and her impregnable navy largely to her marines that are recruited from her vast army of fishermen. She finds her fishery marine a splendid nursery from which to draw her naval forces. Take France, the greatest maritime country on the continent of Europe, and what is her policy ? Why, Sir, every possible and almost every extraordinary encouragement is given to and bestowed upon this industry. Every quintal of fish that is caught for foreign exportation is bonussed by the national treasury to the extent of 10 francs each, almost the value of the fish itself. She does this in order to produce a

class of men from which to man her ships, and that she may have resources to draw upon at any time to man her navy. This is only by the way, but I say again that this deserving and hardy class of our population have a claim upon our best consideration.

I may be permitted while upon this subject to mention the treaty of Washington, with which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is more familiar than I am, inasmuch as he himself took a prominent part in connection with the commission which resulted from that treaty. The inshore fishing privileges of the Dominion of Canada on the Atlantic coast were valued at $4,500,000 over and above all other treaty concessions awarded us by the Convention of 1871, for ten years, and experts say that that sum was far below the real value, and that if fuller information had been obtained at that time and laid before the Halifax commission before which my hon. friend appeared in a professional character, the award would have been very much larger than $4,500,000 for the privilege of access to our inshore fisheries. Now, when we remember that we received that amount paid for such privilege during ten years, besides the right to send our fish and fish oils into the United States market free, I was considerably surprised, indeed, I regretted very much, to see the statement of the First Minister in that unfortunate interview, as I must call it, with the correspondent of the Chicago "Record," when he spoke of giving the United States access to our inshore fisheries on consideration of our being allowed to send fish and fish oils free into the United States market. I thought that was a most unfortunate admission on the part of the Prime Minister, in view of the value of our fisheries as settled by the Fishery Commission at Halifax. He apparently had forgotten the fact that even as long ago as twenty years it had been decided that these inshore fisheries were worth to us in ten years the sum of $4,500,000 over and above the privilege of sending our fish and fish oils in to the United States duty free. It is to be deplored that he had not given some deserved thought to this immense industry before declaring his willingness to have it given away and destroyed by a foreign nation. But I am willing to assume and to believe that the Prime Minister made that statement without a due examination into the facts, and that when he has more closely studied the question in the light of past events and future possibilities, in other words, when he will learn something about it, he will, I trust, insist upon our having our full rights in that respect. I may remind the House in this connection of a statement made by the late Mr. Mackenzie, in the year 1877, when addressing a meeting in the west. The Halifax commission was then sitting to ascertain what amount we should be paid by the Americans for the privilege of using our inshore fisheries for ten years, and Mr. Mackenzie, in addressing a meeting in a western county, spoke very disparagingly of the negotiations that had been concluded at Washington, out of which this Halifax commission had grown, and from which we got this $4,500,000 award. He stated that he himself did not hope that the country would be benefited to the extent of a single dollar from the investigations of the Haliax commission, and he was sorry the country was being put to the unnecessary expense of that commission. That is, if Mr. Mackenzie had his own way there never would have been a commission at Halifax, there never would have been a $4,500,000 award, there never would have been one dollar bounty paid our fishermen. But in a short time Mr. Mackenzie found that he had been mistaken, and that the Dominion of Canada was to receive this large sum I have mentioned. He has spoken without a due investigation of the facts, and I am quite willing to assume and to believe that the Prime Minister, in his interview with the correspondent of the Chicago "Record," also spoke without due consideration of the interests involved. I say again that I am pleased to be able to bring this subject before the House of Commons to-day, and I will be glad to have the views of the Government upon this matter, that so vitally concerns a class of people that are so closely identified with the prosperity of our Canadian nation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am pleased that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has brought this question before the House; and although I should like to say a few words upon it, I think it is almost unnecessary for me to do so, seeing that my hon. friend has gone into the question so thoroughly, and has shown conclusively that it is a subject that deserves the close attention of the Government. I may say that soon after the opening of the session, when this interview between the Prime Minister and the correspondent of the Chicago "Record" was brought to the notice of the House, I regarded the statements made by the Prime Minister with some considerable alarm, in view of the fact that I have a large number of fishermen in my constituency, and in view of the importance of the fishing industry in the province of Nova Scotia. It seemed to me that the statement made by the Prime Minister was rather liberal, considering the value and importance of our fisheries. The First Minister is reported to have said that:

> The simple process of give and take should be applied in any arrangement made between the two countries in respect of the fisheries, whereby not only the ports but the inshore waters of both countries should be thrown open to the fishermen of both on equal terms, and the markets for the fish of the two countries made equally free.

Now, with regard to the inshore fisheries, Mr. Speaker, they are the most important fisheries to the people of the maritime provinces, and I speak from knowledge of the province of Nova Scotia, particularly the eastern portion of it. As the hon. member for Richmond has said, our fisheries in Nova Scotia are worth about $7,000,000 a year. The fish is almost all caught within the three-mile limit, or very near it; and when we consider the importance of that industry to the people who live upon and in the immediate neighbourhood of those waters, it is evident that the question should receive the serious consideration of the public men of the country before they make any proposition to give away such a valuable property to a foreign country. I feel from what I know of the people of the United States that they strongly desire to secure admission to our inshore fisheries, and I am satisfied there is no way in which they could amply compensate the people of this country if we gave them away those rights. Hon. members who have given attention to the fishery question well know that the North Atlantic states of the United States are the states in which the bulk of the fisheries of that country are carried on; but the whole fisheries of the United States, with a population of 65,000,000 people aggregate only $45,000,000, while the value of the fisheries of Canada, with 5,000,000 of people, are of the value of over $21,000,000. If we look where those fisheries are being prosecuted and what states are credited with this value, we find they are the North Atlantic states; and further, that those who follow the employment of fishing in the eastern states secure the bulk of the catch around the maritime provinces and the coast of Newfoundland, and particularly around the eastern portion of the province of Nova Scotia. In view of the difficulty we now have in protecting our fisheries within the three-mile limit, when the people of the United States sail around our shores, as they do, and take inside of our three-mile limit, a large quantity of the fish they obtain, notwithstanding that we have a tolerably effective protective service, the importance of protecting our fisheries is apparent, although it is impossible for any Government, with the amount of money at its disposal for the fishery protective service, to make that service as efficient as the requirements of our inshore fisheries demand. If we were to make any arrangements with the people of the United States by which they would be allowed to enter our inshore waters for the purpose of prosecuting the fishing industry, the result would be that for every hundred dollars our people would be able to use in prosecuting the fisheries the people of the United States would use one thousand dollars, and for every man we could put on our inshore fisheries within the three-mile limit, the Americans would place five or ten men, because they know the great value of our inshore fisheries. That is the reason why I am glad the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has brought this question so prominently before the House. The value of the fisheries of Nova Scotia, which is placed at $7,000,000, represents a very large sum of money and constitutes a considerable portion of the income of the people of that province. If our inshore fisheries were thrown open and the Americans allowed to prosecute the fisheries within the three-mile limit, with the destructive appliances they now possess, in no other way could equal injury be inflicted on the interests of the people living along the coast of the maritime provinces; and I hope that the First Minister and his colleagues before laying a basis for any proposition with our neighbours, the people of the United States, respecting the fisheries of the two countries will inquire to the fullest extent into the interests of our own people, will learn the extent to which they are making their living out of this industry, and the extent to which it is possible for the fishermen of Nova Scotia to be deprived of the advantages of our inshore fisheries in the event of any arrangement being made with our American neighbours. I do not wish to detain the House, but I considered it to be my duty as representing a constituency where a large number of fishermen prosecute this industry, to offer these few remarks in support of the motion submitted by the hon. member for Richmond.

Mr. KAULBACH. The papers asked for, such as copies of all papers, letters, despatches and international agreements that passed between, or were entered into by the British, Canadian and United States Governments respecting the appointments of the joint fishery commission, also for copies of all reports made by commissioners respecting the rules and regulations under which fishing will be prosecuted in contiguous waters, and in waters of the open sea, commonly resorted to by fishermen of the United States and Canada involve a question of no small moment and of no little importance to the maritime provinces. Coming as I do from Nova Scotia, and being largely interested in the fisheries, the export of the fish product alone in that province, as compared with the rest of Canada, being in the neighbourhood of 50 per cent, and representing a county, of which I am justly proud, very largely engaged in that industry, I feel it my duty to ask the indulgence of this House for a few moments. I am heartily with any Government that will foster and promote the industry of fishing, and that will encourage our hardy race of fishermen, who contribute so much to the prosperity and wealth of this country.

Since the treaty of 1818 as respects our fisheries on the Atlantic coast (save the periods under the treaties of 1854 and 1871) the desire has been expressed by our American neighbours for the use of our Atlantic fisheries in common with ourselves; but a disinclination was shown by the late Con-

servative Government to favour such a desire. It is to be hoped the present Government will follow the example of its predecessor and never think of bartering such rights no matter what the circumstances may be that present themselves.

I must say my confidence in this respect was considerably shaken by a report appearing some short time ago in the "Globe" newspaper, an organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was from the correspondent of a Chicago paper called the "Record." The "Record" correspondent says, as alleged to be the words of the hon. the leader of the Government, as follows:—

"Some years ago, when considerable friction had been created by the North Atlantic fishery troubles, I took an opportunity to say that the question should be adjusted in a friendly manner, becoming an enlightened and friendly people, by the simple process of give and take, and I do not see now why an arrangement should not be made resembling that effected under the treaty of Washington in 1871, and the treaty of 1854, whereby not only the ports but the inshore waters of both countries were thrown open to the fishermen of both on equal terms, and the markets for the fish of the two countries made equally free. That, it seems to me, would be the sensible way of settling the fishery question. The North Atlantic fisheries would be more valuable to the United States and Canada alike if some such arrangement were adopted."

The hon. leader, when the question was put to him by the ex-Minister of Railways as to whether the statement so reported was correct, answered: "It is substantially correct." I sincerely hope the hon. leader will recognize the injustice such a course would entail to the fishermen and the industry in Canada, and refrain from such a course, for were our rights to be interfered with in this way, our fishing industry would be all but blotted out. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) referred to purse-seining, which some years ago was prosecuted to a considerable extent by American and Canadian alike to the deteriment of both countries. However, an arrangement was made between our Government and the government of he United States whereby that mode of fishing was suspended, because of the injury it caused. Of late years purse-seining has again been resorted to by the people of the United States, not by our fishermen. It would, I think, be well that the hon. leader of the Government, conjointly with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, should endeavour to arrange with the government of the United States for the prevention of this system of fishing undoubtedly very detrimental to fish sizes. The fishing industry has been greatly fostered by the late Government in the way of bounties and otherwise which it is to be hoped the present Government will carefully recognize. By the treaty of 1818 our fishing rights were very wisely protected. The treaty of 1854 gave these fisheries, together with the trade of the country, conjointly to the Americans; the waters of our shores to be used for the time in common with ourselves. But the Americans thought proper to abrogate that treaty in 1866, and then it was that we were placed in what we considered at the time a very unfortunate position. We felt as if we were out in the cold, not having the market of the United States for our fish. Placed as we were then and feeling our unfortunate position, as it were, and not knowing what the ultimatum might be, we struck out for ourselves, feeling satisfied that there was something bright in store for us. We then arranged for an interprovincial trade which resulted in the British North America Act. When that was brought about we felt that we were masters of our own situation, having our own waters to fish in, and being entirely independent of the Americans. Having the exclusive right of the inshore waters of the maritime provinces, and feeling as I stated that we were masters of our own situation, and to catch all the fish needed for the United States market as well as for our own and shipments for abroad, we believe that in time we can, with the advantages we possess, cause the Americans to understand that they cannot come to our shores and catch the fish as successfully as we can ourselves. The reason of that is, that they are prohibited—unless the present privilege of the modus vivendi is continued—from getting their bait. If they were deprived of this privilege we would be able to keep the deep sea fisheries as well as our other fisheries entirely in our own hands. Of course the Americans have the privilege of fishing outside the three-mile limit, but it is impossible for them to catch fish unless they have the bait. True it is that for a certain short period of the year they can catch bait on the banks, but that occurs so seldom that were it not for the privilege of getting bait under the modus vivendi they would be at such a disadvantage that they would feel inclined not to be engaged in the industry at all, as it would not be to them a profitable investment. This is proven by the fact that the fleet of fishing vessels owned in the New England states is growing less numerically, year after year.

As a reconciliation to American fishermen the modus vivendi was brought about, and under that we are giving them privileges which they would otherwise not enjoy. However, that privilege was only extended to them with a view of their only having it for a year or so until some arrangement could be made between the United States and Canada. That arrangement has never been arrived at, although efforts have been made by the late Government to induce the government of the United States to come to some terms in that direction and give us access to their markets. The Conservative Government when in power always had in view the rights of the fisheries of the maritime provinces, and they guarded those rights so carefully, that I feel now, representing, as I do, a county engaged so

largely in that industry, that it is part of my duty to ask the Government to be careful before they in any way interfere with the rights which so properly belong to us. to consider Canadian interests. I do not wish to trouble the House, further than to say: that if that industry is interfered with by any adverse action on the part of the present Government, the fleet of fishing vessels of which we are now so justly proud, and the men who man them, as well as the implements employed on the shore for their capture, namely, the boats and other tackle, will be sacrificed, as the Americans would in all probability enter in and take possession, build their own vessels, man them, fit them out with their own equipments, frequent our shores and capture our fish in such quantities that really the market of the United States would be of little service to us. Under the circumstances, I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) to have this important industry and our rights constantly in view, and do nothing but what will tend to promote this as pre-eminently more important than any others. Coming as the hon. gentleman does from a maritime province he must necessarily have an interest in the fishing industry, and I trust that he will exercise such due care and discretion in connection with the disposal of our fishery interests as will cause every one in the maritime provinces—it being a question of deep concern to the whole Dominion as well, to feel that we have at present a paternal Government willing and anxious to look after those interests just as carefully as the late Government had been doing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Mr. Speaker, the subject on which my hon. friends have addressed the House is a deeply interesting one to us all, but more particularly so to us who come from the maritime portions of the Dominion. I can hardly say, however, that my hon. friends (Mr. Gillies and Mr. Kaulbach) have kept strictly in view the motion before the House. They have travelled pretty far afield and have discussed the general question of the fisheries, and as to how they should be protected; questions which I do not understand to be involved in the motion which my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) brought before us. That motion has a distinct reference to one branch of the fishery service, and to one only. My hon. friend moves for all the papers in connection with the appointment of the joint fishery commission between Her Britannic Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States some years ago. This commission, as he knows, was the outcome of a delegation which went in 1892 from this Government to the government at Washington, and discussed the relations which existed between the Canadian Government and the United States government. Among other questions discussed, was this one relating to the fisheries—the question whether we could stop altogether, or at any rate to some extent limit, the destructive methods of taking fish in the territorial waters of both countries, in the waters contiguous to both countries, and in the extra-territorial waters of both countries, in which the fishermen of both countries were engaged in common fishing. The United States government appointed Professor Rathbun, of the United States Fishery Commission, as their commissioner, and the Canadian Government appointed Commander Wakeham as our commissioner. These gentlemen entered upon their duties in 1893; and from time to time they have been engaged in prosecuting the necessary inquiries to enable them to make a report. The convention or agreement between the two countries provides that, in so far as they concur, their report shall be a joint one to both governments; that, in so far as they shall not be able to concur, each shall make his report to his own government; and that, after these reports are presented, the respective governments will interchange notes, and endeavour, if possible, to finally reach a conclusion as to the basis on which an international agreement may be come to. I say that since 1893 the joint commissioners have been engaged on their commission, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, the scope of that commission is a very large one. It covers questions which require investigation, not only on the Atlantic seaboard, to which my hon. friends have especially addressed themselves, but also on the lakes lying between the two countries, and in the waters adjacent to British Columbia. The original agreement provided that, if possible, they should make their joint or several reports, such as they might be, within two years of the time they were appointed; but, although the commissioners applied themselves with energy and zeal, and gave up as much time as they were able to give from the discharge of their other duties, to the investigation of this subject, it was found that they were not able to make the report within the two years prescribed by the agreement. It was then agreed between Her Majesty's Government and the government of the United States that the time should be extended to enable them to make the report, to the 31st of December, 1896; and I am informed that Commander Wakeham and Professor Rathbun if they then do not find themselves in a position to make their final and complete report, will be in a position to make an interim report. What the nature of that report will be I have, of course, no means of judging. I will call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that in the report of the Fisheries Department for the year 1892 he will find, beginning at page 81, a great deal of valuable information with respect to the appointment of these joint commissioners and the nature and scope of their inquiry. I will ask the permission of the House to read a paragraph, which is in fact the agreement itself. It says:

The governments of the United States of America and of Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland agree that a commission of two experts shall be appointed, one on behalf of each government, to consider and report to their respective governments—either jointly or severally, or jointly to both governments, with regard to matters in which they may be in accord, and severally to their respective governments with regard to matters of non-concurrence—concerning the regulations, practice and restrictions proper to be adopted in concert, on the following subjects, viz. :—

(a.) The limitation or prevention of exhaustive or destructive method of taking fish and shell-fish in the territorial and contiguous waters of the United States and Her Majesty's possessions in North America respectively, and also in the waters of the open seas outside of the territorial limits of either country to which the inhabitants of the respective countries may habitually resort for the purpose of such fishing.

(b.) The prevention of the polluting or obstructing of such contiguous waters to the detriment of the fisheries or of navigation.

(c.) The close seasons expedient to be enforced and observed in such contiguous waters by the inhabitants of both countries as respects the taking of the several kinds of fish and shell-fish.

(d.) The adoption of practical methods of restocking and replenishing such contiguous and territorial waters with fish and shell-fish, and the means by which such fish-life may be therein preserved and increased.

So that the hon. gentleman will see that the subject-matters relegated to this commission to inquire into and report upon, were of the most supreme importance, and involved an investigation which might continue for some years, and which it may be necessary to prosecute in the near future before any international agreement can be arrived at. I want to say frankly to the hon. gentleman that, up to this time, the international commissioners, so far as this Government knows, have not presented any report or interim report of their labours, and consequently there will, of course, be nothing to be brought down in that respect. There are really no papers to bring down, except some trifling correspondence relating to the meetings of the commissioners from time to time, and the extension of the time within which they were to make their reports to the respective governments. I do not think that any good service would be accomplished by bringing down this formal correspondence, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that, having attained the object he had in view, and having presented his views to the House—and most interesting they were in some points—it will not be necessary to press this motion to a conclusion. After December next, reports will, in all human probability, be presented, and, as soon as they come into our possession, they will be placed before this House and the country. In view of the statement I have made, therefore, I suggest that the hon. gentleman should withdraw his motion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have some knowledge of this subject, and I agree with the hon. Minister of Marine in the suggestion he has made, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the motion, will be quite satisfied with this discussion. The annual reports for the las few years give a very good résumé respecting the treaty under which the investigation is proceeding, and reports of the progress made from time to time. But the subject covered by this motion is, I think, very properly brought to the attention of the House at this particular time ; and, after having heard the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, from the province of Nova Scotia, and also the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it seems to me that the Government should take warning from the important questions that are involved in this very inquiry before following up that—I venture to say—injudicious statement of the Prime Minister in that Chicago interview, because the hon. Prime Minister could not have had before him the very important information to which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has referred, in connection with the destructive engines which were used by the United States fishermen, when they had access to our waters, and which, perhaps, as much as anything, brought about an entire revulsion of feeling on the part of the fishermen in the inshore fisheries on our Atlantic coast against this joint user of our waters.

The subject, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, covers not only the three-mile limit on the ocean, but has to do with the lakes as well ; and no one knows better than the hon. Minister the difficulty that either the state governments or the federal governments have to encounter in connection with their efforts to protect their own fisheries against their own fishermen. First of all, there is the very awkward question of jurisdiction, as to what the federal government may do and what the state legislatures have the exclusive right to do, in connection with the control of those fisheries. It may be said without offence, and is often said in the United States by public men there, that the American fishermen have the whip-hand of their legislatures. I refer to that class of fishermen who are absolutely reckless and indifferent to the preservation of the fisheries, but only seek to obtain as many fish as they can at a time, without regard to the damage caused by their fishing engines upon the supply of fish for the future. In this country, we have experience of the same feeling, but it is to the credit of our fishermen, both on the lakes and down by the sea, that a good number of them are opposed to that greedier and thoughtless element, and our fishermen, as a rule, have submitted fairly to reasonable regulations and reasonable restrictions. Sometimes the department may err and unnecessarily agitate or excite the fishermen, but we have nothing like the difficulty on our side of the line which we find every year complained of by statesmen and executive bodies on the other side of the line. That brings at once into prominence

that unfortunate statement of the First Minister to the effect that he is ready to agree that the inshore waters of both countries should be thrown open to the fishermen of both on equal terms. I venture to say that, no matter what his commission will report, it will be years before the United States government is able to secure the adoption of even the regulations that now obtain in this country and which our fishermen are willing to observe. When was it that the fearful injury done by the purse-seines first came under notice? It was when the United States fishermen had, under the Washington Treaty, the use of our waters; and that experience should be remembered before we make any offer to the United States on the lines of the old treaty. It was under that treaty that we obtained the experience which went to show that the United States fishermen cannot be held in control or restricted when given the right to fish within our limits. They used the purse-seines, and the damage was soon apparent in our waters. The hon. Minister of Marine referred to the valuable collection of evidence made by the Marine and Fisheries Department some years ago, upon which requests were preferred to the United States authorities to endeavour to avoid such destruction in the future. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) brought up the question long before we were able to obtain a treaty, and it is only fair to say that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), were loud in their complaints of the injuries caused to our fisheries, even after the Washington Treaty had expired, when the United States fishermen were free to use those destructive engines known as the purse-seines up to the three-mile limit. While there was a law prohibiting the import into the United States during certain months of the mackerel taken in the purse-seines, there were other periods sufficiently long, during which the American fishermen could use the purse-seines to enable them to inflict great damage. This subject was brought so prominently before me in my time that the department took steps to obtain a remedy, and our efforts resulted, as the hon. Minister has said, in a treaty being arranged which, among other things, provided for a joint investigation; and I was sufficiently long in the department to know, as the hon. Minister now knows, what a suitable man the United States appointed as their representative, Dr. Rathbun, and our own commissioner is known as a man of great experience and most suitable to represent our interests. No doubt the labours of those gentlemen will take some time yet to complete. They have made their investigations on our coasts and lakes, and when speaking of the coast I have particularly in mind the Atlantic coast, and they have proceeded to the Pacific coast, where there are very interesting questions to study, owing to the contiguity of fishermen on both sides of the line in their fishing operations. It is a huge work, and their report will no doubt be most valuable and interesting. It has in view nothing in the nature of a joint user; it never contemplated anything in the way of an arrangement whereby these fishermen, who have exhausted nearly all of their own fisheries, both inland as well as coast fisheries, owing to the license given them to do as they please, should be permitted to come into our fisheries either on the coast or lake shore, which have been far better protected than those south of the line. Hon. gentlemen who disagree with me with regard to the restrictions I have endeavoured to impose on our lakes, have never disputed, and I feel confident will not dispute, that even in the same lake our fisheries are better than those of the Americans. It is so proved by the poaching, proved by the arrests we have made of vessels that come sixty and one hundred miles to steal our fish, their owners running the risk of losing their vessels in the attempt. Vessels have been confiscated; nevertheless, such is the relative condition of their fishery and ours, that in order to get fish, they think it worth while to run the risk of these illegal acts. On the coasts we know the risks they run. Notwithstanding the vigilance of our cruisers—and of course the difficulties of protecting our fisheries are great—they do poach there and have persistently poached there, as proven by the arrests from year to year. So, hon. gentlemen will see how natural it would be for our fishermen to resist, as I believe, as a body, they will resist—in fact I have no doubt about those engaged in the inshore fishery—this opening up of our waters to American fishermen. I do not believe there is an hon. gentleman in this House representing a large population of inshore fishermen who will contemplate favourably a treaty under which the fishermen of the United States are to come in under any regulation and fish in our waters on equal terms with our own fishermen. Without endeavouring to import into this discussion any acrimonious feeling or to make charges across the House for political purposes, I call the attention of the Prime Minister to what I believe, on investigation, he will see was an indiscreet statement made by him on this important subject, and made without the support of a single gentleman, so far as I know, representing these districts. We know that it was common report, and a report used to great advantage in the discussion in 1891 of unrestricted reciprocity, that the then Attorney General of Nova Scotia happened to make the remark that under reciprocal arrangements the fishermen of the United States would be as free as our own fishermen to use our waters. And the bulk of the Liberal party, if I recollect aright, were quick to repudiate the authority of the hon. gentleman for such an assertion; and as-

surely there was no activity on the part of gentlemen opposite to prove that such a construction of the proposed arrangement was right and that under unrestricted reciprocity the fishermen of the United States were to be permitted to enjoy the privileges they enjoyed—and largely abused—under the old Washington treaty. It does not matter that the Conservative party made that old treaty. Under the treaty of 1854, we know the same privileges existed. So in 1872. But it was from experience gained under both these treaties and notwithstanding all the counter advantages, the fishermen are, as I believe, as a mass—I refer to the inshore fishermen and not the bank fishermen, the fishermen who depend for their living on fishing our own waters within our own jurisdictional authority—absolutely and entirely opposed to any arrangement or any construction that will bring into these waters, comparatively depleted as they are, injured as they have been, the active competition of the fishermen of the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred briefly to part of the history of this case. I do not wish to occupy time unnecessarily, but I would like to make reference to that history to support the statement that I have made as to the treaty and as to the very great importance of the subject that is under consideration by these commissioners. I have here the Fisheries Report for 1892. This report devotes a great deal of space to the discussion of this purse-seining, and I have to call attention to the fact that Mr. Whitcher, in his time a most active officer in the Marine and Fisheries Department, called attention, during the operation of the Washington treaty, to the injury that was being done by the purse-seine in the hands of fishermen from the United States. In this report the following occurs :—

In last year's report of this department, the subject of fishing with purse-seines was fully treated, and an exhaustive résumé of the opinions of competent authorities as to its results and effects was collated, forming a valuable appendix. The injurious effects of this mode of fishing being so strongly portrayed, and almost universally admitted, the department had no option but to conclude that the future preservation of the valuable mackerel and herring fisheries of the Atlantic coast demanded its general prohibition in our waters.

Without joint action, however, on the part of the governments of the United States and France, such prohibition cannot attain all that is desired, so long as its use is continued by the fishermen of other nations. The United States government have, however, endeavoured to minimize the danger by preventing the landing of mackerel taken with purse-seines on any part of the coast of the United States before the 1st June in each year, but by this time most of these migratory fishes——

And I call attention to this in connection with the other observations I have offered :

—have found their way to Canadian waters, outside the territorial limits in which the United States fishermen are permitted to use their purse-seines with impunity and freedom from restrictions, the prohibition in question is really not of such value as would at first appear. To be of general benefit to the fisheries, a universal prohibition is required, and international action has been sought with the view of prohibiting entirely the use of these obnoxious engines on the high seas.

So great was the injury that this Parliament proceeded to enact in 1891 a prohibition against the use of purse-seines in our own waters. And notwithstanding the extraordinary condition of affairs under which our own fishermen found the prohibition of this engine within the three-mile limit and its use outside of the three-mile limit, no person has attacked that measure. Well, in 1893 there is a further reference to this important subject and a great deal of valuable information that was not given in a previous report.

It was shown that this form of fishing engine destroyed vast and alarming numbers of young and unmerchantable fish which, at the period of their capture, represented no commercial value, but if allowed to mature, they would have assisted in maintaining the supply.

And again :

At the conference of the Dominion Fishery Inspectors convened at Ottawa in 1891, a motion for the prohibition of purse-seines in the territorial waters of Canada was unanimously adopted. It is to be remembered that from April, 1873, the date at which the Government of Canada anticipated the formal coming into force of the fishery articles of the treaty of Washington which was fixed by proclamation 1st July, 1873, until the year 1885, these highly destructive nets were operated by the United States fishing fleet in the inshore territorial waters of Canada. The destruction which followed this method of fishing is incalculable.

That is the way in which they abused the privilege given them under the treaty which enabled them to operate, with their vast numbers and enormous sail, within the limits of our fisheries. And again :

On the 22nd May, 1890, the Canadian Government asked that the United States government might be communicated with through Her Majesty's government, with a view to obtaining some international legislation looking either to the prohibition of or restriction of the use of the purse-seines in the mackerel fishery, in order that for the general good the impending danger to this valuable industry might be averted.

The Secretary of State for the United States expresses his willingness to give the subject his careful consideration——

And so on. Again it says :

It will be seen that the steps which have been taken were in the right direction. That the withdrawal of the American fleet from the immediate Canadian inshore fisheries owing to the termination of the fishery article of the treaty of Washington, has had a beneficial effect is clearly evidenced from the fact that the percentage of fish taken by the Canadian fishermen within the territorial jurisdiction largely exceeded in 1891 that of 1885.

That accounts in some measure for what I think the very reasonable position taken by our fishermen, based on the experience they had under the old treaty and the experience they have in enjoying the exclusive

right to those fisheries as at present. I am very glad the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has brought this subject immediately under the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and by doing so has directed his mind to the important questions that are being investigated by these commissioners, and also to what is in my view of vastly more importance, that whereas it may be impossible for anything to come out of this joint investigation other than a complete and logical vindication of the position of the Canadian Government, under either political regime, in regard to the protection of our fisheries, in addition to that, of course, the Government will obtain that full information which they should possess in negotiating a treaty with the United States. I am certain that the hon. gentleman will find, that because of the absence of any attempt at restricting or regulating the fisheries to the south of the line, they have practically nothing to give us in the shape of a quid pro quo ; and that our own fisheries, from various reasons, whether from the action of the American fishermen under the treaty, or since the treaty, or from our own fishermen not acting strictly up to the regulations, our own fisheries are not in that healthy condition that they used to be—and I speak now, of course, in regard to the inshore fisheries. Under these circumstances I venture to say that the almost unanimous opinion of the inshore fishermen should be very carefully considered by any negotiators at Washington or elsewhere on the subject of the fisheries, and that view is that under no circumstances can they afford to throw these fisheries open to foreign competition.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) I have certainly no reason to complain of the spirit of the remarks which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. It is very desirable indeed in a matter of so much importance that the subject should be approached in such a way as to obtain the very best results without importing into it any party bitterness. I am ready to admit that I am not as familiar with the subject as I could desire, or as the hon. gentlemen are, who come from the maritime provinces. There are certain facts, however, which are to the common knowledge of every man in this country, and upon those facts I have always based the opinions which I have expressed whenever it has been my privilege to speak upon this subject, whether in this House or elsewhere. Now, Sir, unless I am greatly mistaken, and unless the condition of things has very much changed in the maritime provinces, it is well known that the treaty of 1854 was always considered a very valuable arrangement for the people of the lower provinces, and the people there belonging to both parties always desired to see it renewed. At the very time to which my hon. friend referred a moment ago, when Attorney General Longley expressed some views from which he dissented—at that very time, in 1891, the then Government went to the country upon the statement that they had received an invitation from the American authorities to renew the treaty of 1854, and the Government wished to consult the people as to whether it was advisable to renew that treaty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With modifications.

The PRIME MINISTER. There might have been modifications, but I will come to that. At all events, the broad issue put before the people of the country was that, in the opinion of the Government, it would be to the advantage of the Canadian people, and especially to those of the maritime provinces, that that treaty should be renewed. Now, what were the broad conditions of that treaty as regards the people and the fisheries of the maritime provinces ? The broad features of that treaty were that the fishermen of both nations should have access to the waters of each country, and free access to the markets of each country. Notwithstanding that our fisheries are more valuable by far than the American fisheries are, the latter are a mere nominal quantity, and though all the fisheries of the Atlantic coast are Canadian fisheries, yet we gave to the American fishermen the privilege of using our waters in consideration of our having free access to their market for our fish. I have always understood that we were ready to give to the American fishermen the use of our fisheries, provided they gave us access to their markets.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not since 1878.

The PRIME MINISTER. From 1854 up to 1866 it was so, but the hon. gentleman says it is not so to-day. Perhaps it is not, but what are the reasons ? What has taken place since to change the condition of things ? Again, I do not pretend to speak with authority, or with technical knowledge, but I am informed that at the present time the great objection which our Canadian fishermen have to the admission of American fishermen to our waters is that the latter are allowed to use the purse-seine and other destructive engines, the use of which is denied to Canadian fishermen. Therefore it stands to reason that if the Americans were given the joint use to our waters, and were allowed to employ these destructive methods of fishing which are denied to our fishermen, and properly so—I say it stands to reason that the American fishermen would be placed at a great advantage, while ours would remain in a position of inferiority. Now, the advantage of the new treaty arrangement regarding fisheries, is this : My hon. friend is aware that under the treaty of 1888 American fishermen have to a large extent the use of our territorial waters.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not for fishing.

The PRIME MINISTER. They have the use of our territorial waters to this extent,

that they can make them the basis of their operations to carry on fishing on the high seas. So that while they are able to make our territorial waters the basis of operations on the high seas, and while they are allowed to use these destructive engines to which my hon. friend has alluded, there is at the same time this condition of disparity, that our own fishermen are not only denied the use of those methods of fishing, but they have no market for their mackerel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, the United States have to pay every dollar of the duty now. The supply there is not equal to the demand, and never is.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman means to say that under such conditions the Canadian fishermen are standing on a footing of equality with the American fishermen, I cannot agree with him. I do not think the hon. gentleman's statement will hold good that the Canadian fisherman is on a footing of equality with the American fisherman in the Boston markets for his mackerel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They want his fish.

The PRIME MINISTER. They can have it from the American fisherman, but the Canadian fisherman has to pay a duty. Whatever my hon. friend may say with regard to the old threadbare question as to who pays the duty, I think if he comes to the question of fact, he will find that the Canadian fisherman is at a great disadvantage when he has to meet the American fisherman in the Boston market.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one word. I am tempted to remind him that an authority who do not always agree with me on political economy, Mr. Jones, of Halifax, who both buys and sells fish, explained in this Chamber, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will remember, when we were discussing the rebate of certain duties, that on the mackerel to which we particularly referred, the duty was paid in the United States, on the very good ground common to all political economists, that the supply was not equal to the demand.

The PRIME MINISTER. I withdraw the question from the arena of political economy, which I cannot discuss at this moment. But I have to say this, that at the present time, unless I am greatly mistaken, Canadian fishermen would look upon is as a boon if they could send their fish to the Boston market on the same footing as American fishermen send their fish. No amount of quibbling will take away this bare and common sense fact. I am not prepared to say that I have absolute and accurate knowledge on that, but I give the view I have derived from the history of the subject. It may be that my views will have to be modified owing to changed circumstances which have arisen since the treaty of 1854. What I had in my mind was this—and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will support me in thinking it desirable—that it is most important to the Canadian people that we should enter upon new negotiations with the United States, so as to secure, if possible, an international agreement with respect to the use of purse-seines. I even believe it possible to open negotiations at Washington and lead the American authorities to understand that this is a question much broader than any matter of municipal law, that it has become a question of international law, that there should be international regulations to prohibit the use of those destructive engines on the high seas; I hold that this question possesses a broader aspect than that given to it by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I believe we would certainly meet not only the wishes, but the best interests of the Canadian people, and of the fishermen of the maritime provinces especially, by adopting such a course. If it were possible to obtain from the American authorities their consent to enter into an international arrangement to prevent the use of these destructive engines not only in the waters of the Atlantic but also in the waters of the great lakes, it would be desirable. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), when at the head of the department, made great efforts—I will not say that they were always wise efforts, and I will not say otherwise, but they were commendable efforts from his own point of view—to protect the waters of the great lakes from the depredations of American fishermen. While we were taking precautions to preserve the fisheries on our side of the lakes, the Americans on their side were taking no precautions whatever, but were wantonly destroying their fish. Would it not be desirable that international regulations should be adopted on the great lakes, to apply to both sides of the lakes, in order to prevent the destruction of the fisheries and at the same time adopt facilities for the propagation of fish. Under such circumstances it seems to me there is ample room for ascertaining whether we can arrive at any arrangement, and at all events negotiations are advisable upon the subject. As to what form these negotiations should take, how far they should be modified from the position occupied in 1854 in view of recent events in another matter on which I am open to conviction; but I give my view, and it is that at all events we should endeavour to have the American authorities and the Canadian authorities reconsider the whole subject of the fishery regulations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to enter into this discussion to any great extent, but I cannot permit the leader of the Government to assume for a single moment that the people of Canada, that the fishermen of Canada who are so directly interested in this matter would ever consent to adopt the proposal that was suggested, I think, in the unfortunate interview which the hon. gentleman gave to a Chicago newspaper re-

porter—free fishing for free fish. That was the broad statement made there, and I was very glad to gather from what the hon. gentleman just stated that he is quite open to investigate that subject——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER—with a view to modifying the statement made by him on that occasion, because in my judgment nothing could be more unjustifiable, so far as the interests of Canada are concerned, than the adoption of such a proposal. No such proposal ever was entertained by any Canadian Government, no such proposal was ever approved by any Canadian Parliament either before or since confederation. The treaty of 1854, as the First Minister has correctly stated, was highly popular throughout Canada. It was denounced by the United States, very strongly in opposition to the views of all the people of Canada. There can be on doubt that under that treaty great benefits accrued to the trade and business of every part of Canada, and especially the maritime provinces. There can be no question that under that treaty an immense trade was created and expanded which was for the general interest of Canada, but it is also well known that while the benefits resulting from the treaty of 1854 were highly appreciated in this country, those benefits were still greater relatively to the United States. Notwithstanding that fact, the government of the United States terminated that treaty as soon as its provisions allowed—which was in 1866—and I have no hesitation in saying that the Prime Minister was quite right when he said there was a strong desire manifested and continued efforts made by subsequent governments for the purpose of obtaining a renewal of that treaty. But there can be no doubt that public sentiment in regard to the value of that treaty has greatly changed in the intervening period. It must not be forgotten that confederation had not then been accomplished, and that the abrogation of that treaty was calculated to produce a general paralysis of business of every kind in the maritime provinces which had at that day practically no means of trading except with the United States. Confederation itself has rendered us, the maritime provinces especially, vastly more independent since the cancelling of that treaty than we were before, and therefore we are not in the same position we occupied then. But the treaty of 1854 contained no such provision as that of free fishing for free fish. The First Minister was quite right in saying that that was a prominent feature of the treaty, but the slightest examination of the treaty itself will remind that hon. gentleman that Canada obtained large and important concessions independent of a free market for their fish in the United States under that treaty of reciprocity, considerations to which the people of Canada attached the greatest possible value. In the treaty of 1871, when the late Sir John A. Macdonald acted as one of the joint High Commissioners, the hon. gentleman is aware there is no such provision embodied as free fishing for free fish. The hon. gentleman is aware that under that treaty the fishermen of the United States and the fishermen of Canada and Newfoundland were permitted to enjoy the use of the fisheries of the two countries on equal terms; but that treaty provided that an arbitration should be held for the purpose of ascertaining the increased value of the fisheries of one country over the fisheries of the other, and under that arbitration my hon. friend will remember Canada was awarded $5,500,000 for eleven years' use of our fisheries by the Americans, or something like half a million per year. It was, therefore, anything but a question of the Americans being allowed to enter the waters of Canada for the simple privilege of our being allowed to have the markets of the United States. I do not for a moment question the advantage of our having in the United States a free market for our fish. There is no doubt that so far as regards the mackerel fishery, the people of the United States are so dependent upon the waters of Canada that it makes practically very little difference; but my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) was quite right in saying that the fishermen of Canada would regard it as a great boon to have a free market for their fish in the United States. But, Sir, they would not regard it all as an equivalent for permitting the American fishermen to come into the jurisdictional waters of Canada for the purpose of fishing. One of the principal reasons for that objection undoubtedly is, that there is every reason to fear that if they were allowed free access to our waters they would adopt the same methods which have ended in the destruction, almost the annihilation, of the fisheries of the United States. Under these circumstances, there is, I am satisfied, the strongest desire on the part of Canadian fishermen that no arrangement should be made that will open the waters of Canada to the fishermen of the United States. At all events, no person who has taken the trouble to investigate the subject can arrive at the conclusion that any person in Canada would for a single moment entertain the question of "free fishing for free fish." I do not propose to prolong this discussion, Mr. Speaker, although it is a very important one. I agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this view of the question does not exactly appertain to the motion before the House, but I think it very fortunate that there has been an opportunity given for an expression of opinion upon this subject; an expression which may lead the Government (in any question of negotiations for altered commercial relation between Canada and the United States) to be extremely guarded in what they do, so far as this great and important question of our fisheries is concerned.

Mr. GILLIES. I am quite content to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) and withdraw the motion. At the same time, I must say that I have every reason to congratulate myself and my friends from the lower provinces upon the very interesting discussion that has taken place upon this important matter. I may state to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), and also to the Prime Minister, that the motion had a dual object. The first was to ascertain what was being done under the joint commission that was appointed in 1892; and as to what suggestions had been made by that commission with a view of preventing the use of those destructive engines, such as purse-seines, upon the extra-territorial waters The second object of the motion was to permit the discussion which has taken place upon the general value of our inshore fisheries. I do trust that the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) will permit the views that he made known to the correspondent of the Chicago "Record" to undergo such a modification with regard to this matter as he has given us to believe that he will. Our fisheries are a great inheritance and they have been jealously guarded since the earliest days, not only by the colonial government, but the British government as well. The latter government in the '50's sent out armed vessels to guard our coast fisheries. From that day to this our fishing rights have been carefully guarded by every government that held sway in Canada. I do hope, if my hon. friends opposite have an opportunity of negotiating a treaty at Washington during the period they are in power, that they will remember that one of the most important things they have to bear in mind in negotiating a successful treaty will be the great value of the inshore fisheries.

THE CLAIM OF THE MESSRS. CONNOLLY.

Mr. CAMERON moved for:

1. A copy of the claim made by the Messrs. Connolly against the Government for $44,459 and of an amended claim of $70,418, and of an Order in Council respecting said claims dated 27th January, 1896, and of another Order in Council relating thereto dated the 7th May, 1896.

2. A copy of all Orders in Council and other proceedings relating thereto referring each of said claims to the Exchequer Court, and of all other papers connected therewith.

3. A copy of the judgment of the Exchequer Court and of all proceedings connected therewith, thereon.

4. A copy of the contract on which said claims were based.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to make just a few observations on the motion that I propose to submit to the House. I would not have ventured to address hon. gentlemen at all were it not that I believe that the circumstances connected with the matter I am about to discuss render it necessary that I should do so. Those of us who sat in the Parliament of Canada in the session of 1891 will have some recollection of an investigation that took place before the Public Accounts Committee, in which the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. had some little interest. They will recollect that there was a long investigation before that committee touching frauds alleged to have been committed upon the public treasury by McGreevy and the Connollys, with the connivance of the Public Works Department. It will be recollected also that upon the presentation of the report of the committee there was a long discussion in this House upon the subject. Now, I had supposed at the close of the session of 1891, and after the complete and somewhat thorough investigation which took place before the committee, and after the exhaustive discussion upon the floor of this Parliament; I had supposed, and indeed I think every one expected that we would hear no more of the Connollys in connection with contracts from the Government or raids on the public treasury. Sir, I thought myself—and I daresay every member in the House at that period thought—that the startling disclosures that were made in connection with the Esquimalt graving dock and the still more startling disclosures that were made in connection with the Kingston graving dock, and the still more startling disclosures that were elicited before the committee and discussed in the House in connection with public works in the city of Quebec; I had thought that these would have ended for all time the connection of the Connollys with the Government of Canada, and that no further claims would ever be made upon the treasury by them for extras or anything else. Sir, we know something of the history of these contracts. We know that that firm had three contracts, the aggregate amount of which was $2,184,259. We know by the evidence submitted to the Public Accounts Committee, that the taxpayers of Canada had to pay for those contracts the sum of $3,138,234, or a clear loss to the people of Canada of $953,975; or, allowing, as was then stated, more than a fair profit to the contractors of $253,975, there was a raid on the public treasury by somebody, and with somebody's connivance, to the extent of over $700,000. We know, from that investigation, to some extent, at all events, what became of this large sum, which was paid to these contractors, over and above the contract price. We know that it was established by the oral testimony given and by the books produced, that a considerable portion of that sum went into the hands of leading men supporting the then Government, and into the hands of some members of that Government to be used for purposes that were in no sense justifiable—I use no stronger language. But what became of the whole sum then abstracted from the public treasury, we did not then know, and I dare say we shall never know, in this life at

all events. The investigation of this huge and gigantic fraud resulted in what? In the expulsion from Parliament of a gentleman who sat in this House for many years, and in the expulsion from the Government of one who had been a leading member of the Government for many years. It resulted in more than that, Sir. It resulted in the trial of two of the men implicated in these frauds before a jury of their peers in the city of Ottawa. It resulted in their conviction and in their sentence by the presiding judge to a term of twelve months' imprisonment in the common jail of the county of Carleton. It is true; they did not spend twelve months in jail. Within two months their health failed, and they were released by order of the Government of the day. Now, Sir, one would have supposed, I must confess I supposed, and every thinking man in Canada supposed, that that was the end of this matter. One would have supposed that, when these men were released from prison, and when they had abstracted from the public treasury $900,000 more than their contracts called for, that was the end of the matter. You supposed it, Mr. Speaker, but, if you did, you were never more mistaken in your life. That was not the end of it. The Connollys, after having extorted these immense sums, bided their time for another raid on the public treasury. Like wise men, they bided their time until the eve of a general election. Things had changed, and men had changed. I have no doubt, from facts in my possession, that they had attempted the same thing during the reign of Sir John Abbott; I have no doubt that a similar attempt was made during the days of Sir John Thompson; and I have just as little doubt that during the supremacy of Sir Mackenzie Bowell these men made the same attempt. They failed. But other men were to the fore now; other men guided the ship of state; and the Connollys were on hand. We find that they presented an additional claim to the Government for $44,459 in January last. Was the claim rejected? Did the Government of the day tell those men: We have already overpaid you; we have a judgment of the court against you, and we will not consider your claim; in the first place, you have not complied with the contract; you have not got a certificate from the engineers in charge of the works; therefore, we cannot admit the justice of your claim? Not at all, Sir. That was not the stand taken by the late Administration. On the contrary, they referred this claim of $44,459, by Order in Council dated the 29th of January last, to a referee or a commissioner—not to the judge of the Exchequer Court, as they ought to have done, if they entertained the claim at all; but to the judge of the Exchequer Court, not as the judge of the Exchequer Court, but as a referee or commissioner. The singular thing about it is that this claim of $44,459 is in connection with the Kingston Graving Dock. Now, every man who sat in this Parliament in the session of 1891, knows that it was shown beyond peradventure that the contract for that work was obtained by the Connollys by the clearest possible fraud and forgery, which I charged then, and charge now, the Department of Public Works connived at. You see that what I complain of is not what is past and gone. My observations, so far, have been solely with the view of leading up to what I consider a rank scandal on the part of the late Administration. So far, you will see, this claim was recognized to some extent by the late Government, for they passed an Order in Council referring it to a commissioner. It seems to me that the late Administration were pliant, submissive, plastic as clay in the hands of the potter, for they yielded to the Connollys. Having got an admission of the claim of $44,459 and a reference of the claim to a referee or commissioner, the Connollys felt that they were masters of the situation. They had the Government by the throat. They could do with the Minister of Public Works and the other members of the Administration just what they liked, by some process that I know nothing of. But I know this, that, unless they had a pull on the Administration, they never would have had that reference to a referee. They were playing a game of poker with the late Administration, and everybody knows that the leader of the Opposition knows that game thoroughly, but he was no match for the Connollys. They were bound to go him one better, and they went one better; and, having got a reference of their claim for $44,459, they put in an amended claim for $70,418. They asked the Government to allow them to amend their statement of claim. They asked the Government to amend the Order in Council, and the Government, submissive, pliant in their hands, yielded to their demand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Who was the referee?

Mr. CAMERON. Judge Burbidge; but it was not referred to him as a judge of the Exchequer Court. The Government took care to refer it to him not as a judge with the responsibility of a judge, but as an individual, a "commissioner," as he is called in one place, or "referee," as he is called in another. On the 7th May, 1896, this Government which pretended to guard the interests of the great tax-paying body of this country so amended their Order in Council as to refer the whole claim to the referee or commissioner. Why should this be done at this late stage? The claim was stale; it was as old as Methusaleh. If these men had a bona fide claim against the Government, why should it be left to stand until the gentleman who is now the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) became First Minister? I hope the papers I called for will throw some light on the subject. If the hon. gentleman had been in Parliament in 1885—and I believe he was not—he would have known that he had overpaid these men, as was practically admitted before the Pub-

lic Accounts Committee. Will the hon. gentleman kindly condescend to tell us why we should waive the terms of the contract? He may say that it was because the engineer was dead. That is true; but all the engineers were not dead. There were others ready and willing to estimate the value of the extra works claimed for. I would like to know the real reason why he waived the terms of the contract, and I am sure a great many others would like to know also. It is because I want to thoroughly understand the grounds upon which the late Administration dealt in this manner with the contents of the public treasury that I move for these papers. The hon. gentleman knows well that by the action of his predecessors the country lost $900,000. Was he prepared as Prime Minister to advise that we should lose $70,000 more? I hope that when these papers come down, Mr. Speaker, they will throw light on this mysterious transaction.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to the motion now in your hands, Mr. Speaker. It is a very proper motion, and I only regret that it was supported by a very improper speech. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would be better prepared to discuss this question if we had the papers before us. Had the hon. gentleman made this motion calling for the papers and, when they were in the hands of hon. members, discussed the question and placed it in as strong a light as he is able to do, I think we should be better prepared to deal with such a question. But the hon. gentleman, taking advantage of the fact that these papers were not before the House, taking advantage of the fact that hon. gentlemen, many of them new members or gentlemen who had not been members when the transaction to which he referred took place, has used very strong and, I think, very uncalled for and improper language in support of his motion. The hon. gentleman starts with a false premise. He gives as an evidence of corruption, of malversation in office, and, in fact, of everything that is bad, that the expenditure in connection with the Connolly contract was greater than what the contracts were made for. I undertake to say that this is an entirely false basis on which to place the argument. There is no gentleman in this House who has any acquaintance with public contracts who does not know that that is the normal state of affairs in connection with these works. Whether one party or the other is in power, the cost of public works is usually greater than the amount for which the contracts are let. Take the contracts on the canals, take the railway contracts either under the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie or under the Administrations which succeeded his, and it will be found that the actual cost of public works has been enormously in advance of the sums for which the contracts were originally let. That proves indisputably, in my judgment, that is no evidence of corruption, no evidence of wrong-doing, that a public work costs the country a much larger sum than the original estimate. I say therefore that the very basis upon which the hon. gentleman relied for the strong and unjustifiable language he used is an entire fallacy. The Manchester Canal has been referred to, and it is in the knowledge of gentlemen on both sides, that that great work, not built by a government, but by private capitalists, cost nearly three times the amount of money for which the contract was originally let. Yet, although the parties concerned were driven to their wit's end to raise the money in order to complete the work, I have no recollection—and I was in England at the time—of any portion of the press, or any one else, ever insinuating that there was the slightest wrong-doing or misappropriation of money on the part of the people engaged in the contract. If that be the case, why should it be treated as absolute proof of wrong-doing that a public work should have cost more than the original contract. The hon. gentleman, of course, knows that I was not in the country at the time that this ancient history, through which he has been wading, was being made. He has made, however, a great many statements in that connection through which I do not intend to follow him, because I was not only not in the Government but not even in the country. But he insinuated that the Government had been guilty of great partiality in releasing Messrs. Connolly and another contractor from prison before their sentence was completed. If the hon. gentleman had only turned around to the gentleman by his side, he would have learned that that eminent member of the medical profession was the very authority on which the Government felt justified in acting, and he would have learned also that the hon. gentleman who sits in beside him had joined his professional opinion to the statement that the health and life of these people required their release from prison. I was not consulted as to whether this opinion was unsound or not, but I think it seems to indicate that it was not exactly a party opinion upon which the Government acted, so far as the professional gentlemen, who gave that opinion, are concerned. But the hon. gentleman made another reference that I think we should have been spared. It was one that I think no hon. gentleman on either side of this House should ever make in this Parliament. He impugned the integrity of a judge on the bench. The hon. gentleman says that this reference had been made to a friendly referee.

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I took the words down at the time, but if he says he did not

intend to say that, I will assume that I misunderstood him. That is a position that I think no hon. gentleman in this House, who has regard to the high character and standing of our judges, ought to make. No imputation ever should be made by any member of this House, under any circumstances whatever, that would tend, in the least degree, to impugn the integrity and impartiality of any judge. If the time ever comes when it is necessary for any hon. gentleman in this House to take such a position, it should be followed up by the proceedings that are necessary in order to test the soundness of such an opinion. We are all interested, no matter to which party we belong, every Canadian is interested in maintaining the high character for the impartial administration of justice which should be possessed by every occupant of the bench; and I think I am warranted in saying that if there is anything in our country of which we have reason to be proud, it is the independent and impartial administration of our judiciary. Why was it necessary to make an insinuation of that kind? I care not whether the private party interested be a man who stands high or low, I care not whether he be a man of great wealth and standing and influence or in a very humble position, that comes before the Government for justice. I take the ground that whether a man has been found sinless or not in other and previous transactions, the Government have nothing to do with that, when a claim for justice comes before it, and the claimant asks for an impartial arbitrament of his case. It is one of the first principles of British law and justice, that a claimant shall have his claim fairly and impartially investigated. What has been done? Has any money been taken by the Government of Canada and given to Mr. Connolly? Not a dollar. Has anything been done of which the hon. gentleman according to his own statement, because we are without the material to discuss the question in the absence of papers, has proof to warrant the strong language he has used? No such thing is asserted. All that the hon. gentleman undertakes to assert is that the man had a public contract and claims that the Government owe him a certain amount of money and that the Government submitted the case to Judge Burbidge—a man of great experience, whose impartial administration of justice has never been challenged. The Government were willing that Judge Burbidge, who is familiar with such cases, whose whole life and business are spent in dealing with just such cases, should act in this matter. The Government were willing that Judge Burbidge should be placed in a position to fairly investigate this claim, and find out how much money, if any, is due the contractor, after going into everything connected with the claim. I fail to see what there is so very objectionable in that. I fail to see anything in it to warrant strong and unguarded language which the hon. gentleman used. It lowers the tone of this Parliament and the position of this country in the eye of surrounding countries, when gentlemen are to be found in Parliament who will make such free use of the very objectionable terms of "raiding the treasury," "fraud" and every thing of that kind, in the use of which the hon. gentleman seems to delight. Where does the hon. gentleman get his impression that there is no honesty in man? What induces him to believe that the gentlemen charged with the administration of public affairs in Canada are so corrupt, so unworthy, so dishonest, as to desire to take money from the public treasury and give it to any person? I say that the hon. gentleman does himself no credit. Because when you are called to estimate the acts of other men, you are accustomed to look within and to believe that other men will do what you would have done if you were in the same position. That is the only reason I can suggest for the hon. gentleman using the strong and unqualified epithets that he did. I was not in the country when this contract was let, nor am I familiar with the investigations that took place. All I know is that the then Minister of Public Works, a gentleman whom we all know as of high standing and high character, who did honour to the House of Commons by his presence here and by his conduct as a public man for many years, a gentleman who was afterwards called to the Senate—this gentleman brought down a proposal and an Order in Council which was endorsed by and had the concurrence of the late Minister of Justice, Mr. Dickey, whom all gentlemen on both sides of the House who know him, will acknowledge to be a gentleman whose character and integrity are of the highest. Under these circumstances, I was not prepared to say that I would object to having a reference to the judge of the Exchequer Court, which was constituted for the purpose of dealing with just such cases, to decide, after full investigation, in the light of all the evidence that could be put before the judge, just how much money was due by Canada to Mr. Connolly. All I can say is that I hope I may never be called upon to answer any charge of a worse character than that. In the absence of the papers on this question, I do not intend for a moment to discuss them. But I regret that the gentleman moving for the papers, instead of having them laid upon the Table of the House where members on both sides may be in a position to consult them, should take the opportunity, in the absence of the papers, to endeavour to prejudge and prejudice the case in the mind of members of the House and in the opinion of the country. I must point out how very objectionable is the mode that has been adopted now for the second time in relation to questions which are legitimate subjects for discussion, and which could be so much better dealt with in the light of the information

that the papers would afford were they brought down. For my part, I have no objection to the motion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The facts of the case are not, perhaps, without some interest. To the old members of this House they are well known. In 1888 or 1889, I do not remember which, when apparently Connolly was not in the field, Bancroft got a contract for the construction of a graving dock at Kingston. That contract was investigated in 1891. I will not go into what the hon. gentleman has called ancient history. The facts of the case, as they came before me when I was sworn as Minister of Public Works, I will relate. I found that on the 7th of May, 1896, His Excellency had sanctioned an Order in Council, which reads as follows :—

On a report dated May 2, 1896, from the Minister of Public Works, submitting that on the 29th January, 1896, an Order in Council was passed on a memorandum dated 28th January, 1896, from the Minister of Public Works, stating that in connection with their contract for the construction of the Kingston Graving Dock, Messrs. Bancroft, Connolly & Co. have filed with the Department of Public Works a claim amounting to $44,459.10 for certain extra work executed, and also in connection with the detention of the plant, and on account of damages caused to one of the cribs of the outer piers, which claim they desired to be looked into and allowed by the Department of Public Works.

That since the Order in Council of 29th day of January, 1896——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to draw his attention to the rules of Parliament providing that no Minister is allowed to quote from public documents in his possession unless he is prepared to lay them before the House at once. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to do so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just reading the papers preparatory to laying them on the Table of the House.

That since the Order in Council of 29th of January, 1896, was passed dealing with the said claim, and referring the same for adjudication to the Exchequer Court, the said firm of Messrs. Bancroft, Connolly & Co., now N. K. & M. Connolly, have filed an amended claim with the Department of Public Works claiming the total sum to be due to be $70,418.61, the excess over the former claim being owing to clerical errors therein and to the addition of items omitted by inadvertence from former accounts, and of interest claimed for moneys alleged to have been due for some years.

Well, Sir, when I had read the first part of that Order in Council, I was very anxious to read the balance of it, because it seemed to me that able men, and there is no doubt that these were able men, like the Messrs. Connolly, who had filed the claim, would not have forgotten an item of nearly $40,000. I read on and what did I find ? I found that the Government of which the hon. gentleman was the leader, had waived the rights of the Crown in every shape and form. We all agree that the humblest citizen has the same rights as the highest citizen to equal justice. The courts of justice are for all citizens. I found that the Government of the hon. gentleman waived all the rights of the Crown. On that point I certainly will not be contradicted. But I will make myself better understood by reading on :

That in the said Order in Council it was stated that before the claim of the said N. K. & M. Connolly could be examined, in fact before the full completion of the work, the resident engineer, Mr. W. O. Strong, who had superintended the work during its construction, died before any items of the claim could finally be discussed and adjusted with him, and further that the contract entered into with the Messrs. Bancroft, Connolly & Co. stipulated, as is usual in the contracts entered into with the Department of Public Works, that no claim for extras would be recognized unless supported by authority in writing of the engineer in charge, and the claimants have represented the difficult position in which they are placed by reason of the impossibility of producing the evidence of the said engineer to support their claim. The Minister recommends in view of the fact that it is necessary that a reference to the Exchequer Court should bear upon the full amount by Messrs. N. K. & M. Connolly, and further, so as to remove any doubt as to the conditions to the said reference, that the said Order in Council be amended.

And in that amendment is included the following stipulation :

That except as to prices as aforesaid, no provision or stipulation contained in the tender, specifications or contracts, shall be allowed to govern, which might prevent the said claimant recovering what they may be in fairness entitled to, and that this is to include a waiver of the certificate of the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works prior to payment.

Sir, I have said elsewhere that on many occasions officers in the Department of Public Works were prevailed upon to do things against which their conscience and judgment revolted ; and I state from my seat here that on this occasion the officers in my department were overruled from beginning to end.

The reference was made, not to Mr. Justice Burbidge, but to Mr. Burbidge as a commissioner. The dates, I hope, have not been lost sight of. The first Order in Council was dated 29th January, 1896. The second Order in Council, by which the rights of the Crown were waived, was dated 2nd May, 1896, when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was at the head of the Government. The reference was acted upon on 15th June. The proceedings were very brief, lasting only three days, and judgment was rendered on 2nd July. The judgment against the Crown was for $45,296, precisely the same amount that Connolly & Co. owe the Crown by virtue of a certain arrangement that never should have taken place. The hon. gentleman is aware that there was a claim against Connolly & Co., by order of this House, for over half a million dollars. That claim was settled for $60,000 in round numbers ; $10,000 to be

paid by Larkin—he was obliged to pay up his share—and the balance by Connolly & Co., but they never paid their share. It is now paid, if we are bound by this award. The leader of the Opposition has stated truly, that we should never lower the dignity of the bench. Surely we are not guilty in this case; it was not our party that referred these claims to Mr. Burbidge. I will follow my usual practice of stating just what I think. At the very time that this claim of Connolly & Co. was referred to Mr. Burbidge, the Government thought proper to refer to him a claim by Mr. Goodwin, which had been discussed during the last session of Parliament. There was only one opinion entertained by Parliament, and it was that Goodwin's claim was a bogus claim; but in that case the Government also waived the rights of the Crown, and we have been condemned to pay $73,000. At the same time as the reference of Goodwin's claim was made and the claim of Connolly & Co. to Mr. Burbidge, a claim by Murray & Cleveland, of Toronto, was referred to the same commissioner. It is a great pity that so many claims which have been discussed before Parliament, and which had been declared unjust and unfair claims, have been referred to Mr. Burbidge. The Crown has waived its rights, and Mr. Burbidge has adjudicated upon the claims as they have been presented to him. There is nothing easier for a man to do than to lose his case, when he wants to lose it. I do not know whether we are bound by this Connolly award. Mr. Connolly came to my office, a few days after I had been sworn in, and asked me what I was going to do. I told him I did not consider that the Crown was bound by the award, but at the same time I would carefully investigate the case and see if there was any justice in the claim. I discussed the matter with my responsible officers, and their opinion is that, if there is anything due to Connolly & Co., it is a very small sum indeed. The award was given. The Crown did not have to pay the costs, but they were paid by Connolly & Co. themselves. Those costs amounted to $693, which Commissioner Burbidge charged for his work, and that, I suppose, is a very reasonable amount, but I do not say anything about the charge. I state this fact just to point out that the leader of the Opposition is altogether wrong, when he speaks of judges in this case. It was not a judge who acted in it; it was a commissioner, and so much is that the case that the commissioner has charged a fee of $693. If I have been well informed this award was deposited in the Bank of Montreal, and, on payment of $693 being made, it was delivered to Connolly & Co. So there is no question as to the dignity of the bench; it was a commissioner who acted on a case referred to him. Connolly & Co., I have been informed, paid the costs themselves; the Government have certainly not paid a cent. There was an amount of $693 paid to Commissioner Burbidge—I suppose there is no harm about it—and he has made an award. I have nothing more to say, except that I will refer the case to the Department of Justice, which will have to deal with it, after I have investigated the facts, and after the session I intend to go into it very carefully with my engineers. As the leader of the Opposition has said, whatever may have been the faults of Connolly & Co. in the past, if there is any money due to them, they are certainly entitled to it. About that matter there is no difficulty. If there is any money due to them, it will be paid to them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I had not the pleasure of hearing the leader of the Opposition address his remarks to the House, but I am informed that, referring to the matter of Connolly being released, he said that he was released on a certificate given by me. I believe the hon. gentleman referred to the hon. member who sits beside the hon. member for West Huron. Did the hon. gentleman refer to myself?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I was informed, and, indeed, I thought it was a matter of public notoriety, that the hon. gentleman had agreed to the certificate as to the state of health of those parties.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to inform the leader of the Opposition that he is entirely mistaken. I never gave any certificate of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity to make this statement, for I have heard it very frequently mentioned, or I would not have thought of referring to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words on this very important question. Every time this matter is stirred up, new facts of a very unpleasant and disagreeable kind are brought to the surface. We have learned to-night, from the papers submitted to the House, additional information on the whole question, and the surrounding circumstances point out very clearly and distinctly that, if there was not corruption intended, there was an intention to offer very reasonable terms on which an advantageous settlement for the contractors could be reached on the eve of the general elections. The leader of the Opposition has said that he was not here when the contract for the undertaking was let; that he was not aware of all the incidents connected with the inception of the contract and the construction of the work. Can he give a plausible reason why he took the whole matter out of the hands of the court that properly should dispose of it, and put it before a referee who was not discharging the duties of a judge. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) took a judge off the bench who ought to have adjudicated the claim in his judicial capacity, and he

appointed him as a referee under certain instructions to decide the claims of Connolly & Company. It is quite clear that the leader of the Opposition made this move to meet some urgent appeal on behalf of somebody, possibly on behalf of Connolly & Company, and probably for the purpose of getting into the better graces of men who might be of advantage at the then approaching election. The hon. gentleman told us that in the past history of this country, as a rule all these contracts have far exceeded the estimates. We are sorry indeed to have to admit that that statement is true, so far as contracts let under the Conservative Government are concerned. I have been in the House for fifteen years and I have never known the Tory Government to let a single contract through the Public Works Department, which contract remained in its original condition for any length of period after it was let. An alteration took place in every single instance. The moment a tenderer got the contract then changes were made day after day, month after month, and year after year. In the case of the Kingston graving dock the contract was only left for a short time when changes were made. Take the Langevin Block. Why, Sir, the foundation was not dug until a change was made in the quality of stone to be used. Let us contrast that with the erection of public works in the province of Ontario. Have there been such practices in that province ?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, Sir ; I deny it. The Parliament Buildings in Toronto were built within the estimates, and the same applies to nearly every public work undertaken in that province. The leader of the Opposition has cited the case of the Manchester Ship Canal as having cost three times more than the original estimate, and he would have us believe that there was nothing unforeseen in connection with the construction of that gigantic undertaking. Well, Sir, he brought that case up in the House before as an argument why we should not be surprised because public works in Canada cost extra. Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) not know the difficulties that surrounded the completion of the Manchester Ship Canal. He must know because he was living in England at the time. The fact is that immediately after the survey of the canal and letting of the contract a suit was brought by the city of Liverpool to prevent its construction, on the ground that it would carry the sewage of the whole city of Manchester into the Mersey. The work was commenced at the time that action was taken, and for two or three years it was kept hanging because of a law suit of enormous cost. To obviate the difficulty they had to build the canal alongside the River Mersey making it two or three miles longer than originally intended. And, Sir, in order to carry the trade clear past Liverpool in trans-Atlantic vessels fully laden, they deepened that canal to an unexpected depth. Does not the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) know that, and does he not know that all that extra work had to be done owing to the opposition of the city of Liverpool. Yet he gets up here and he cites the case of the Manchester Ship Canal as an excuse for all the increased cost of public buildings, and canals, and graving docks in Canada. Does not he know also that unexpected difficulties, quicksands and other things, which had to be overcome were encountered at the very start in the case of the Manchester Canal. The fact is that at one time they thought they would have had to abandon it, and although it did cost an enormously increased amount they carried it through, and it stands to-day one of the grandest engineering feats of the British Isles. This is the second time the hon. gentleman has cited this case in the House as an excuse for the enormous extra cost of Canadian public works. I hope he will not fancy this House so ignorant as to bring it up for a third time.

Sir, there is no question about it, but that scandals and disgraces of an unpleasant character have been for years mixed up with the letting of our public contracts in this country. We on this side of the House have deplored the great squandering of public money in this direction. Sir, this country will long remember the disgraceful doings in connection with the Langevin Block, the Curran Bridge, the Tay Canal, the dredging contracts, the graving docks, and all the rest of it. I sincerely hope that all these things are past, and that a better day has dawned for the people of this country. I believe firmly that the scandals and disgraces and extravagances that have characterized proceedings in connection with public works in this country for the last ten or twelve years, have disappeared never to be seen again. I tell my worthy and respected leader, and I tell him in the face of this House, that if he ever lends himself to things of that kind, I will never consent to swallow what hon. gentlemen opposite have done for the sake of party. When my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition came to this country he no doubt made a most gigantic effort to bring the old Tory ship safely into harbour once more. But, Sir, she had got down in the trough of the sea ; she was rotten from stem to stern ; her masts were sprung and her sails in rags, and she refused to answer the command of her captain. Her rudder was virtually useless, and she had a mutiny on board. He made a very vigorous and determined effort to bring her safely to port, but she was wrecked upon the rocks of public indignation for her own misdeeds. We hope we have seen the last of the scandals which occurred under the Conservative Government. We never want to see them repeated, and, Sir, I think that we never shall. The electors of this country have

taken my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition down from the dignified position he occupied as First Minister, and they have relegated him to the stool of repentence for all time. We hope that it will do him and his associates good, that after a while they will be purged and purified; and if it ever should fall to their lot to be again placed in power by the people of this country, it is to be hoped they will make a more honest effort to administer the affairs of this country than they have done during the last eighteen years. But I think their return is a distant day. I believe the evidences of honesty, ability and statesmanship shown by the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches to-day indicate an earnest desire on their part to banish for ever those experiences; and as long as they administer the affairs of this country honestly and honourably, I believe the people will keep them where they are.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, we have got, as far as it is possible at the present moment, the facts relating to the contracts of Connolly & Co. I may say here that Mr. Bancroft was a fiction; no such man as Bancroft existed. The contract was awarded to Bancroft, but the tender was in fact that of Connolly & Co. They put in two tenders—one in their own name and the other in the name of Bancroft. As my friend the Minister of Public Works has stated, an action was brought by the Government against the Connollys, and the Connollys had an opportunity then, if they really had a claim against the Government, to set off the claim which was afterwards referred to arbitration; but it was kept back along with the other matters. The result of the settlement was that the Dominion Government appeared to be entitled to something like $60,000 against the Connollys. That was the settlement of the civil proceedings entered by the Government against them. It requires no lawyer to state to the House, because it will appeal to the judgment of every hon. member that in an action of this kind between the Government and other parties, just as between two individuals, there is an opportunity to have every matter of difference adjusted and settled. But there appears to have been no claim made on behalf of the Connollys for this $40,000 odd in the trial of the case of the Queen against the Connollys. So that we must come to the conclusion, so far as that claim is concerned, that it was an afterthought. There is no doubt that the fact of the Connollys allowing their claim to remain in abeyance for so long a time, and forcing it, so to speak, just before a general election, is a suspicious circumstance in itself. Whether the Government received any contribution from these men or not is of no consequence. It looked as if the Government were anxious that the claim should be settled in some way, not for the purpose of giving these men justice, but for the purpose of securing their support. We find that these men pressed their claim shortly before the general election, and we find that after the Government was defeated this claim was decided by a commissioner by reference—a gentleman not acting in his capacity as a judge at all; and the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition reproving my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) was entirely uncalled for. Judge Burbidge was not sitting on that case as a judge; he was sitting on it as an arbitrator, and as such charged fees to the litigants. If he had been sitting as a judge, he would have been entitled to charge nothing, as the country paid his salary; but, as a matter of fact, he sat not as a judge, but simply as a referee or an arbitrator. That is proved by the papers on the Table, and it is further established by the fact that before giving up his award he charged the fees of an arbitrator, amounting to $600 odd. So that we may dismiss at once any question as to the position in which Judge Burbidge acted upon these two cases. If that case stood alone, it might be different. But, strange to say, we find that at the same time Murray & Cleveland claimed to have a charge against the Government, on account of their contracts, of $80,000, which they had been pressing for a long time, and which the Government, for some reason, refused to adjust until just before the election. At the same time that they agreed to refer the Connolly claim, we find that they agreed to refer this claim of Murray & Cleveland. The matter was hurriedly pushed through; an arbitrator was agreed upon—an able man, I will admit. I do not for a moment pretend to say that so far as he was concerned, there was any impropriety at all. But I do say, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works said a moment ago, that if you confess that you are guilty, if you admit the claim of your opponent, it is not to be wondered at that the judgment will be against you; and we find the Government of the day in Council consenting that every defence they held against the claim of these men should be waived. What was Judge Burbidge to try? The Government had waived every defence to the action, and all he was to do was to go through the form of finding how much might be due to these people. But, Sir, that is not all. There is the claim of Charlebois in connection with the Langevin Block—a claim that had stood from 1886, I think; a claim outlawed, of ten years' standing; a claim which the Government had never recognized or acknowledged in any way. Suddenly the Government become satisfied that it was necessary that that claim too should be recognized and settled—under a contract that bears upon its face either the grossest negligence on the part of the engineers, or corruption—one or the other; because, as my hon. friend says, from the moment that contract was made changes took place from

time to time It is true, as my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says, that for years, I will venture to say since the late Government went into power in 1878 to the time they were ejected from office in 1896, there was never a contract completed which did not involve enormous extras. The extras on the Langevin Block were nearly as much as the original contract price. At the time of the investigation of 1891, Mr. Charlebois was in Europe; nobody could get him to give evidence. His claim was investigated, but Mr. Charlebois could not be found; and this claim has dragged along from then until June, 1896, when the Government make up their minds that it ought to be adjusted in some way or other; and what do we find? We find that the claim was not left to Mr. Burbidge, but to private arbitrators, gentlemen who occupy no official position at all. Two arbitrators were appointed to try it, and Mr. Shanly, of Montreal, a former member of this House, was appointed as the third arbitrator. But the claim was to be adjusted without Mr. Shanly ever having been informed or knowing that he had been appointed arbitrator at all. Sir, we have a letter of Mr. Shanly's. In so great a hurry, it appears, was the Government to settle this claim finally, that the third arbitrator was never notified, and never knew that he was connected with the case one way or the other. Here is Mr. Shanly's letter:

Sir,—The Hon. Mr. Tarte, in his speech at Knowlton, "Star," 31st July, stated that I had been named by the late Government as 'Referee' in a claim made by Mr. A. Charlebois, contractor, against the Department of Public Works and that an Order in Council to that purport had been drawn and "submitted." This, being "news" to me, I took to be one of those random assertions not unusual in stump speeches and, therefore, was surprised to read in the "Star" of August 1, confirmation by the Hon. Mr. Desjardins, late Minister of Public Works, of what had been proclaimed from the stump by Mr. Tarte. My object in asking insertion of these lines is just to say that the late Government, either through the Minister of Public Works or otherwise, never communicated with me on the subject of Mr. Charlebois's claim and that for the first intimation of my appointment as Referee and of the Order in Council, in the framing of which I was not given an "option" touching the use of my name, I am indebted to your report of the Knowlton speech. Absence from the city has prevented me from taking earlier notice of what, in so far as my name has been brought in, seems like a somewhat unbusinesslike fashion of doing business in a public department.

W. SHANLY.

Montreal, August 5, 1896.

Sir, it seems almost incredible that a Government should have decided that the claim of over $250,000, should be ajudicated upon by reference to arbitrators, and then have failed to notify the referee of his appointment or of any of the proceedings taken from first to last. Such, however, is the fact, and there is the letter from the referee, stating that the speech of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was the first intimation he got of his appointment or of the Order in Council. One cannot suppress the feeling that these cases have been at least dealt with with undue haste. Let what charges be made against the Government that may be made, the time may come when it will be necessary to investigate these matters; but, I say, that having allowed this claim to stand for years, it was a most suspicious circumstance, that, on the eve of an election, it should be hurriedly put through, the Government waiving every defence it had, and allowing the claimant to get judgment against the country for a large sum of money.

Mr. McCLEARY. One of the principal weapons which have been used by the Liberal party in their attempt to overthrow the Conservative Government and party all these years has been that of suspicion. They have endeavoured by the system of maligning the public men connected with the Conservative party, to create the impression that the men who have been controlling the destinies of this country for all these years have been men of most dishonest and corrupt character. They have attempted, by a system of suspicion more than anything else, to gain the ear of the public in this regard. I would not have risen in my place to say anything on the question just now before the House, had it not been for the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has told us that in nearly all the public contracts that have been let in this country, the final expenditure had exceeded very largely the original estimate. The hon. member for North Welllington (Mr. McMullen) took exception to that. He said it was not the case, and he cited the Parliament buildings in the city of Toronto as an instance to the contrary. In that case, he said, the expenditure was kept within the estimates. Now, this is my first term in this Parliament of Canada. I have read and heard a good deal of the hon. member for North Wellington and of the position he has taken in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, if his statements in the past are not more to be relied upon than what he has said this evening, I think that very little weight can be attached to them. Any hon. gentleman in this House, who is acquainted at all with the expenditure in connection with the Parliament Buildings in Toronto, knows well, that not only was the original estimate exceeded, but that it was exceeded by more than one-half. Let me give you, Sir, briefly the interesting history of this undertaking. In 1880 the Minister of Public Works of Ontario, then the late Hon. C. F. Fraser, asked the Ontario legislature for an appropriation of half a million dollars, and that appropriation was granted. He said that it would be ample for the erection of the

building, completed, and handed over to the province. Competitive designs were advertised for and several plans were submitted to a committee of experts, which consisted of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Mr. Storm, Architect, and Mr. Waite, Architect, from the city of Buffalo. These gentlemen sat in consultation upon these plans, and two Canadian sets were adopted. The department then advertised for tenders, and it was ascertained, when the bids were all in, that the lowest tender exceeded the amount which Parliament had appropriated. The Minister of Public Works, did not come down to Parliament until 1885, when he told the legislature that it would be impossible to have buildings erected suitable for the province for the half million dollars voted, and asked for an additional $250,000, which the legislature granted him. And, moreover, Sir, the hon. Minister of Public Works stated from his place in Parliament at that time that this additional quarter of a million dollars, making a total amount of $750,000, would complete and equip this building, and that the building would be constructed after one of the Canadian plans that had been adopted by the committee of experts who had examined into the matter. But, when the bids had been asked for, it was found that, for some reason, the Canadian plans were defective, and Mr. Waite, of Buffalo, the American architect, was asked by the Department of Public Works to come and pass an opinion upon them and see if they could be adjusted so as to meet the requirements of the Minister of Public Works. Mr. Waite rejected both sets of plans, and said that neither of them would do, and he himself submitted plans to the department at Toronto, and his plans were accepted as the ones which should guide the contractors in their bidding for the erection of this building. Well, Sir, bids were asked upon the plans submitted by Mr. Waite, and the contract was let for $752,000. Mark what I told you a moment ago—that the Minister of Public Works had declared from his place in the House that the $250,000 he had asked for would complete these buildings. They went on and spent the $752,000, and what did they have for it? They had the bare walls of the building; they did not have a door, they did not have a window, they did not have a floor or even a roof over the building. And, before that building was completed, it cost the people of Ontario $1,400,000. Of course, Mr. Fraser, the Minister of Public Works, declared from his place in the House that he had never intended the equipment, the lighting or the furnishing of the building to be included in the original amount asked; and possibly he did not. Now, we in the province of Ontario did not complain about this; the Conservative party did not complain about it; Mr. Meredith, now Chief Justice Meredith, then the leader of the Conservative Opposition, did not complain that we did not get value for the money spent. But we did complain, and complained righteously, against the Canadian sets of plans being set aside and an American architect being invited to furnish the plans and getting the commission upon the work. No one suspected the Minister of Public Works of being dishonest, of being a corruptionist, or of stealing from the public treasury of Ontario, notwithstanding that we had to pay $1,400,000 for a building which the department declared would not cost more than $750,000. Now, what will the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) say to this, after having stated here before the representatives of the people that the expenditure on the parliament buildings of the province of Ontario was kept within the estimates? I say that gentlemen opposite are proceeding along lines of suspicion only. I have nothing to say with regard to the question actually under discussion. But, being to some extent a practical man, I think I may claim to know a good building when I see it; and, in my opinion, the Langevin block is an ornament to the city and a credit to the Dominion, and I believe that for the sum expended upon it the people have received good value.

Motion agreed to.

GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

Return of all correspondence between any person or persons and the Government on the subject of grain inspection in Manitoba and the North-west and complaining of the manner in which the grain standards have been selected, and all correspondence relating to the subject of mixing grain at the elevators, also to the manner of weighing and buying grain.

He said: This is a subject of the greatest importance to the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and one in which the people there take the greatest possible interest. It is one that is not new to this House, at least to those members who were in previous Parliaments, and the new members of this House are sufficiently interested in matters of this kind to have had their attention directed to the needs of the farmer in this respect. I am glad to see evidence that there is a great deal of interest taken in this matter this session. Last session I brought the matter before the House, and my hon. friend, the then Controller of Inland Revenue, held out hopes that the Government would deal with it. He assured me that the Government would inquire into any charges of frauds that had been made, and promised that if frauds were found to exist, redress would come. The hon. gentleman who at that time represented Winnipeg in this House, spoke at considerable length on the subject, and he declared positively that frauds existed, and that advantage was taken of the farmers in the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman who is now

the leader of the House spoke sympathetically in regard to that matter, and said :

I think the hon. Minister would do well to allow my hon. friend from West Assiniboia to have his committee and investigate the question.

Now, Sir, the reason I have not moved for a committee this session, was because the session was likely to be so short that the committee would be functus officio.

An hon. MEMBER. What does that mean?

Mr. DAVIN. It means that it would not have any power to go on. But, Sir, after that question had thus been brought before the House last session, we, that is, certain senators and members of this House who are interested in that subject, pressed on the Controller of Inland Revenue to deal with it. The House will remember that I brought a resolution before it, passed by one of the large agricultural societies in Manitoba, and that at the very time I was pressing the necessity for action on the attention of the Government, I received a letter from the secretary of the Patrons of Industry of Regina County, as follows :—

N. F. Davin, Esq., M.P.,

Dear Sir,—I was requested to send you a copy of the following resolution passed at the last meeting of above.

That is, the Patrons of Industry of Regina County.

That whereas, by a Dominion Act certain regulations are set forth whereby the grain standards of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are adjusted by a Grain Standard Board each year, said Act also provides that No. 1 Hard Manitoba and North-west wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the measure bushel, and shall be composed of not less than two-thirds hard Red Fife wheat, and whereas, said standard board frequently fixed grade No. 1 hard to weigh much more than 60 pounds, and to contain more than two-thirds hard Red Fife wheat. This causes great dissatisfaction, and we believe by thus altering the grades each successive year, it causes great depreciation in the value of our wheat in foreign markets through the confusion of grades.

Therefore, it is resolved that in the opinion of this Regina County Association of the Patrons of Industry, the standard grading should be abolished, and that a fixed Government standard be permanently established.

I am, sir, yours faithfully,

(Sd.) EDWIN MEADOWS, C.T.

Now, that is what we contended for as the solution of the difficulty, that we should have a permanent grain standard for No. 1, for No. 2, and for No. 3, so that the farmer would be able to carry round with him, just as the mechanic carries a rule, his glass bottle as a fixed standard by which he could measure his wheat. When a year came that you had exceptionally good wheat which might grade several degrees higher than the standard, the farmer could get the advantage of it. But at present, when a great country like the North-west Territories and Manitoba have had their yield, the buyers and the farmers, too, who are associated with them, take the wheat and mix it up ; they mix scoured wheat with the very best wheat produced in the territories. Now, the farmers hold, and those of us who have looked into it are convinced, that in consequence of mixing scoured wheat with the best wheat, the farmer is deprived of the full advantage of his crop. Not only that, but in the North-west Territories, where we produce the very highest grade of wheat, we do not get credit for the grade we produce. While we were pressing this on the Minister, there comes to his office another communication signed by Charles Braithwaite, provincial president, and W. C. Graham, provincial secretary of the Patrons, which I will read :

"To His Excellency the Governor General in Council :

Hon. Sir,—At a recent convention composed of delegates from all over the province of Manitoba and from all parts of Assiniboia in the Territories, held under the jurisdiction of the Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry, the undersigned was authorized by them to submit the following as their decision in reference to the matter set forth below :—

Re the amending of the Grain Standards Act, it was unanimously decided that the standards be fixed permanently in the fall of 1896. That such board for fixing same should be composed of at least one-half producers ; also that the Standard Act should be amended as follows : One hard, hard extra,"

and so on. This, of course, to use a vulgar but expressive phrase, knocked endways all the pressure we were bringing to bear upon the Minister ; and the Minister was able to flaunt before us this communication, said to be from all the Patrons of Industry in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. But palpably there was some misunderstanding, because a letter from the Patrons of Industry of Regina County, dated February 18, 1896, endorsed the action we were taking. Well, Sir, I wrote this letter to Mr. Meadows :

Ottawa, February 29th, 1896.

Edwin Meadows, Esq.,

Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge yours of the 18th instant, conveying to me a resolution of the Patrons of Industry to the effect that as regards wheat, a fixed Government standard be permanently established.

This is what we have been working for and some progress was being made, but our efforts have been marred by the following petition to His Excellency.

I will not presume to say that Mr. Braithwaite and his friends do not know what is in the interest of the farmer as well as we do, but I certainly thought it would have been better not to postpone action until the fall of 1896.

Yours truly,

N. F. DAVIN.

We have had a communication which would seem to indicate that the view we took last year in favour of having a permanent grain

standard, and to have it as soon as possible, was the right view, and not that which was put forward by those gentlemen, who effectually put a spoke in the wheel of those who were pressing their views on the Government at that time. I hold in my hand an extract from a report of the minutes of the Manitoba Central Farmers' Institute Convention, held in Brandon, July 14, 15, 16, 1896, and this is what it says :

Report of Committee on Grain Standards, Elevator Monopoly and Transportation Charges.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen,—

Your committee fully realize the importance of the work allotted to them under the above heading. And that not only the success of our farmers, but our country generally depends largely on the measure of relief granted. That the present and future outlook for low prices make it absolutely necessary that the cost of production and placing our crop on the world's markets must be reduced, or in other words, the farmer must receive a large percentage of product of his labour than under existing circumstances.

We believe that it would be advantageous to all concerned if grain standards or grades could be fixed on some more permanent basis than at present, the fixing of standards for our wheat we submit should be such as to enable the farmer to secure the full market value of his wheat, whatever its quality and to enable him to know exactly what is its relative value, and this can be better accomplished by a permanent grade than by one changing from year to year.

We hold that this is principally a farmer's question, more so than an exporter's, seeing that after all very much of our wheat is exported—not on the grade or standard fixed, but by certified samples made by the different exporters to suit their own convenience and profit. Hence the necessity of a classification of our wheat which would not admit of too much manipulation by making grades wide apart in price or value.

We think it would be a grievous mistake simply to reduce the number and so widen the grades as to absorb wheats which might vary considerably in value. As the whole of wheat purchased under such grades would be sold by farmers on the basis of grade, and all having wheat of higher quality would not receive value for their product and would naturally not aim at keeping up the quality of our wheat ; and we deem it very important that our reputation should be maintained for a high grade, hence the recommendation with reference to this point which is attached to the following resolutions, all of which are submitted for your approval.

1. That in the opinion of this Institute the Grain Standard Board of 1896 should consist of at least one-half farmers, or representatives of farmers.

2. That the Dominion Government should so amend the Act as to make permanent the grades and standards as fixed by the said board with reference to grades 1 Hard, 2 Hard and 1 Northern.

3. That in deciding upon their permanency the board be requested to take into careful consideration the varying qualities of our wheat from year to year in the past.

4. That the word "Manitoba" be prefixed to all permanent grades of wheat, grown in this province.

In the North-west there is a strong feeling among the farmers that injustice is done to them in having Manitoba the classifying word for all wheat grown in the western country, it being known as Manitoba No. 1, and so on. We think that we ought to have a grade known as North-west, that in some way or other a phrase should be devised that would embody the idea of the North-west, so as to have its claim acknowledged. I am assured by farmers in parts of my own constituency, for instance around Moose Jaw and Regina, that they have from year to year produced a higher quality of wheat than that produced in Manitoba, high as is the grade produced in that province, and it is unjust to us that we should be asked, we being the larger country and bound within a very few years to have tens of thousands of acres of wheat more than Manitoba, to bring our wheat under the classification of Manitoba. So I must not be supposed to agree with this portion of the report, but it is most important to bring it before the House and before the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue at this time.

5. That Manitoba No. 1 Hard shall consist of at least 75 per cent of hard wheat, to be sound, well cleaned and weighing not less than 61 pounds to the bushel.

6. That Manitoba No. 2 Hard shall consist of at least 66⅔ per cent of hard wheat, to be reasonably clean but not clean enough for one hard, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel.

7. Manitoba No. 1 Northern snall consist of not less than 50 per cent of Hard wheat, sound and clean, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel.

8. That a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the Department of Inland Revenue, also to our federal members and to the secretary of the Winnipeg Board of Trade to be placed before the Standards Board when they meet.

9. That we ask the co-operation of both local and federal governments to aid in securing the placing of our grades on the principal grain exchanges in England and getting market quotations on same, thereby giving us a true conception of the export value of our wheat.

In regard to the elevator monopoly, I have to say this, that the resolution I have placed on the paper points to complaints of the farmers in my district to this effect. They say the way the wheat is weighed and the way it is graded is unjust to them. For instance, a farmer will come to you and say : "If you will come to my barns, you will see a large quantity of grain all of precisely the same character. I go in on a certain day with a load, and it is graded No. 1 hard or No. 1 extra. The next day I go in with a load from the same heap, but, instead of the grade being No. 1 hard, it is probably No. 2." The farmer will not accept the grading, and he goes to another place, and his wheat is graded as he thinks it ought to be graded. The complaint is that there is something wrong in the way the wheat is graded, and not only so, but something wrong in the way it is weighed. Farmers tell me, and I have seen it myself, that buyers will not allow any fractions to the farmers, all fractions

going to the benefit of the buyers. That surely is terribly unjust. I sat down and tried to make a calculation as to the amount which is taken out of the pockets of the farmers and the North-west, and I estimated that in one year it would amount to tens of thousands of dollars. In regard to this subject, the resolution I have been desired to bring before the House is as follows :—

That we endorse the sentiments expressed by the Central Institute last year, on this subject and regret very much that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not seen fit to meet our wishes in the removal of an admitted grievance and an unjust restriction which causes serious loss in many districts.

Your committee fully ackowledge and appreciate the effort made during the past season by the executive of the Central Institute and would emphasize the necessity of still further following up the work by again urging the Canadian Pacific Railway to consider this matter, at the same time laying before them any further information obtainable, that will tend to strengthen our case.

As bearing on that point and cognate to it, there is the cry of the farmers in the North-west, that freight rates are oppressive ; and it was a great consolation to them, and they were filled with hope, when we were told that the present leader of the Government had come into power, that the freight rates would be dealt with. I have been told that there has been some disappointment felt in the west by the answer that was given to me by the leader of the House, when I asked him a question with regard to the promise he had made at Moose Jaw. This is what they say :

TRANSPORTATION.

We endorse the sentiments of the Central Institute, as expressed last year in this matter, and deeply regret that the Canadian Pacific Railway apparently cannot see that by their excessive freights they are seriously retarding not only the producing power of the farmers of this province but their consuming power as well, and as a consequence reducing to a great extent the carrying traffic of their own railway.

Your committee are of the opinion that the Central Institute has already fully discharged its obligations to the farmers of this province in so far as petitions to the railway companies and our legislative bodies are concerned in connection with this matter, and we feel that the time is fully ripe when we should discuss the advisability of taking more potent action in this issue. (Nothing definite was done with this clause, unless it was assumed to be carried with the motion which followed.)

That the Dominion Government be requested to amend the Railway Act so as to require railway companies to furnish all reasonable facilities for receiving, forwarding and delivering freight, and that the wording of such petition be left to the executive of the Central Institute.

Now, Sir, in connection with that I should like to call the attention of the Controller of Inland Revenue to a proposal in regard to this matter that has been placed in my charge by the farmers of my constituency. It is to the effect, that the Government should co-operate with the railway and with the steamship companies for the purpose of enabling the farmer to ship his wheat direct to the broker in Liverpool, or in case it should be found advisable, to London sometimes. At all events, the proposal is that the farmer should be enabled to ship to the broker in the old country, and he can then send his wheat direct in bags marked with his own initials. In this way there would be avoided the mixing process that takes place at Port Arthur, and which the farmers contend takes away from their legitimate profit and lowers the undoubted high standard of the grain they produce. Last year when this subject was before Parliament I had the strong support of the late member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and this is what he said :

I understood him to say that he would be very glad, if these frauds were pointed out to him, to bring legislation into this House to cure the evil——

Mr. PRIOR. If there are frauds.

Mr. MARTIN. There are frauds ; I do not think there can be any possible doubt about that. There always will be frauds, I fancy——

Mr. PRIOR. No, no.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to take my word for it, but I think he might pay some attention to the declaration of his hon. supporter from West Assiniboia. I think it must be within the knowledge of every member of this House that purchasers of wheat, like purchasers of every other article, will take advantage of every opportunity—and no doubt they have had considerable opportunity in this wheat trade—to buy at a lower grade and a lower price than is just, and that I think may fairly be denominated fraud. But the hon. gentleman who has just left the office of the Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) has pointed out that this is an evil which it is almost impossible to cure by means of legislation. Parliament can provide what the grade shall be and take means to prevent frauds by the Government inspectors, but, as the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood) has pointed out, it would be a very uphill job indeed to make an Act of Parliament to prevent frauds of the kind referred to by the hon. member for West Assiniboia.

And again he said :

I understand the desire of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who moved the motion is to elicit such information as to enable this House to legislate in the interests of the farmers. I am satisfied that so far as the interests of the farmers are concerned, the grades of wheat should be made permanent, not only as regards No. 1, but as regards No. 2 and No. 3 or any other grades that are considered desirable in the country.

I commend that to the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue, as coming from a gentleman who was allowed to take a very prominent part in the Liberal opposition last session. And, Sir, if the Controller of Inland Revenue will look into the principal organ of the Liberal party to-day he will see that one of the railway men in the United States has made an appeal to the railway companies there to treat the farmer differ-

ent from what they have been accustomed to treat him. This gentleman points out that they have been accustomed to make special rates to the buyer of wheat, rates more favourable than they will make to the farmer. These rates are not in existence for carrying wheat until the crop is bought up, and thus a more favourable rate is given to the buyer than to the farmer.

Well, Sir, the farmers of the North-west Territories feel that in regard to the buying of wheat from them, in regard to the grading of wheat, in regard to the system of fixing standards, in regard to the mixing of scoured wheat with their perfect wheat, and in regard to the transportation, they feel that they are at the present time in a state of great disadvantage and in a condition that calls for action on the part of the Government. I have shown the House that the leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) did last session speak sympathetically in regard to the motion I brought before the House, as also did a gentleman who took a prominent part in the late Opposition, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). I see that the "Globe" to-day writes in a very favourable way of the claims of the farmers, and my hon. friend and colleague from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is taking a very commendable part in these matters. That hon. gentleman is chairman of a committee and en passant I might express the hope that when that committee meets again I shall get some notice of it. Of its first meeting I got no notice whatever, nor could I find that any of my Conservative friends got notice; any way I got none, and when they meet again I hope I shall be informed. I say, we are taking a very great interest in these matters now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friends opposite say "Hear, hear," but I remember when I first tried to interest the House in these very same questions the interest was not so great as it is now. But, as Mr. Disraeli educated his party, I suppose I may say that we have educated both parties just as my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Taylor) and other members and myself have educated the House on the subject of the Alien Labour Law. Having indicated to the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) and to the House what are the features of this question that ought at once to occupy the attention of the Government, what my object is in asking for papers, and why it is I have not moved for a committee (namely the brevity of the session), I have no more to do than to move, seconded by Mr. Sproule the motion which stands in my name.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbiniére). I had no idea until recently that there was so much to consider in connection with the question, and so many difficulties in the way of rendering justice to all parties concerned, not only in the growing of the wheat, but in the transporting of the wheat, the sorting of the wheat and the wheat trade generally; and I have been so short a time associated with these matters that I hope the House will be indulgent with me if I say that so far I have only begun to understand the question. The first thing that drew my attention to it was a meeting with the millers of Ontario, who called upon me about a fortnight ago to try to secure a settlement of this very question which has now been brought to the attention of the House with so much care and detail by my hon. friend. I discovered at once that there were three different interests concerned in the question, only one of which was there represented, namely, the millers; and they could not expect their proposal to be entertained without my giving attention to the other interests. First of all, we have the interest which I really look upon as the most important, and the one deserving of the greatest help and sympathy—the producers'; secondly, there is the interests of the dealers, who purchase the wheat from the farmers, and send it to the millers or export it; and, thirdly, there is the interest of the millers. Every year about this time a board meets at Winnipeg to decide what the standard shall be for the year's crop. So far there has been no rule for the composition of that board—as to the proportion in which these three different interests ought to be represented upon it. In fact, I do not think the question has been considered in that light before. For this year I do not know whether I have made a mistake in having a board of fifteen members, with five representing the farmers' interest, five representing the dealers' interest, and five representing the millers' interest. I know that this division does not meet the views of many of those interested in the question in the North-west. My hon. friend a short time ago read some petitions sent by the Patrons of Industry and other associations of farmers in the North-west, asking that one-half of the board should be farmers or producers of wheat. Well, as I said a moment ago, I think the producers of wheat ought to have a paramount, at all events a very great part, in settling the standard; but nevertheless, I would not put everything in their hands: because even in their own interest we must keep up the standard and the reputation of our wheat. What has been said by my hon. friend shows the difficulty that exists, even regarding the appelation of the wheat. My hon. friend protests, as representing the part of the country he comes from, against putting all the wheat under the name of Manitoba, and he wants a distinction made between North-west and Manitoba wheat. Then, there is the question whether there should be a permanent standard or a standard that will vary from year to year. At first sight it appears rather illogical to have a standard

changing every year according to the crop and the season; but on that point opinion is so much divided that the House will see how difficult it is to settle the question on the spur of the moment. For my part, it has seemed to me that there was a want of logic in the way our standards were fixed, for we have really two standards. We have the standard fixed by the board at Winnipeg, which last year placed No. 1 hard at 62 pounds, with two-thirds of hard, while the law fixes No. 1 at 60 pounds. The existence of these two standards accounts for the mixing done by the traders in order to bring the wheat which they export down to the No. 1 legal standard. Men who have given a great deal of attention to the question are of opinion that instead of having only that material standard of a certain number of grains of wheat, with a certain proportion of each kind, it would be much better to provide, since the law says so, that No. 1 hard must be 60 pounds, with two-thirds of one kind and one-third of the other kind. I think that would be much better than having the fixing of the material standard every year at so many grains of wheat in a little bottle which might be passed from one hand to the other. However, this is a matter which I think should not be altered hastily. Above all things, we have to consider the interests of those who grow the wheat, how any change would affect the position of the farmers in the North-west, and the hopes we entertain of peopling that country, and seeing at last a reward for all the sacrifices we have made in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. In view of the fact that in eight or ten days the standard for this season is to be fixed, I think it would be imprudent now to entertain the idea of making any change; and I think we must not do anything which might discourage the farmers in the North-west or impair the attractiveness of that country to farmers who want to settle there and make a home for themselves and their children. I think we must deal with that question with the greatest tenderness, and not make any change at the eleventh hour. I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied to choose the different papers he desires out of the enormous amount of correspondence accumulated in the department; and, in the meantime, I have not the slightest objection to the motion passing.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there are two or three interests at stake in this matter, in regard to which it is desirable as far as possible to satisfy people who feel that there is a grievance. In the first place, there is the farmer of the North-west Territories. Now, he appears to have two grievances. One is with regard to the weighing, and that I think could only be remedied by appointing a public weigher, for even after the scales are examined, there is an impression in the minds of the farmers, that, in many instances, they do not get fair-play. Whether that impression be well founded or not, it will always exist until a remedy is found. From information I have, I believe that, in some cases, there are just grounds for complaint, but I do not think it can be substantiated that such is the case at all points where grain is weighed. It appears to me that the difficulty can only be got over by appointing public weighers who would be sworn to do their duty faithfully between buyer and seller.

On the other hand there is an impression that a class of wheat, afterward called scoured wheat, is bought from the farmers at very low prices and then, after it undergoes the operation of scouring, is sold to the millers in Ontario and elsewhere, at a much higher price than it should be sold at, according to its quality. In this connection there is also a very serious grievance complained of by the millers down here. Let me give you an example. As the law stands, you are permitted to mix scoured wheat with No. 2 hard. The law provides that No. 1 hard shall weigh not less than 60 pounds to the bushel and contain not less than two-thirds red fife or hard winter wheat. What the farmers complain of is that they often supply wheat that will weigh 63 pounds or 64 pounds to the bushel, and yet get only the same price as for wheat weighing 60 pounds to the bushel. That would seem to indicate the necessity for another grade. From the information I have, I believe that it is desirable that a grade called "No. 1 Extra" should be provided, which would weigh more than 60 pounds to the bushel, and which, of course, will turn out a larger percentage of flour than wheat that only weighs 60 pounds to the bushel. Then, there is nothing in the law to prevent the mixing of scoured wheat with No. 2, although scoured wheat is not worth within 5 cents or 7 cents a bushel of what No. 2 hard is worth for making flour. There is sometimes only a difference of two or three cents between No. 1 hard and No. 2, but there is a difference of 5 to 7 cents between No. 2 hard and scoured wheat, and, therefore, it is unfair to mix scoured wheat with No. 2 hard and sell it as the latter. I know a gentleman who made a contract for five or six thousand bushels of No. 2 hard. The first consignment of 2,000 bushels might fairly be regarded as No. 2 hard, according to the standard it was selected from. Out of that, he made a class of flour that suited his requirements. Some months later he got a delivery of the balance, some 3,000 bushels, but in that consignment he found a very large percentage of scoured wheat, which was not as valuable for flour making as No. 2 hard, the difference being about 4 or 5 cents per bushel. He applied to the millers association for a re-examination in order to ascertain whether the last consignment was up to the grade which he had bought, by comparing it with the samples according to which he had bought. The law was turned up, and there was nothing found in it to pro-

hibit the mixing of scoured wheat with No. 2 hard, and therefore, although the last consignment was not worth to him within 5 cents per bushel of what the first consignment was, and of what No. 2 hard ought to be, he had no redress. He does not like to go to law because he is a man who exceedingly dislikes going to court, but he feels that an injustice has been done him, and that, owing to the regulations of these standards, it is impossible for him to get his rights. My suggestion to remedy this would be the fixing of a standard for scoured wheat by itself, and not allow the mixing of it with any other grain, unless of a grade equally low in value. If that were done, you would prevent the danger of any fraud being perpetrated on the millers. It is also necessary to fix another grade for No. 1 hard, to be called No. 1 Extra, which would include all wheat that weighed over 60 pounds to the bushel. By making this expansion of these grades, substantial good would be done. For instance in Liverpool, where our wheat is largely sold, when they receive No. 1 hard and No. 2 hard this year, they will naturally conclude that each of these grades represents a certain settled quality of wheat; but if some years the No. 1 hard grades 60 pounds to the bushel and in other years over 62 pounds, confusion is created, and our wheat does not attain that stability in the foreign market which it should. It should be our object to have it known that each grade represents a certain fixed quality, and we would thereby have our wheat quotations as regular as those for western wheat from the United States. If my suggestion were adopted, the Government would be able to fix a permanent standard, which would be satisfactory, not only to the farmers but to the millers. My suggestion for remedying this I have given. It is for the Government to take the matter into consideration. If it is impossible for them to make any change in the standards this year, it is to be regretted, because I believe there is a substantial grievance on the part of the Ontario millers and also a substantial grievance on the part of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west. Whether the farmer is getting justice or not, he believes he is not getting justice; and it is important you should satisfy him on this point. Many of them believe that there should be a permanent standard.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would ask permission to say a few words in reference to the question of scoured wheat, which will be in explanation of the remarks my hon. friend led me to offer. I forgot to say that, when the deputation of Ontario millers came to me, they maintained the necessity and advantage of making a special class for scoured wheat, and that was decided upon; and I hope that when the board meets in Winnipeg, they will take that into consideration, and make a special class for scoured wheat. I have taken a note of what my hon. friend says about the other things, and I will see if it is possible to get some of these classifications agreed to at the meeting that is to take place.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) deprecates anything that would give a bad name to the North-west. I need hardly say that I am entirely with him in that. The way to secure the highest possible name for the North-west is to have the North-west wheat go to the ultimate market at its own standard, and not be depreciated by being mixed with scoured wheat at Fort William. The strongest opinion has been expressed to me by the farmers against mixing scoured wheat with their wheat. And I quoted, because I knew it would weigh with the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue and with the First Minister, the statement of the late member for Winnipeg (Mr. Joseph Martin), who spoke with the greatest emphasis endorsing this proposal. I suppose that just now it is impossible to carry out what I contend for in regard to giving us permanent standards. I am very much obliged to the Controller of Inland Revenue for the sympathetic way in which he has approached the proposals I have attempted to make. I have suggested to him whether he might not be able to arrange—of course, the Minister of the Crown can do more than a private member can—whereby the farmer would be able to send his wheat direct to the old country, the ultimate market. I have myself communicated with all the parties that I thought would be able to help in this matter, and I would appeal to the Minister to give his influence in the same direction. I have here a letter from one of the most intelligent farmers in the North-west Territories. No more intelligent man is engaged in agriculture in the North-west than the writer of this letter. The communication is short:

Headnesford, August 24th, 1896.

N. F. Davin, Esq., M.P.

Sir,—The petition signed by farmers in this district that I forwarded to you at Ottawa respectfully asking you to bring it under the notice of the Government and urging upon them the necessity for them to use their influence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to grant to us the lowest possible through freight rate for wheat in bags, say for the present from Balgonie to Liverpool—the said petition was forwarded too late in the last session of Parliament for any practicable result any more than the acknowledgment of the practicability of the scheme. I again on behalf of the petitioners most respectfully ask you to bring it under the notice of the new Administration and urge upon them the necessity for them to use their good offices in urging upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the necessity for them to grant what we consider a reasonable request. Amongst the many reasons why we ask this favour are, 1st. We wish to avoid the men who are sent into the North-west to purchase wheat, because their business transactions have been with us most unsatisfactory. 2nd. We wish that the North-

west wheat may escape in future the mixing process that it has been subjected to in the past. 3rd. We are most desirous that the North-west wheat shall be placed on the English market in its pure state and there sold upon its merits. When these things are accomplished wheat growing in the North-west will become a fairly profitable industry, and it will be one of the very best means of bringing about immigration and inducing the right class of people to come to this country from Great Britain. Lastly, but not least, we are of opinion that it will be for considerable time to come the means of dispelling the clamour for the Hudson Bay Railway and it would aid very materially to increase the traffic upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. Hoping you will excuse me taking this liberty.

I remain yours,

J. HOLDEN.

I would urge the Minister to pay some attention to the suggestions of this farmer. I would also point out to him, what probably is hardly necessary to dwell upon, the wheat we send over now is highly appreciated by the English manufacturer of flour, because his wheat requires the mixture of No. 1 hard. But our wheat in its pure condition, unmixed with the scoured wheat, would be of far higher quality and would, of course, be still more highly prized and would fetch, as these gentlemen who have spoken to me on the subject say, a higher price. And the moment the manufacturers in England found they could get this high quality of wheat, they would take good care that every facility would be afforded for its transmission to them, just as in the case of the farmers of the North-west Territories, when they first attempted to send butter to British Columbia. It was not such an easy matter at first, but the very moment the merchants in Victoria found the quality of butter they could get from the North-west Territories, they secured every facility for its transmission, and the consequence was that the farmer who produced a high quality of butter, was able to send his product to the market. Now, here is another matter that will require readjustment from the hon. Minister, and that I would press upon him. It has been pressed upon my attention, not only by farmers who have spoken to me, but by my own observation. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Sproule) has also suggested it to me. Why cannot the hon. Minister get his officers to overhaul the weights used in weighing the grain of the North-west farmers? They assert to me that these weights are not true, and even if their assertion is not well founded, it is necessary to disabuse their minds of such an impression. The evil of their supposing they are cheated is just as great—and I was going to say greater, though that might seem paradoxical—as though they actually were being cheated. I would urge upon my hon. friend, who has an officer in the North-west Territories, to let him go and see that the weights used at theses elevators are correct.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend knows that is the duty of the inspectors.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, but I also know that the inspectors do not attend to this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then let them be removed.

Mr. DAVIN. It seems not to be considered to be their duty at present. I spoke to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue on the subject, and Mr. Miall said to me: "Well, that whole question of Weights and Measures in the North-west will have to be overhauled." I did not take a note of what Mr. Miall said, and I do not want the Minister to suppose that I am quoting him literally, but I understood him to say that the staff for the purpose is not sufficient, and that there would have to be some reorganization of the staff in order to accomplish what I suggested to the Minister. Well, I cannot complain of the manner in which the Controller of Inland Revenue has received the suggestions I ventured to make in moving for these papers. I will so far comply with his suggestion as to go to the office, and if the end that I have in view will be subserved by selecting from the papers, I would be most happy to do that. But meanwhile I propose that this motion shall pass.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am told that some members who have motions on the paper that we can reach in a very short time, are anxious to have an opportunity of making their motion. Suppose we go on until 11 o'clock.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly, I have no objection at all. I thought I was consulting the wishes of the House.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. CRAIG moved:

That Mr. Speaker be requested to issue an order prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors within the precincts of the House.

He said: I wish to make but very few remarks upon this motion. I have been asked why I did not move a resolution of this kind last Parliament. It has been said that then my friends were in power, and that was the time I should have made this motion. Well, I will give the same answer that I gave in speaking on the subject of prohibition last parliament; I said at that time that while perhaps it might not be practicable to have prohibition all over the country, that while

we might not agree on that, there was at least one thing on which we could agree, we might have prohibition within the precincts of this House. I said that I had sometimes thought of making a motion to that effect, and my reason for not doing so was that I was comparatively a young member of the House, and I thought it better that some older member who had been longer here than myself, should do that. However, as there are a good many members in the House now who are newer than myself, I do not feel that the same reason prevents me now from making such a motion as this. It has been said to me since the notice has been on the Paper that there is no necessity now for making this motion, that the order issued by the Speaker a few days ago accomplished all that will be accomplished by the passage of this resolution. Well, Sir, I know that such an impression has gone abroad in the country. I was a little surprised to see an editorial in the Montreal "Witness," a paper which is usually well informed; but that editorial would lead all who read it to believe that the abolition of the bar will prohibit the sale of liquor in the restaurant connected with this House. Now, Sir, I suppose that most of the members of this House, at any rate, know that such is not the case; that while it is true that the bar is closed so far as members going to the bar and obtaining drinks is concerned, yet it is also true that liquor may be obtained by going down stairs and sitting at some table there, and getting liquor at meals, or with some refreshments. Now, I do not intend to say anything with a view to taking any party advantage in this matter. I do not look upon this at all as a party question. What I want to accomplish is something which I think will be for the credit of the whole House, without respect to party at all. But it seems to me that we cannot help a little party feeling passing through our minds sometimes; and when I read this editorial in the Montreal "Witness" praising up the Liberal party for doing what the Conservative party had never done, I just thought—and I wish to give the House the benefit of my thoughts on that occasion—I thought that if the Conservative party had done what is now done by the order of the Speaker, the Montreal "Witness" would not have been so ready to give us credit. Well, I suppose that shows that although it is as it says, an independent paper, yet it has leanings in a certain direction. I do not blame them for that, but at the same time I think they could do better than write that editorial, which I have not seen contradicted or criticised, and ascertain the facts of the case and give those facts to the public. I say this in answer to remarks made to me several times that there is now no necessity for the motion I intend to move to-night. I say, further, that I happened to be at the meeting of the Dominion Alliance when it was stated that owing to the efforts of some members of the House belonging to the Liberal party, the bar was abolished, at which the members of the Alliance rejoiced very much, and I and others received the impression that the sale of liquor was to be prohibited, just as I wish it to be prohibited by my motion. But I understand that the sale of liquor is not prohibited in the restaurant of this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did you try?

Mr. CRAIG. That is rather a personal question. I wish the country to understand just how matters are, for I do not desire a false impression to go abroad on such an important question, and I think a good many people are under a false impression on this question. So I wish to repeat what I was saying when I was interrupted, that it is a fact that the sale was not prohibited within the precincts of the House by the order issued by the Speaker. I believe that the Speaker's intention was good, and I give him credit for doing what he did. I want, however, to go a little further than he went, and a good many members think with me in this matter. I wish to make a reality that which people now think is an accomplished fact, but is not. A great many of the people have gathered from what appeared in the Montreal "Witness" and the "Globe" that the sale of liquor was prohibited by the order of Mr. Speaker. That was not the case, but I wish it to be the case, for many hon. members have that impression, and I wish to make that impression a reality. That is one of the reasons I had for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. Another reason is that there is no need for liquor being sold within the precincts of this House. I have heard it stated that when the House sits to late hours some hon. members may need refreshment. Without making any inviduous reflections, I think I may say that some of the hon. members who might need refreshment when the House sits late are not those who take refreshment, but that possibly some of those who take refreshment do not need it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. CRAIG. I only say it is possible, I do not say it is so; but I wish to remove any opportunity for this to occur. While some hon. members during late sittings might require refreshment of this kind, they would be willing to deny themselves for the sake of getting rid of what is looked on as an evil by a great many people in the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You could carry a flask.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman seems to know how to do it I do not propose to interfere with carrying a flask, because that is not possible, but I do not want to take the responsibility of the flask. Another reason for my action is because of the feel-

ing in the country. There is a public feeling that the sale of liquor within the precincts of the House is not a proper thing. We find that feeling entertained by people who drink liquor, who do not call themselves temperance men. I have spoken to men who are moderate drinkers, and they have agreed with my view that while perhaps they do not see anything wrong in drinking liquor and do not believe in a prohibitory law, they hold it would be better if liquor was not sold within the precincts of the House. I submit this motion also for this reason, that I desire to free myself from all responsibility in this matter, and at the same time give other hon. members an opportunity of doing so. If the motion does not carry, I shall have done my part. I shall have brought the matter to the attention of the House, and having done that, I shall feel myself released from all responsibility; but I have an impression that the motion will carry, for while I have heard some hon. members are not in favour of a prohibitory law, they favour a motion of this kind.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not know that I agree altogether with every word that has been said on this subject by my hon. friend, but neither personally nor as head of the Government have I any objection at all to the motion being adopted, and the Government has no objection to the motion being passed. The order given by Mr. Speaker was given in a way which he thought would meet the different views held on this matter by the members. There are some who are prohibitionists, and who hold that liquor should be prohibited altogether and everywhere; there are others who believe that temperance does not necessarily mean prohibition and total abstinence. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the sale of liquor over the counter in the House of Commons was altogether improper. I am not ready to say that the sale of liquor as it was done under the order of the Speaker, and as is done in a club is of that character; it is not properly a sale of liquor, and the order of the Speaker was to the effect that liquor should be served as it is in clubs, to hon. members who wished to have it with their meals. If the sense of the House is to the contrary, if the sense of the House is, as it seems to be, that there should be no liquor at all sold within the precincts of the House of Commons, no matter in what form or way, and not only over the counter but even with meals, the Government has no objection that the motion should carry.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not prolong this discussion, but I was very strongly impressed with the importance of some such movement as is proposed by my hon. friend who has submitted this motion to the House by what occurred during last session. The fact that liquor could be obtained within the precincts of this House enabled parties to publish very strong and unjustifiable censures with respect to the character and conduct of hon. members of this House, and I think in order to avoid the possibility of any grounds for such censures as were then published, and very extravagant censures they were, it is almost necessary to adopt the measure which has been proposed by my hon. friend. I shall certainly support the motion. I understand, Sir, that the same conditions existed under the late Speaker as would exist under your recent order. I understand that Mr. White when he occupied the position of Speaker gave instructions that no liquor should be sold at the bar, and in fact closed the bar. But the fact of liquor being allowed in connection with meals or refreshments, makes it an extremely difficult thing to promote that temperance which both you and the late Speaker have aimed at. At all events it has not protected the House from severe animadversions on the part of the press, and on public platforms throughout the country. In my own judgment I do not believe it would be possible to collect an equal number of gentlemen in any part of this country, or in any other country, amongst whom temperance is more uniformly the rule. I do not believe it would be possible to find a Parliament anywhere where greater self restrainst is exhibited on the part of its members. I have had the opportunity of seeing Parliaments in other lands, and in my judgment the conduct of members of this House of Commons, in respect to temperance, compares most favourably with that of the members of any deliberate assembly in any part of the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the present occasion I am mainly influenced by the desire to protect the members of this House from such aspersions as have been cast upon them—I think most undeservedly—and which it is not unlikely may be repeated unless we adopt the stringent rule proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) of preventing any intoxicating drink being sold within the precincts of this House.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a resolution of this kind is of little importance, unless the rule is carried out in its entirety. I have been informed that there are other places, not under the control of this House, where liquor can be purchased and, if that be the case, it seems to me that we are not stopping the overflow, if there is such a thing, but that we are merely transferring from one part of the Parliament building to the other the traffic which is supposed to be carried on. If an effort is to be made in real earnest to stop what is undoubtedly an evil, then the matter should be carried further than it can be carried by the resolution offered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig). It only applies to

places under the control of this House. We may pass this resolution, but, if the sale of liquor is permitted in another part of the building, nothing more will be accomplished, Sir, than what was accomplished by your first order.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF LATE GOVERNMENT —CORRESPONDENCE WITH HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I take this opportunity of asking if I shall receive at the next sitting of the House the further papers that are absolutely necessary in connection with the correspondence with His Excellency the Governor General.

The PRIME MINISTER. I can assure my hon. friend that I am making every effort to have these papers brought down at the earliest possible moment. The work of classification of the many Orders has been so great that it has necessitated delay. I will make an effort to have them brought down to-morrow, and I am pretty sure I shall succeed.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports and correspondence respecting the appointment and dismissal of the sub-agents of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the port of Pictou.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Copies of all reports and correspondence and the reasons for the dismissal of Mr. Daniel McLean, captain of the Pictou Island life boat, and the appointment of Alexander Currie.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Copy of all correspondence and the Order in Council of the 11th July, 1890, by which a grant of land in the town of Revelstoke was made to the Kootenay Smelting and Trading Company. —(Mr. Bostock).

Copy of all correspondence in connection with all grants of land in the town of Revelstoke to J. A. Mara, ex-member for Yale and Cariboo, and the Order in Council under which the said grants were made.—(Mr. Bostock).

Copy of all correspondence in connection with grants of land within the railway belt in British Columbia made by the province subsequent to the date when the lands in the belt passed under control of the Government of Canada, and of the Orders in Council of the 29th March, 1895, and the 6th December, 1895, setting forth terms of the agreement between the Government of Canada and the province of British Columbia, acting on behalf of the grantees.—(Mr. Bostock).

Return of all papers, plans and documents relating to the acquisition by the Brockville and Ottawa Railway of what was formerly the Soldiers' Island, opposite the town of Brockville, and relating to the rights acquired by the said company (if any) to obstruct the navigation of the St. Lawrence River between the said island and the town of Brockville.—(Mr. Wood).

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—SALE OF LIQUORS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to mention to the House that in accordance to the resolution unanimously passed yesterday with respect to the abolition of the supply of liquor within the precincts of the House of Commons, I have given the most stringent and absolute directions that that order shall be carried out.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he proposes to bring down during the present session any Supplementary Estimates, and when we may hope to receive them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am afraid we will not be able to dispose of the business of the session without bringing down Supplementary Estimates. I am really unable to state the precise day on which they will be submitted, but that day will be within the period when the hon. gentleman was in the habit of bringing down Supplementaries, and therefore I trust he will not deem it too late a period. We are very desirous to bring them down at a very early day, and we shall do our best to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will follow my example for the last few years he will not bring them down any Supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am very much afraid that if I copied the hon. gentleman's example during the past few years, I would very soon find myself in his place.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank the hon. gentleman for the admission.

PORTFOLIO OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to draw the attention of the First Minister to the question asked by me some time ago, and to which I had hoped to have received more explicit information from the hon. gentleman by this time, and that is in regard to the Department of the Interior. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has made any progress, and when we may hope to have the portfolio of that important department filled ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). We are making progress every day, but we have not reached a conclusion yet. I hope, however, to do so within a very short time.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I wish to make an intimation as to a course of action to which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will agree. It is well known that there are important departments of the public service for which no provision whatever has been made for the current year, and as a consequence all expenditures are necessarily suspended. There is a class of expenditure, namely, salaries and emoluments payable to various employees, for which provision was made during two months by Governor General's warrants; but now we have reached the third month, and it will be necessary in one form or another that we should be in possession of funds to meet very pressing claims, such as the House will recognize. I therefore propose to ask the unanimous concurrence of the House in the resolutions already agreed to in Committee of Supply, and as regards the balance of the items I propose to ask for a vote on account to the extent of one-tenth of the amount of each item with which the committee has not yet dealt. If that suggestion meets with favour of hon. gentlemen opposite, I hope to be able by such a course to provide for the expenditures urgently necessary, and which I presume hon. gentlemen opposite would not wish to delay.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman means to proceed on Thursday.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

RETURNS.

Mr. GILLIES. I desire to ask when will the Postmaster General lay on the Table papers connected with the Morrison contract for the carriage of mails between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). On Friday last I instructed that the papers be prepared. They have not been handed to me by the deputy, but I will make inquiries in the department to-day.

THE OLIVER EQUIPMENT.

Mr. TISDALE. I desire to call attention to a matter which came to my notice yesterday. I find in the "World" of the 14th, the following:—

> The Government has cancelled the Order in Council passed by the late Ministry authorizing the payment of $5,000 for the purchase of the patent rights to Oliver's infantry equipment. General Gascoigne has made a recommendation that as tests are now taking place in England, and as improvements are also being made in the equipment, it is inadvisable to make any purchase at present.

I wish to say that an Order in Council was passed, which I introduced in Council, authorizing the purchase of the Oliver equipment for $5,000. The vendee wanted $10,000. Before the order was passed I consulted the Major General commanding and he approved of it, and the purchase at $5,000 was under these circumstances authorized. I regret very much that the Government have seen fit to cancel this order, because it was conceded on all hands that it was a most excellent equipment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot go into any argument on a statement at this stage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The matter might be postponed until the motion is made to go into Supply.

Mr. TISDALE. I understood the motion had been made.

BLOCKADE AT GALOPS CANAL.

Mr. QUINN. I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to a meeting held in Montreal yesterday of the Montreal Corn Exchange Association. This meeting was occasioned by the serious detention of crafts at Galops Canal owing to the low water, the result of which is that ocean vessels are detained at Montreal and are unable to proceed. The canal is blocked by obstructions, and the request of the Montreal Corn Exchange is that attention be given to it immediately in order to secure, if possible, nine feet of water in the channel there so as to allow vessels to pass through. There is also a request that instructions be given to the lockmaster at the lift lock, Cardinal Canal, to pass vessels down and up that lock on Sunday for the remainder of the season. I call attention to this matter as one of great importance to the trade of Canada, and I trust these obstructions will be removed as soon as possible so that vessels will be able to reach Montreal in order that ocean vessels may not be detained for want of cargoes.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is not in his seat at the moment, but I will call his attention to the matter referred to by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope when the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals is called to this matter the Government will not see fit to grant the request that the Lord's Day be desecrated by having canals open on the Sabbath. The policy of the Government has always been to keep canals closed on the Sabbath, and there is no argument in favour of opening the canals on that day that cannot be justified in regard to permitting labour of any other kind on that day.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. TISDALE. As the Minister of Militia is not in his place, I will call attention to the Oliver equipment matter at another time.

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

(In the Committee.)

Archives $6,000

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to carry on the collection of archives as formerly, and continue the copying of the manuscript documents in London and Paris ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). It is proposed to carry that on much in the same way as has been done. There have been some expenditures in Paris, which will probably be less in the future.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Privy Council, the State Department and the Department of Agriculture are engaged in the collection of these archives. Have any steps been taken to unite their work in this matter, as was proposed by the late Government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Up to the present time I have not had an opportunity of looking into this matter, but I will do so on an early occasion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will find on record a memo. with regard to that.

Patent Record $9,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will the cuts in the "Record" be executed by the Printing Department, as is done at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The "Record" has been in the hands of the Printing Department, but the cuts have been printed in the office of the Montreal "Gazette," and I do not propose to continue that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is hardly right. I think, last year they were done by the Printing Department here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My information with regard to that does not accord with that of the late Finance Minister.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman require some new plant for that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That will be a matter for consideration by the Printing Department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Had the Minister a report of his chief officers in connection with that before he announced his policy ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not yet announced my policy, except that I do not intend to have them printed in future in the Montreal "Gazette" office.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman have them done in the Printing Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say.

Statistical Year-Book $4,000

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask the hon. the Minister why he makes a reduction of $2,200 a year in this vote. Is it his intention to get out a larger number of these books than have been circulated formerly ? It is a very valuable work, and is used in our schools largely at the present time. We find it impossible to supply more than a small fraction of the number who apply for it. It would be advisable, in my opinion, to get out a larger number of copies of this book than we have been accustomed to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Statistical Year-Book has been an increasingly large publication. Next year I propose to decrease the size and bulk of this volume. I have not yet had an opportunity of going into the exact way in which that will be brought about. I would also inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that for the past two years the vote in the Main Estimates has not been sufficient to cover the expenses of the book, and it has had to be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates. I trust that this year I shall be able so to reduce the bulk of the volume, without in any way impairing its efficiency, or decreasing the amount of valuable information in it, as will enable me to bring the expense within the vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to issue a larger number, or the same number ? I think it would be desirable to issue a larger number.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a matter which I have not yet had under consideration, but I trust that we shall be able to get out a sufficient number to supply all proper applications.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear the hon. Minister state that he hopes to decrease the volume of this book ; but I join with my hon. friend opposite in the opinion that the book properly compiled is a most valuable document, and that the hon. Minister, consistent with the reduction in size, might probably be able to issue an increased number. We can easily dispense with the comments on the facts which we have been accustomed to see in that book, but we cannot dispense very well with the tabulated statements of facts which are found there and cannot be found anywhere else. I do not think there is a book in greater demand, or one that gives a better idea of the condition

of the country, than the Statistical Year-Book, properly compiled.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister urged despatch with these estimates on the ground that they were estimates prepared by the late Government, and that therefore we ought not to criticise them. I notice that my hon. friend takes credit for the decrease of the vote. The vote is not decreased from the estimate which I brought down. I quite agree that the volume of the Statistical Year-Book had grown too bulky and, while the Minister of Agriculture was away last year and I occupied that position, I issued an order that it should not exceed a certain number of pages, and made my estimate accordingly. I think the book had grown so bulky as to defeat its own object, and an improvement in that respect is desirable.

Experimental Farms $75,000

Mr. DOMVILLE. Before this is carried, I would like to say a word to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. I was amazed to see an experimental farm for the information of the farmers of this country, with a mansion for one of the employees to live in. I can see my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) looking at me. He seems to have an idea that whenever I rise I have something to bring out with regard to him; but I have no intention of saying anything that will shock him. We hear talk of economy, and yet we see a mansion on the experimental farm for one of the employees. As a representative of an agricultural constituency, I hope the Government will see some way to reduce the expenditure on this farm.

Mr. BERGERON. Not to burn it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I thought my hon. friend said to burn it. I have known my hon. friend a long while, and I hope he will not find fault with me for expressing my opinion on this matter. I think it is a perfect disgrace to the country that the public money should be expended in building what may be termed mansions for employees. I do not know the name of the gentleman or anything about him; but I cannot see how any gentleman, on the salary granted to him by Parliament, could live in a mansion like that, and keep it going.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will take quickly and seriously to heart the very strong advice given him by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. After that plea, I think he can hardly ask for the $75,000. Say $72,000.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend is very good in his reply. I was only suggesting to the Minister that he should abandon the precedents of his predecessors. Perhaps it would be a good plan for him to lease the farm to some of his friends for a trifle; then he could have all those buildings on it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the vote for the farm is too large; neither do I think that the houses are more than what are required for the staff, nor that any one who has really the interests of agriculture at heart will object to this vote. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has decided on the appointment of an agriculturist?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not decided on the appointment of any agriculturist. There is an application in the department for that position, but up to the present ttime I have had no opportunity to consider the question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister answer me another question—whether he intends to enlarge the bee department and to appoint an apiarist?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope to be able, in some little changes which I purpose to make with regard to the work on the farm, to give a little more encouragement to bee culture in this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not, I think, as satisfactory an answer as the House would like. I believe there is no department in which the farm could be made more useful than in the encouragement of bee-keeping, a subject not as well known to the farmers as some other auxiliary branches of agriculture. In the preparation of these estimates it was intended that there should be sufficient funds, by a re-arrangement of the expenses, to appoint an apiarist and to extend the work of the bee department, and I trust that the hon. gentleman will be able to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. A suggestion was thrown out last year which I think was in the right direction, that is, that a suitable building should be provided in which the crowds of people who visit the farm in the summer time could be sheltered from the weather in the event of a sudden rain storm. It was strongly urged that a building, supplied with seats and with water for the convenience and comfort of the visitors, should be erected; but I see that nothing has been done in that direction. I would like to say a word with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville). To my mind there is no money voted by the Parliament of Canada spent to better purpose than that voted for the experimental farm. I think that the great difficulty heretofore has been that there has been too much economy in connection with that farm. More money could be spent to good advantage, and I believe the great interest of agriculture demands that there should be a much more lavish expenditure on that farm in the future. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the buildings there are mansions. It is an easy matter to create that impression on the minds of people who have never seen them; but I think the buildings

are of moderate dimensions consistent with comfort and convenience, and the gentlemen who occupy tham have done so not only with credit to themselves, but with advantage to the country.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would like to ask my hon. friend what an ordinary farmer who made his living by farming, and not by talking, or as a politician, would say if he saw a man teaching farmers how to farm, and living in a house like that?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman travels throughout the country, he will find many farmers living in buildings quite as expensive as those on the Experimental Farm.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not find fault with the work of the gentleman who has charge of the farm. It apparently is well done. As I drove through the farm, it seems a good-looking farm, and there were a good many nice looking plants around, but I ask why this country should be asked to pay for a building such as the gentleman who managed that farm lives in, and how he could possibly live there on his salary. He must have means outside his salary to keep that building up. I say that the principle is bad. It does not look as if the authorities were trying to teach the farming community how to farm economically.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman know what the building cost?

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that there are barns within fifty miles of the farm which have cost as much as the most expensive building on it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not know what it cost, but it must have cost many thousands of dollars. If we are to teach our farmers, by means of this experimental farm, how they can best employ their small means and muscles, we will have to set a better precedent and example. It is a very bad example to set them when we tax our people in order to provide our employees with such buildings as that.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I wish to take occasion of the debate on the vote for the Experimental Farm now before this committee to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to that portion of the organization of the farm which more particularly concerns the province of Quebec. The service I wish to refer to is that of the correspondence. As we have no experimental farm in the province of Quebec, we have to apply directly to the Ottawa Central Farm. Now, I dare say that, such as organized at present, that farm serves no purpose, so far as the French Canadian farmers are concerned. I believe that the staff of French-speaking clerks is not large enough. I understand that there are only three or four French-speaking employees at the farm. Now, I do not wish my remarks to be construed as reflecting on the way in which those employees discharge their duties. I believe that they do their best, but they are not numerous enough to enable them rendering all the services which the French Canadian farmers have a right to expect from the farm. I know that there is a considerable French correspondence, but it cannot be helped, if the French-speaking people mean to share in the benefits it was intended should be conferred upon the farming community. Now, that correspondence is attended to by only three or four clerks in all, who, however, expedite the business to the best of their ability. And that is the reason why letters remain without a reply for whole weeks and months. That is the grievance generally complained of throughout the province. Our French Canadian farmers state on good ground that for them to apply for information to the Experimental Farm is simply wasting paper, as no reply is vouchsafed to their letters. The province of Quebec contributes her full share of the expenditure incurred for the maintenance of the farm, and I do not think it is asking too much that the service be so organized as to have the correspondence and the inquiries by letter coming from the French portion of the country promptly attended to. I think the Government ought to select a man well qualified to attend to that correspondence, and he ought to be put at the head of a special service. He should be authorized also to employ as many French Canadian clerks as would be required in order to despatch the business in connection with that correspondence. A separate branch should be established in which that correspondence would be attended to. By that means, the expenditure incurred for the maintenance of the Ottawa Experimental Farm would give more satisfactory results and those results, I maintain, can only be reached through the means I have just alluded to.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. Minister any reply to my question as to whether or not he thought of erecting a building for the accommodation of excursionists to the farm?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That question has been brought before me by the officials, and I hope to make some provision. I might say that the number of buildings on the farm and their extent is already very large, and the expense of maintaining them very great, and I think it would be possible, without adding to them, to make such accommodation as the hon. gentleman suggests. I trust I will be able to do so without incurring the cost of a new building.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not desire to prolong discussion, but I cannot forbear saying that that it is an opinion pretty well entertained

among those most interested in this experiment, and for whose special benefit it was designed, that the experiment is a pretty expensive one. The farmers generally are inclined to believe that we are making an outlay upon those experimental farms which has hardly been warranted by the benefits conferred upon them; and for my part, I cannot forbear urging upon the Minister of Agriculture the desirability of economizing in every way possible, and not allowing the very large expenditure which has already been reached, to be increased in the future.

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite admit that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has not had time yet to thoroughly investigate the whole expenditure so as to enable him to make what we earnestly hope he will, considerable reductions in the annual expenditure of this farm. There are many things that could be well dispensed with. I understand that we are paying a very considerable sum for the supply of water from the city. I would like to know what that amounts to annually. There are other contracts which have been entered into and which add very considerably to the expense. I hope that when the hon. Minister comes to Parliament next year with his Estimates, he will be able to report a very considerable reduction. From the establishment of this farm down to the present time, very extravagant notions have been carried out, and I would suggest that every item of expenditure which can be dispensed with should be avoided. Of course, we have at present to give the hon. Minister a fair opportunity of thoroughly investigating the whole subject, and it would not be fair to expect any changes until he has been able to make a thorough study of the whole business.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with some of those who think that we have not hitherto had the value of our expenditure on the experimental farm, but I cannot quite agree with the assumption that the expenditure ought to be very largely reduced. I am the more inclined to the view that, while the farming community require that considerable expenditure should be made on these farms, we ought to get a great deal more value from them than we do. That is the view of the question which I would rather press on the hon. Minister. It is not so much undue economy in the management that we require as the obtaining of much better value for what we do spend. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is quite correct in saying that extravagant ideas have prevailed, and that is naturally accounted for when we remember that the management of these experimental farms as part of the Department of Agriculture has been in the hands of people who were not farmers and did not understand farming. They are making unpractical experiments, and, without intending to be extravagant, were spending more money than was necessary without being able to show value for it. We have had a lawyer, a brewer and a doctor try their hands at its management, and the success has not naturally come up to our expectation. But now our farmers feel that we have at last a practical man in charge of the farm. I am not inclined to bother him much with advice at present. I rather think he knows as much about the matter as I do and a great deal more than most people. With my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I am in hopes of seeing next year estimates that will look much more like real and practical progress than any we have seen for some years past.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). I do not like the experimental farm to be left without a fair hearing. I believe that, on careful inquiry, it will be found that the distinguished men who are at the head of that institution, each of whom was chosen for certain special qualifications, have really rendered great service. For my own part, there are certain questions in which I take a deep interest, particularly in matters relating to forestry and certainly most useful experiments have been made by these gentlemen in that line. So what I would like my hon. friends to do would be to wait until inquiry has established whether really we do not get good value from the expenditure that is made upon the experimental farm.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to suggest, after the criticism of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), that we should follow the course adopted in Ontario and put the farm into the hands of a commission. It would seem that they found it impossible to get a farmer to manage a farm discreetly and wisely, so they put it under the control of a commission and appointed a number of farmers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire only to say a word, which I think is due from me in justice to the officers of the farm. I am satisfied that the gentlemen who have spoken, are of opinion that we do not get value for the money spent; I am equally satisfied that those who find fault with the work that has been done are, to a certain extent, unacquainted with that work. Take the work of some of the departments—take, for instance, the department of the entomologist, take the work done in forestry experiments, to which the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue has referred; take the work in connection with the dairy which has been done by Professor Robertson; take the work done by Professor Saunders in testing seeds—and I think you will find that the farmers of Canada thoroughly appreciate the results achieved. Of course, the farm has not been established a great many years, and there had to be much capital expenditure at first;

but, so far as the work done is concerned, I am satisfied that those who investigate it, will find that it has been faithful, honest and effective work for the farmers of Canada. I am perfectly satisfied, also, that, when my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture comes to investigate the work and the means provided for accomplishing it, while he may make changes here and there, he will find, at least, that no extravagance has been permitted, and that the money voted year after year has not been too much to secure effective and useful work on the part of the farm in the interest of the farmers of Canada. As to the statement of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that novices have hitherto been in charge of the Department of Agriculture, and that now a change has taken place, I may say that I have the greatest possible faith in the new Minister of Agriculture, more especially since these Estimates bear evidence of the fact that all the changes that I made in the department have received his certificate of value, because he proposes to carry them out.

Mr. McMILLAN. I desire to say a word before the vote for the Experimental Farm is passed. When it was proposed to establish these experimental farms, it was stated that the Central Farm would be established and fully equipped for $160,000. When they made that statement, the Government certainly could not have known what they were going to do, for the buildings alone, to say nothing about other improvements, represent a total expenditure of between $150,000 and $160,000. I was much astonished at the remarks of the late Minister of Agriculture; they show us what a loss the country has suffered by having gentlemen at the head of the Agriculture Department who did not understand the business. He says that the Experimental Farm should increase the department of bee-keeping. The first thing they ought to do is to make thoroughly effective the departments that have been established. They have established a large stock of cattle on the farm, and what have we, the farmers of Canada, benefited by the experiments that have taken place with all these cattle? Large sums of money have been spent to encourage the dairy industry, bpt I would ask my farmer in this room, or any farmer in this country who has received the report of that farm, whether that report has been of any benefit to the farmers with respect to the dairy that has been established there; whether the department has gone in and shown us how a farmer should go to work to establish a good herd of dairy cows, which lies at the foundation of all solid dairying; whether it has shown to us what is required in order to keep a herd, the cost of a herd for a single year—which they certainly had a good opportunity of learning there—whether they have shown us how much could be made on each animal, what is the best way to keep the animals, and so on. I say that the report is without value upon this, one of the most important phases of farming in Canada at the present time. For two years or more this has been the case. In the last report we have not a single word about the number of cattle kept, the number of cows kept, or the amount that can be realized from each animal. If we had no example in the Dominion of this work being done, we might say that the Experimental Farm was doing good work. But let me point to the case of the farm established at Guelph. In the report of that institution you will get the number of cows kept, the weight of each animal, the number of days each animal is in milk, the quantity of milk given by each, the quantity of butter that can be manufactured, the cost of keeping the animals, and what is actually realized from the product. That is what we want to get from an experimental farm. And let me say that I have urged, year after year, that the farm proper ought to be separated from the experiment plots, from the department of experiment in forestry, from the horticultural department and all other experimental departments. We can never expect an experimental department to be self-sustaining. And yet we know that it is one of the most important departments. A good deal has been done on this farm in the way of experiments. But, when we come to the farm proper, we want that set apart by itself, and want to know the exact amount—which the report of the farm at Guelph shows—the exact amount grown upon the farm and the revenue derived from it. The report of the farm manager at Guelph shows conclusively that, now that he has got the farm in good working order, he is able to show a surplus over the working expenses of the farm proper. As a farmer, I pay more attention to the field crop and what can be realized from it, and what can be realized from the stock, than I do to what can be done on the experimental plot; because I know that, when experimental plots are dealt with, great care is exercised with them, and they show a very much larger yield than can be gained upon a whole farm. There is one thing I have certainly found fault with before, and I do it again to-day, I care not who thinks I am wrong—I refer to the amount spent for manure put upon the farm. The farmers of Canada are thrown upon their own resources; the manure put upon each farm must be made upon the farm. What are the facts with respect to this farm? In the report that I called for last year it was stated that no less than $12,700 had been spent in manure and fertilizers on that farm; while the revenue from the whole farm during the whole time it has been in existence, has only been $20,000, leaving something less than $8,000 revenue from the farm after the manure was paid for. Now, I say it is not a benefit to the farmers of this country to know what can be done on a cer-

tain quantity of land if two-thirds of the value of all that was raised upon that farm is spent upon manure to be put on the farm. I am pleased to think that we have a practical farmer in the Agriculture Department; and I hope he will divide all the different sections on that farm in the same way they are divided on the agricultural farm at Guelph, where the sections devoted to experiments are entirely separated from each other. On the Ontario farm there is a thoroughly practical man at the head of the experimental work, who keeps a separate account of every lot and of every experiment that is made. But he has full control of it; while here in Ottawa the director of the farm is a gentleman who never was a farmer himself. He is, I believe, an excellent individual, and one that will not make a statement that he does not believe to be entirely correct; so that in any criticisms I may make I do not wish to be understood as trying to belittle Professor Saunders. But I say it is impossible for any man, I care not what his theory may be in farming or stock keeping, efficiently to conduct a farm like that unless he is himself a thoroughly practicable farmer. Unless he be such he cannot conduct that farm in such a manner as that the farmers of this country may be largely benefited through it. Now, when these farms were established we were told that $35,000 was the very utmost it would require annually to keep them running. Go back to the "Hansard," and you will find that the then Minister of Agriculture stated that he would give his guarantee that it would not require more than $200,000 to establish this farm. Well, we find that it has cost pretty well up to $300,000 to establish this farm in the condition it is in at the present time. Let me say that the different departments on this farm should not be extended until such time as they are put upon an efficient basis, which I fear not to state is not the case to-day. I can say of the gentleman who is in care of the stock, that I have gone over the farm frequently and have never found that the stock was not thoroughly cared for.

But we want an individual at the head of that farm who is a practical farmer, who knows what farming really is, who knows what should be done, and what can be done. What benefit is it to us to know that in labour alone there are over $3,000 spent upon the farm proper, when the revenue from the whole farm is only somewhat over $3,700? When we take the item of the care of stock alone, there are over $5,000 spent for labour, and the revenue is only a little over three thousand dollars. This is not as it should be. Therefore I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will begin at the beginning and reorganize the whole institution. I see there is another building going up there. I was out and examined that building, and was told that it was for the purpose of establishing a herd of sheep. Now, to establish a herd of sheep upon that farm will require an expenditure considerably more than that building will cost, because the farm in its present condition is not fit for establishing a herd of sheep. I am convinced that in the province of Ontario to-day the best breeders have done more in that direction than can be done on the Central Experimental Farm for the next twenty years. In the present condition of that farm, it would only be throwing away money to establish a herd of sheep there. I would like to have the Minister get a proper herd of cows and see what can really be done in making butter from that dairy, and putting it upon the English market, so that the farmers may see what a thoroughly equipped institution of that kind can do in this respect. I do not think that the butter from this farm has ever yet been sent to the old country market. I think that when we are spending such large sums of money on a Government institution, furnished with all the appliances, and conducted with the best skill the Government can secure, that should be one of the first things to engage the attention of the department. They should have taken the herd that was there and have shown what could be done, and what the farm can realize from butter put upon the British market. That would be a point of great importance to the farmers, it would have been a good example to them, but we have had no such example up to the present time.

In going over that farm lately, I was well pleased with the condition the farm proper was in. It was really in a neat condition, and well kept, so that I will give the foreman credit for that. But there was one thing on that farm I did not like, and that was the orchard. I do not know who has charge of the orchard. We have heard a good deal about the orchard upon that farm. I must say it was in a disgraceful condition, and I must suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he should place at the head of that department a thoroughly practical gardener. Do not put it into the hands of any professor. I have had a little experience in that line, and my experience has been that wherever you put practical work into the hands of professors, that work is neglected and does not do the farm credit. I must say that the orchard upon the Experimental Farm does not do credit to whoever has had charge of it. I drew the foreman's attention to it, and all I could get out of him was that it was not under his care, and I was happy that such was the case. In the present Minister of Agriculture I believe that we have got the right man in the right place, and I think that if he is properly supported by the people of this country, and by the farmers of this country, in a few years he will show us such results that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, especially those who have pretended to fill the Department of Minister of Agriculture, will sink their heads in shame when they compare those results with what they have done.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is clear that the leader of the Government made a mistake in selecting his Minister of Agriculture. Although the hon. gentleman who just spoke is too modest to say so, yet the indirect eulogies that he bestowed upon what has been done on the farm at Guelph, were indirectly pronounced upon himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I am in order in showing what has been done on the farm at Guelph. And when this House knows that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) was on the board of management of that farm for a long time, of course he was indirectly advertising his own ability.

Mr. McMILLAN. I had no reference to that whatever. Here is the report, where the hon. gentleman can see the facts for himself.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman feels sensitive upon this subject, no doubt, as he also does upon the selection of the Minister of Agriculture. Now, the hon. gentleman has said a few things that may be worth referring to. He said he was pleased that a practical farmer has been selected as Minister of Agriculture, because nothing but a practical farmer, in his estimation, could fill the bill. Well, he has told us what has been done on the farm at Guelph, and I would like to ask him if there is a practical farmer at the head of that institution; if Professor Mills is any more of a practical farmer than Professor Saunders?

Mr. McMILLAN. I will answer that question. It is Mr. Rennie who has full charge of that farm, and not Mr. Mills. Mr. Rennie is a practical farmer, and it was between him and his brother as to who would take the gold medal offered for the best farm.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman forgets that it is only a very short time ago that Mr. Rennie was appointed, and that all the practical farmers who have been employed to manage that farm up there have been obliged to change their manager every few years.

Mr. WALLACE. Permit me to remind the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) that Mr. Rennie is a seedsman in Toronto, and has been for the last thirty years.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that if the selection there was so good, and the results so beneficial to the farmers, we cannot forget the fact that the manager of the farm has been changed three of four times since it was started; and that while it was at first under one manager, it was afterwards put under a board of management selected from the agriculturists of the province, one of whom was the hon. member who has just addressed the House; so that the panegyric which he passed upon the management of that farm, was indirectly passed upon himself. But notwithstanding those facts with regard to the Guelph farm, the management of the agricultural farm at Ottawa has been under one man since it commenced, and it will be admitted, especially by intelligent farmers, that he has done admirable work and the Government have not been obliged to change the manager every few years, as has been done at the Guelph farm. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has stated that what is desirable is to show what can be done with a herd of cattle. The hon. gentleman cannot be so poorly informed that he does not know that a herd of cattle is kept at the Experimental Farm here and that data are collected, for example, as to how many cattle can be kept on forty or fifty acres, and I may say they have been keeping twenty-five head on forty acres and trying to keep thirty head. All the data are collected so as to enable any farmer to secure similar results. Experiments are made to ascertain what food is best for dairying, for fattening and for ordinary purposes, and these experiments are carried on in a most intelligent way. The value of the results is evident by the demand for these reports by the farmers. While we have been endeavouring to get the House to vote more money in order to secure a larger distribution of these reports, complaints have been constantly received from farmers that a larger number of these reports should be issued. Experiments have been carried on with respect to seeds; as to the proper time for seeding, what kinds of grain are preferable for certain soils and certain climates; changing seeds from one part of the country to another; and the farm has inaugurated a system known as hybernation by which the country is getting new seeds. The hon. gentleman is aware of these facts, because he has been a member of the Agriculture Committee from year to year, and he has not raised any complaints but has acknowledged the value of this information to the farmer and the excellent work carried on at the farm. With respect to dairying, no man will refuse to admit that we have perhaps the most competent dairy superintendent in any part of the Dominion, and, I might say, over the continent of America. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do the value of the Dairy Commissioner, whose work is known not only through this country but the continent, and it is admitted that no better man could be selected for this most important work. It cannot be denied that this work is being conducted on most intelligent lines and that the information secured is valuable to agriculturists. With respect to bee-keeping, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) seems to consider that line to be of little value; but it produces $800,000 a year at very little outlay. In my opinion if the present Minister of Agriculture does what is the very best for the people, he will place in charge of

that branch a man who will develop it as much as possible, as it is one in which much money can be made with very little outlay, and that is what the farmer wants. With regard to the development of sheep raising, the hon. gentleman has said that the farmers of Ontario and the Agricultural College at Guelph have done more in that line than the Experimental Farm.

Mr. McMILLAN. I did not mention the Agricultural College at Guelph, but I mentioned the farmers.

Mr. SPROULE. Those efforts have been confined to one province, and there are many other provinces which have not benefited by information on that subject as have the farmers of Ontario, and while this House is voting the money of the Dominion, it is proper that the information selected should be distributed in every province. In the province of Quebec the farmers were far behind those of Ontario in dairying, especially in cheese-making, but during the last few years they have improved so rapidly that to-day they are on a par with the most intelligent dairying of Ontario. This is due to the valuable information disseminated through the Experimental Farm here. No one can fail to have been proud of the position we occupied at the World's Fair at Chicago where we took 95 per cent of all the prizes for cheese. Much of this success must be attributed to the valuable information disseminated from the headquarters at Ottawa by which the dairymen of Quebec and Prince Edward Island, and also of Ontario have benefited, not to say anything in regard to Manitoba and the North-west. When we remember these facts it is unfair to say that the Experimental Farm is serving no good purpose, that there is not an intelligent or proper man at the head of it, and that a change should be made in the interest of the people. I do not think so. All my information leads me to the conviction that there is not a man at the head of any branch who is not admirably adapted for the work, and that in all human probability men less competent would be introduced if a change were made. The men there are the right men in the right place, and they should receive every encouragement for the valuable work done on the farm in the past.

. The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I desire to say a word or two in reply to the hon. member's remarks. No one in this House appreciates more fully than I do the importance and value of the work that has been done by the experimental farms in this country. I may in that connection say that I was a member of a committee of this House on whose report the establishment of these farms was based and in consequence of whose report the experimental farms to-day are in existence in Canada. The work of this farm at Ottawa is of the greatest value to agriculturists of this country. A large amount of most valuable information has been collected by the officials and placed at the disposal of the practical farmers in the country, information which it is impossible for the farmers, with their ordinary facilities and ordinary training, to obtain for themselves. By reason of the employment at that farm of men trained to special work by scientific training and possessing the highest scientific qualifications, there is placed at the disposal of our people information of the most valuable character, information which is valued not only in Canada but in the United States, and even in England. I will say a word, and I do it very gladly, on behalf of the staff, the officials of this farm. For a number of years, ever since the establishment of the farm, I had been myself in close personal touch, as a farmer, with those officials, and I must say a word in praise of their universal courtesy, their devotion to their work and their competency for that work in the scientific branches to which I have alluded. The work of the farm is of a two-fold nature, and it would be well for hon. members and the country at large in speaking of this farm to remember this fact. In the first place, it is esentially an experimental farm, on which and through which experiments are made for the benefit of the farmers of the country. In the second place, it is a large farm, it covers a large area of cultivated land which has to be managed and dealt with by a practical farmer in a practical way. At the time of the inception of these farms, I myself protested against the extent of the land acquired, not only in Ottawa, but at the branch farms, because I believed a much smaller area was necessary for experimental work, and the other kind of work might very well be left to the practical farmers of the country to be dealt with. That opinion, however, was not adopted by the House or by the Administration, and the result is that to-day we have this large farm at Ottawa and other large farms at Nappan, N. S., Brandon, Man., Indian Head, N.W.T., and Agassiz, B.C. The vote under consideration is for the carrying on of all these establishments, and consequently it requires to be a very large one. As I have stated, I do not think that such large farms were necessary for experimental work, but in consequence of their size the expenditure had to be much larger than it otherwise would be. The House can quite understand that in the short time I have had the position which I now occupy it has been impossible for me to undertake to make any radical, or even small, reforms in the management of such large establishments as these five farms are. However, I beg to at once thank the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) for the practical suggestions he has made in regard to the reforms which might be carried on in connection with these farms. The hon. gentleman has a long time been a member of this House, and he has so frequently discussed agricultural matters

here with an ability gained by experience not only in his own province, but all over the Dominion, that it is unnecessary for me to say one word as to the ripeness of his judgment on agricultural matters. I know that the suggestions which come from him are very valuable. The hon. member (Mr. McMillan) is a practical farmer, and has demonstrated through his work on his own farm, his practical knowledge of agriculture. I trust and hope to be able in a short time to carry out some of the suggestions that have been made in the House. I can assure hon. members who have made those suggestions, that I am glad indeed to receive them from both sides of the House, because I am satisfied that gentlemen on both sides have but one object in view, and that is, the benefit to and the interest of the agriculturists of this country. With regard to the orchards on the Central Farm, to which reference has been made, it is simply a matter of justice to state that last winter was unusually severe upon orchard trees in this part of the country. The result has been a very great injury to the orchards on the farm, a result which is common to other orchards all over this section of the country. I regret extremely that the orchard is in the condition it is, but I trust that we will be able to establish a very good orchard there, by replacing the trees which have been hurt, and by choosing such trees as will stand the severity of the climate which is here notorious.

There is another thing which I trust will be able to be brought about on those farms, and which has not apparently received the attention of former Ministers of Agriculture. I refer to an effort to show in some sense and in some way how land can be treated in this country so as to bring a profit to the individual handling it. In saying this, I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the former management of the farm. I believe that in this country, where we have in the last few years spent enormous sums and devoted a great deal of attention to the completion of the manufacturing side of the products which we produce, not enough attention has been paid to the cultivation of the soil and the production of the fruits of the soil which we require for that after treatment. I trust that in the near future I will be able to arrange some work upon the central farm and upon the other experimental farms, which will show to the people of this country what I am very anxious to show, and what I believe to be the fact, viz.: that in Canada a farmer can take ordinary land and make money out of it as a living. I think that is one of the most important things which any Minister of Agriculture, or any experimental farm, could demonstrate to the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is an unfortunate fact to-day in Canada, that a great many of our farmers are so discouraged that they are beginning to think that agriculture cannot be made to pay. That is an opinion which I do not share. That is the opinion which, if permitted to go abroad, would be of the utmost injury to the people of our country. I desire as soon as possible, to remove any such opinion that may exist, and to do away with it forever.

I want to draw attention to one fact in connection with some remarks about Prof. Robertson. Prof. Robertson is a gentleman whom I have known for long years. I knew him before he became connected with the farm. At the time of his appointment I was one of the great convention in the dairying interests which was held in this building, and the result of which was the appointment of a Dairy Commissioner for the Dominion. Prof. Robertson has done great work for the dairying interests of this country, and he is a gentleman who is splendidly qualified for the work. For the last year or so, the late Government has seen fit to divide Prof. Robertson's duties from the farm work, and to-day he is no longer connected with the Experimental Farm. He is Dominion Dairy and Agricultural Commissioner, and his work is specially designed with the view that his attention should be drawn towards the advancement of the agricultural products of this country, and especially for export. Therefore, his work and his salary and his expenses can no longer be charged in connection with the farm. There is one other thing which I may say in answer to the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil).

(Translation.) In reply to the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), I may tell him that I felt a genuine pleasure in hearing his suggestions in connection with the service of the French correspondence at the Ottawa Experimental Farm, as also with regard to the benefits which that farm is called upon to confer upon the French-speaking farmers of the province of Quebec. Long since, I have come to the conclusion that this question is deserving of the most serious consideration and that it should be settled in accordance with the views given expression to by my hon. friend. I am also aware that, among the French farming community in the province of Quebec, this is a question of paramount importance. I beg also to give my hon. friend for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) the assurance that this question will receive all my attention and that at the earliest opportunity, I will take such action as may be necessary to improve the service of the Experimental Farm, in so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. It is my intention to do all I can in order that the French Canadian farmers in Quebec may

reap all the benefits which they are entitled to expect from it and also, to so dispose matters as to enable those farmers to be put, in all respects, on a footing of equality with the rest of the farming community in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he subscribes to the statements made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) that the buildings on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa have up to this time cost nearly $160,000 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures at my command just now, and I cannot off-hand say whether that is correct or not. I suppose the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has looked that up.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. McMillan) got his figures at hand ?

Mr. McMILLAN. Here is a report brought down last year which shows that up to the 1st of January last the buildings cost $151,448.

Mr. FOSTER. The buildings where ?

Mr. McMILLAN. On the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I understand that five or six thousand dollars, if not more, have been expended since.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he is quite certain that that means buildings on the Central Experimental Farm, or upon all the experimental farms?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is a statement of the total expenditure in connection with the Central Farm at Ottawa up to the 1st of January, 1896. The total amount expended for buildings was $151,448. As I stated before, a building has been put up for sheep at a cost of $5,000 or $6,000, and I say, as a practical farmer, that that building could be put up for one-third of that amount. For labour and making permanent improvements, $10,129 has been expended ; for farm labour, $47,147 ; for manure and fertilizers, $12,869 ; for live stock, $6,160.90 ; for swine, $558 ; for poultry, $270. The total amount paid for machinery and implements was $4,121 ; for harness, $922.70, and for horses, $1,270. The amount received from the sale of produce at the Central Experimental Farm and paid to the Receiver General was $20,581.

Mr. CASEY. It would seem that the farmer knows more about the expenditure of the late Government upon this farm than the late Minister of Finance does, and that the late Minister of Finance, when he rose in that superior style, and asked if the hon. gentleman was quite sure if this referred to the Central Experimental Farm, and not to all the farms, simply, in another moment of weakness, exposed his own ignorance of what his own Government had been doing ; because the report from which my hon. friend has just read is an official return sent in by the Department of Agriculture last year, in answer to an order moved for by my hon. friend himself. A few moments ago I said that I would not bother the Minister of Agriculture with much advice, and I have abstained from doing so in regard to the management of the farm. But I would suggest that he should take advantage of this large establishment which we have on hand, for the purpose of not only conducting experiments but conveying instruction. He is no doubt aware of the extent to which these two objects have been combined in the management of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph. At the same time that a large number of students have been instructed in the science and practice of agriculture, quite as much valuable experimental work has been done at that college as has been done at the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, and I think more.

We have an experimental establishment in connestion with which enough might be economized for a contribution by the Government towards the education of a number of students. The hon. Minister is aware that the students at Guelph pay a considerable part of the cost of their education not only in work but in other ways. There is one thing, however, which the Minister may not know, that is, the extent to which that college, and the association of its graduates, have popularized experiments amongst the farmers of Ontario. No one could realize that, scarcely, unless he was present last winter, as I was, at a meeting of the Experimental Union, composed of graduates of that college, when a whole afternoon was devoted to the results of the experiments they had conducted last year. If the hon. Minister was not there, he could hardly realize the amount of enthusiasm that seemed to enter into their work of scientific experimenting with different grains, &c. I can assure him that through the operations of the Guelph College much more valuable experimentation is being done by the farmers of Ontario themselves on their own farms than is being done on all the experimental farms of this Government put together. With this object in view, as well as with the view of increasing agriculture education generally, I would strongly urge upon him the advisability of considering in the near future whether it might not be possible to combine the teaching element with the conduct of experiments on those farms. We have a vast plant that is not fully utilized at present, and I think it might be fully utilized in that way.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) a few moments ago referred to experiments at Guelph with re-

gard to each cow, her production of butter, and so on. I have the last report at hand, and I am unable to find in it anything about such experiments. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be good enough to send me over the report. There is another matter I would refer to. These experimental farms are for educational purposes, and they cannot reasonably be expected to yield profits every year, or perhaps any year. The hon. gentleman stated that certain services in connection with the Central Farm at Ottawa had gone considerably behind. I am not prepared to say whether that can be justified or not; but I am going to ask the hon. gentleman's attention to the results on the farm with which he has been very closely associated, and if that farm has gone behind, he should be able to offer some substantial reasons why it has done so. Let me take the last report of the Agricultural College at Guelph.

I shall not criticise in either case the management, but I find that at Guelph on the farm proper, during the last year, the sum of $37,568 was expended, and the revenues were only $11,708, making a loss of $25,850. We are not dealing with the farm at Guelph, but the hon. gentleman dragged it in, and unfortunately brought himself in with it. It is unfair to the Experimental Farm at Ottawa to say that it should pay large revenue. It must be remembered that these stations are educational in their character and that we cannot expect them to yield revenue, but there is no use in making things worse than they are by unfounded comparisons. In the figures which I have given of the Guelph farm, I have left out the expenses of the teaching staff and college.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 69 of the last report from the experimental farm at Guelph, he will find that the salary of the superintendent is $1,200, the wages of the herdsmen, teamsters, &c., $2,771, and care of live stock $1,154, and that the total amount of the expenditure is $8,062, in connection with the farm proper, and not $37,000, as the hon. gentleman stated. He will find also that the revenue was $5,084 during the last year, so that he will have to examine the report a little more carefully before he rises to make a statement of the expenditure and revenue. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the same mistake was committed in organizing the Guelph farm that was fallen into in organizing the Ottawa farm. A theoretical, instead of a practical man, was appointed in each case. At the Guelph farm, however, they now have a practical man in charge, who, although he was a seedsman in Toronto, many years, ran a large farm during those years, and at a competition he was a tie with his brother for the first prize for the best farm, and only failed obtaining it because it was considered that he might have put in his farm moneys earned elsewhere. He had as good a farm as there was in the province of Ontario, all the time he was seedsman, and he raised on the farm a quantity of the seed he sold. At Ottawa, in the last report, there is $1,500 expended for feed for animals. Well, there is a distribution of the grain, and, taking that distribution at the regular market price, it realized a little under $500. If a farm of that descriptiion will not feed the quantity of stock that is kept on it, it does not set a good example for farmers to follow. We want this Ottawa farm to be an example to our farmers, which, I believe, it can be made.

Mr. SPROULE. I spoke of Mr. Mills as not being a farmer, in the proper sense of the word. The hon. gentleman replied that the Guelph farm is not under the charge of Mr. Mills, but of Mr. Rennie, who himself was a practical farmer. If that be evidence that there have not been changes, I cannot understand it. If Mr. Mills cannot be accepted as a practical farmer, he has, nevertheless, been kept at the head of the Guelph farm, doing the same work as Professor Saunders does here.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Mills is a practical farmer, and lived on a farm until twenty-one years of age, when he met with a severe accident, which forced him to leave the farm? There are few men who have more practical knowledge. But the manager at Ottawa was a druggist in the city of London, and had never been on a farm, and, while he is a very capable man and would be a proper head of all those institutions, if we had practical, and not theoretical, men under him, as it is, his management has not had the success expected.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to set the hon. gentleman right, because he evidently is not conversant with all the facts. The hon. gentleman relies entirely on the agricultural reports, independent of the public accounts, which show the whole expenditure of the farm. Take the public accounts for 1895, and you will find that $32,066 were paid for the teaching staff, &c., of the Agricultural College at Guelph, and he will find that the receipts from the students amounted to $7,000, making a loss of $25,000. Then, take the farm proper, and you will find that for experimental plots and seeding, dairy department, including experimental dairy, dairy school, poultry department, garden and orchard and mechanical department—all being of an experimental character—the whole sum expended, apart from what was expended on teaching staff, &c., amounted to $37,568.08. What were the receipts? They were:

Farm produce	$ 1,224 76
Garden produce	2 30
Sale of stock	2 30
Service of animals	134 00
Experimental dairy	2,707 18
Dairy school	3,727 75
Poultry department	187 64
Miscellaneous	67 28
Total	$11,709 17

showing a loss of $25,850.

Mr. McMILLAN. When I mentioned the experimental farm at Guelph, I only mentioned the farm proper, and here is the report of the farm proper. Let me state that the total amount spent is $56,000 on the college and farm at Guelph, but the amount spent on the college is $31,000, leaving $25,000 spent on the farm. But remember that included in that expenditure, is the dairy school, which has a very large number of pupils, and it must not be forgotten that in the Ottawa farm there is no teaching. I, therefore, made the only fair comparison that could be made, when I took the farm proper at Guelph, apart from the experimental farm.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not wish to follow the example of hon. gentlemen opposite and obstruct the passage of this item, but I wish to say that no money is better spent than what is spent for the benefit of the farmers. The only point sought to be made by those hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side, was that the late Government did not spend this money in the proper manner. In fact, they went over the same story that we have heard so often. If these statements are made only in a general way they lose their effect. I think it might have been better if those who criticise these expenditures had given us some items. What we are trying to do to-day is to pass these items, and it seems to me that the discussion about the conduct of the late Government is not very profitable, seeing that the late Government have not control of these Estimates. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to talk about the extravagance of the late Government in expending money for these services, but I think it would be more proper if they would show how the present Government expends the money entrusted to it. If the present Government can improve upon their predecessors by expending this money to the greater benefit of the farmers of this country, no one will rejoice more than I shall. But, as we have had a change of Government, I think it would be in better taste to wait and see if that improvement takes place. Comparisons may be in order after a while. But when this Government comes down to the practical work of expending this money, it may be found that these general charges of extravagance against the late Government do not amount to much after all. I hope it may be found so; I do not want to think that the Government I have supported has wasted the people's money as hon. gentlemen opposite charge. As a matter of fact, I do not think they have; I think they were honest in their endeavour to improve the condition of the farmers of Canada and to give good government to this country. I believe they made mistakes, as all governments have and as this Government will. But because they have made mistakes I am not going to charge them with dishonesty and fraud. I am not going to say they were extravagant and that they wasted the people's money; I will say that they made a mistake and will point out that mistake. But now that we have heard so much about this Experimental Farm and have listened to so many lectures about farming, I would appeal to hon. members to let this item go through.

Experimental Fruit Stations..... $2,500

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if he has formulated any plan for the expenditure of this money and whether he can state now where these experimental stations are to be established?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I desire to inform the hon. gentleman and the House that when I found this vote in the Estimates, I inquired of the officers of the department whether any plans had been formed for spending the money. I found none, and I have had no opportunity of forming a plan myself. I left the item because I took it for granted that there was need for something of this kind, and I trust I may be able to expend the money so as to benefit so important an industry as the fruit-growing industry of this country.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope the hon. Minister of Agriculture will not forget British Columbia when he comes to establish these experimental fruit stations. Any one who has been in British Columbia must know that there is no part of the Dominion in which fine fruit can be raised to better advantage than British Columbia. There is every kind of climate in British Columbia—you can get it as cold as you like or as warm as you like. I would call attention especially to the need of a fruit farm on Vancouver Island. We have an experimental farm on the mainland of British Columbia, a very good experimental farm, carried on by experienced men and yielding good results. But on Vancouver Island we have nothing of that kind. The island is not so well adapted for farming, that is for grain growing, as some other parts of the province, but it is the best possible place for fruit. Salt Spring Island, in the vicinity of Victoria, is not to be excelled by any place in the Dominion. I trust that when the hon. Minister makes up his mind to expend this money on fruit farms he will see to it that

one of them is established in the vicinity of Victoria.

Dominion Crop Reports, printing forms and other expenses and bulletins..... $1,500

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister tell if this work is being completed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In accordance with the instructions of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague), no doubt, circulars were sent out asking for information on this subject. When that information is received, I think it is wise and best that it should be distributed and available, and therefore I wish to continue this vote for the ensuing year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may explain very briefly in regard to these circulars. We found that in some of the provinces there was a system of crop reports but in the Dominion as a Dominion there was no such system. The only circulars I sent out after I had decided to arrange for this work were, first, one to the provincial governments asking for their system and asking also for their assistance, and one to the municipal officers and officers of agricultural societies in various parts of the Dominion asking them to suggest the names of those who would be likely to report in their several districts. I understand, though I cannot recollect at this moment where my information comes from, that a great list of these names had been secured some time ago, and I naturally supposed that circulars asking for information about the crops had been sent out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that I have not had any consultation with the officials of the department in regard to this matter yet.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if he has considered the effects of these reports. I have no doubt that both the provincial government and the Dominion Government, in seeking information of this kind, have been moved by a desire to spread among the people information that would be very useful. But I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that such information, in the broad sense, is not really useful to farmers, and the farmers are not anxious to get it. It would be well if it were not followed by other and evil effects. I hope I shall not be understood as speaking against anything that will furnish every citizen with the fullest information relating to every industry, and more especially to so important an industry in Canada as agriculture. But I desire to point out to the hon. gentleman that in Canada as well as in the United States and Great Britain, the reports given out to the whole world are not used by those most interested, but have been made the basis of gambling, as every farmer in this House will know. The chances of every farmer in the whole enlightened world, we may say, are discounted by persons who use this information as a basis for the buying and selling of futures. I desire to call his attention to a protest that was made in the province of Manitoba last year against giving detailed information as to the crops of that province, pointing out, as the farmers did there, that it was made use of for the purpose of affecting the prices of grain, even in Chicago, where it was acted upon. I have no doubt the end aimed at in getting such reports was good, but I have very material doubt as to whether the expenditure of any sum of money in this direction brings with it the results that were originally intended. I do not wish to say that information so useful should be entirely done away with; but I do think that this is a matter of such importance to the farming community that negotiations might take place with the United States government with a view to minimizing the effect of the gambling system which is carried on to such an extent as sometimes completely to overrule the law of supply and demand. No one who takes an interest in matters of agriculture but must have noticed that during the last year the prices of grain in England were so affected by the operators at that end working with those upon this side of the Atlantic, that the law of supply and demand, to a considerable extent, had no operation whatever. Now, the information for this purpose was gained entirely from the resources to which I have made reference. It would appear rather paradoxical to lay down a proposition that no information of that kind should be given, but I only desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what seriously affects the farming community, both in this country and in the United States.

Fall Wheat Experimental Stations..... $1,500

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these fall wheat experimental stations does the hon. gentleman contemplate establishing, and in what localities?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This item was put into the Estimates by my predecessor, and I find no plan in the department with regard to it, and I have not yet myself formulated any plan. I do not say positively even that I will do so until I have had an opportunity of thoroughly investigating the subject.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say that this item was put in the Estimates after consultation with the staff of the farm here. They represented, as the hon. gentleman knows, that no experiments in connection with fall wheat can be made at Ottawa on account of the climate. They also represented to me that it was desirable that such experiments should be made somewhere in the Dominion, since the fall wheat industry was one of the great branches of agriculture. The vote seems exceedingly small for the

establishment of experimental stations proper; but it was represented that we might lease certain parts of farms in various portions of the country, and perhaps, by the employment of expert farmers to take charge of the experiments, a small vote could be made effective.

Mr. CASEY. The fall wheat area is entirely in Ontario, and it is already covered by the experiments carried on by the graduates of the Guelph Agricultural College, without any expenditure to this Government.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that the country between Toronto and the Georgian Bay is one of the finest sections for fall wheat. There is no doubt that while it cannot be raised here, it can be raised there to perfection. I speak as one who for some time was engaged in purchasing wheat of that kind, which has always been supplied of the very first quality from that part of the country. If you take part of York and Simcoe, either south or north, and a portion of Grey, going across through that district, you will find the best district in the province of Ontario for fall wheat. If such stations are established, I would strongly advise the hon. gentleman to establish one somewhere in that district.

Mr. CASEY. And in my county, too.

Dairying service $30,000

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend propose to utilize the whole of this vote?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a vote that Professor Robertson has in charge, and is expended in experimental work in dairying, in carrying on cheese factories and butter factories, and in assistance to such factories in different parts of the country. It covers the whole Dominion. Professor Robertson has thought that this year there might be a slight reduction, as he is curtailing operations somewhat in creameries and factories. But I think the sum indicated here will not more than suffice for the work that is really in hand.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the vote that is used for sending around through the country the different instructors? We had them travelling through Ontario some years ago, and last year in Manitoba and North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE They were paid out of this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these instructors do you propose sending out this year; or how many were out last year, and where have they been carrying on work?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at the moment, but I can soon obtain the information from Professor Robertson. The instructors to whom the hon. gentleman has referred to, are chiefly in the North-west Territories and British Columbia; and there has been a little work of that kind done in Quebec during the present season.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope that it is not the intention of the Minister to decrease the amount expended for this purpose in British Columbia.

To enable the Dairy Commissioner to promote dairying interests by advances for making cheese and butter within the provinces, the proceeds of sale of products from such advances to be replaced to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund $25,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman taken over recently any new factories in connection with this?

Mr. SPROULE. There were a number of factories taken charge of last year, but I understood the commissioner to say that they were going to drop quite a number. Does this account for the reduction in this vote?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman kindly tell us how many factories the commissioner intends to have under his charge during the coming year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give the exact figures.

Mr. SPROULE. Nor where the factories will be located?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like to receive a statement of the price realized for a certain quantity of Prince Edward Island cheese, sold under peculiar circumstances to Hodgson Brothers. It was sold at a certain price, but that price could not be stated until it had been marketed in England, and afterwards one-half of the profits were to go to the parties who produced the milk. I should like to know what price was obtained, and if any profits have been distributed among the milk producers. I believe this is a system that should not be followed, and that no Government official should be able to make sales in this way, under which the price cannot be made public until a purchaser has gone to the old country and effected sales. I do not say that any jobbery has taken place, but the practice certainly opens the road for it, and it should be stopped at once.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman refers to a sale that took place during the time I occupied the position of Minister of Agriculture. The hon. gentleman's statement that no jobbery took place is perfectly correct. The transaction was perfectly open

and above-board, and the sale, I am led to believe by practical men who are entirely disconnected with the matter, was an admirable one, a very wise step to take at that time. It is true that for market reasons Professor Robertson, who acted on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, agreed that for the present the price should remain private, but the only reason was that which has been given. I do not know how the results may turn out, but the Minister will be able to give that information to the committee; but, so far as the department was concerned, it was a perfectly straight business transaction.

Mr. McMILLAN. If it was a perfectly proper transaction, why was not the price given to the public?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not insinuate that it was anything else but a proper transaction, and I gave him the reason.

Mr. SPROULE. The proceeds of the sales are to be refunded to the consolidated revenue fund. How much has been repaid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The whole outlay.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, no loss has been sustained?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No loss. Professor Robertson has just handed me these figures, which will answer the question asked by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan):—June and July cheese sold at 8 cents; August, 8½ cents; September and October, 9 cents. There was no profit; some loss was sustained by Hodgson Bros. The sale was reported to the department; I have not yet obtained the details, but I can say, speaking from memory, that the reason the details were kept private at that time was that an arrangement was come to with Hodgson Bros. that, if certain profits were realized by them, they would be shared by the department, and, as the firm had not full details from which to ascertain whether there would be a profit or not, and, as the matter was one connected with their private business, it was hardly justifiable for the department to make public the details of that transaction.

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand that 250 boxes of cheese were sold and not paid for. Has suit been taken and the money collected?

Mr. TAYLOR. Did I understand the Minister to say, in regard to this cheese transaction by Professor Robertson with the people of Prince Edward Island, that no loss had been involved to the Government? Why I ask is that I heard the matter discussed at the Brockville Cheese Board, and a serious charge preferred against the Government, and a statement made by Mr. Mark Everitt, a large cheese dealer, that the Government had lost largely by this transaction. If I understood the Minister aright, he said that no loss to the Government had accrued by the action of Professor Robertson in this arrangement with the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was no loss. When the statement was made in the House that a loss had been involved, I stated then that all the advances given the farmers of Prince Edward Island were paid out of the profits of the sale, and, in addition, $25,000 was distributed to the farmers out of the sale.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the full details of this matter, but I understand there was no loss at all to the department or to the country in regard to this sale. I shall be very glad to lay on the Table the papers or to allow any hon. member to see them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I will thank the Minister to bring down the papers, because this has been a burning question at the Cheese Board of Brockville.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The truth should be known.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like the Minister to bring down the papers, in order that we may examine them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The charge was also made that the country was paying interest on the money advanced to those farmers. That was not true. The interest was paid out of the proceeds of the sale.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), I beg to say there is no suit in court. Instructions have been given to recover from Messrs. Warrington the price of 250 boxes of cheese, for which they have so far refused to pay.

To enable the Dairy Commissioner to promote the dairying interests of Canada by making provision for the placing of fresh made creamery butter and cheese on the British markets in regular shipments without deterioration in quality and for securing recognition of quality there $20,000

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Minister of Agriculture be kind enough to give the committee some information as to what is being done in this line at the present time, and also as to the result of last year's operations?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is what is known as the cold storage vote. It was adopted for the purpose of trying some experiments, so that our butter might be placed on the English market in a better condition than hitherto. It is well known that our butter does not have the same recognized position there as our cheese and we who understand butter believe it is due to the fact that butter deteriorates on

its passage from manufacturer to consumer. We believe Canadian butter is just as good an article as any made in the world, and, if it could be placed on the English market in the condition in which it leaves the dairy in Canada, our butter trade would be very much larger than it is now, and our butter would have a very much higher reputation. To endeavour to accomplish this result this effort was made to obtain cold storage, by which the butter might reach the English market in the same good condition in which it leaves the dairy. This has been done to a considerable extent, but not to that extent I should like to see, or hon. gentlemen opposite would like to see realized. An arrangement was made between Professor Robertson and a certain line of steamers in Montreal, under which insulated compartments for cold storage purposes were provided on certain vessels leaving Montreal for Avonmouth, the port of Bristol, in England. The service has been going on during the present season. Arrangements were also made for two vessels to be fitted with mechanical cold storage apartments. That plan, however fell through, because the agents and owners were not able to secure the fulfilment of the contracts with the firm in England to supply the mechanical equipments. The firm was not able to carry out its contract, and the result has been that we have not been able to reap the advantage of experiments with mechanical cold storage between this country and English ports.

Mr. FOSTER. In no degree ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mechanical cold storage, in no degree. We have had what is known as the insulated compartment, which is a cold storage in which chilled products can be kept by use of ice in a good condition until they reach there. But the products put into these compartments ought to be chilled before they leave the port. I may say that in the beginning of the month of August when the rush of butter into the English market began this year, it was found that the arrangements made by Prof. Robertson were not adequate to meet the demand, and in an interview which I had, along with Prof. Robertson, with the agent in Montreal of this line of steamers, I authorized him, to a little more than double the capacity of these cold storage compartments, because I believed that it was a very valuable assistance to our dairying interests in this country. The fact that these demands have sprung up to such an extent is a full justification of the experiment in this line, and I trust that before long we will be able to accomplish a great deal more in this direction. I suppose that the members of the House are aware of the fact, that the leader of the Government and some other members of the Cabinet, met a large number of persons interested in this matter in the city of Montreal, and they declared then that it would be one of the first considerations of this Government to try and accomplish much more in regard to a chain system of cold storage which would stretch the whole way from the producer in Canada to the consumer in England. This matter is under the most careful consideration of the Government, and I trust before another season comes around we will be able to accomplish what I am sure is in the interests of the producers not only of dairy products in Canada, but of all other perishable food products, namely : that our products may be sent to the English market without any chance of deterioration on the voyage. I have just had a memorandum handed to me which shows that the shipments of butter to date in cold chambers of steamships are more than twice as great as they were last year. I may also state that this vote is not entirely devoted to the cold storage on ships from Canada to England ; but that a portion of it is available to be paid out, if necessary, to bring about a system of cold storage throughout the country on certain lines of railroad, so as to convey these perishable food products to the ports of shipment. The arrangements in regard to this are of a nature which may require a considerable payment from the Government. The nature of the arrangement is such, that if the advantages are availed of to a very large extent and the railroad companies in consequence get a full charge for the cars which they are obliged to run, there would be very little indeed for the Government to make up.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the maximum limit ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can hardly tell the hon. gentleman that. I believe it is expected that some $1,500 or so would be spent this season by the Government. If the advantages were availed of to the fullest extent there ought to be no payment necessary on the part of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount of butter would a railway have to carry in order to free you entirely from the charge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The full capacity of their cars being occupied.

Mr. FOSTER. And you limit the number of cars ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes. The reason that the Government has to supplement it, is, that we require cars to be sent, and frequently these cars are not by any means full, but for the purpose of helping the people along that line of railway it is necessary that cars should be run although the products so far have not been sufficient to anywhere near fill the cars. When the trade is sufficient to fill the cars, I do not think there will be any expense on the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be interesting to know how frequently these shipments have been made, and the quantity that has been shipped at each time. I would also like to know whether the consignments have been made to agents who generally handle these commodities, or to agents of the Government direct. The sum asked for appears to be very small, especially when we consider the amount of work which has to be done for it. In my part of the country last year, there were applications at different times for these refrigerator cars but they could not be supplied. I understood there was to be a car sent along each line of railway, but on the Grand Trunk Railway, north, from Toronto to Meaford there was no car, nor so far as I can learn was there a car on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Toronto to Owen Sound. On both these lines there are creameries, the owners of which wished to take advantage of the cold storage, but they could not get the cars sent to them and they complained very much on account of it. I think there might profitably be spent a much larger sum of money in this direction. In my opinion it would be very desirable to have these shipments made at regular and short intervals, because by that means we would be more likely to gain a good status in the English market. It would be wise also that we should have selected agents from among the firms who deal in those lines in Great Britain to whom the butter would be sent, and that we should not send it to the ordinary agent or commission merchant who handles produce, and who has no interest in it so long as he gets his commission. There would, I believe, be a better result if the butter was consigned to agents of our own whose duty it would be to introduce it in the English market, and get it a good reputation there as early as possible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will remember what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has said and take note of it; and when I come down, as I may next session, with a much larger sum for this cold storage business, I shall hope to obtain his cordial support in asking the House for that vote.

Mr. SPROULE. I will do that with pleasure, if the money is wisely spent.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This arrangement permits any private individual to ship his own produce by these cars, but the Government does not control the produce in any way whatever, and does not buy or sell it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am glad to hear from the Minister the figures showing an increase in the amount of butter which is being sent to England, and which I take as a very strong compliment to the course adopted by the previous Government; which course was adopted by them in spite, sometimes of protests and opposition from gentlemen who now I suppose will cordially support it. The Minister, I think, stated that he authorized a steamship company to double their capacity. What line was it, and on what terms has this arrangement been made?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Elder, Dempster line. Many say that the whole arrangement will have to be recast. The arrangement with this company was one by which they were obliged to supply two vessels with mechanical cold storage, and in consequence of the heavy investment in that matter the Government was to share——

Mr. FOSTER. Up to a maximum?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Up to a maximum. The company was not making any charge for the insulated compartments, but as this mechanical cold storage arrangement fell through, and they consequently are not getting help from the Government. I have no doubt they will expect some assistance in regard to cold storage which they are now supplying. We have not yet come to any definite terms, however, with regard to that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are doing the work, and the arrangement so far as any bonus is concerned, is in an unsettled state. It seems to me to be an extraordinary way to be going on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a work which is somewhat of the same nature as that in connection with the railways. The charges made by the companies in this regard have to be credited to the Government, and the Government cannot possibly go beyond paying the deficit which might be shown in respect to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am quite aware, but in the old arrangement, if I remember rightly, we had a maximum limit to the contribution of the Government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The understanding was that it would be on the line of the old arrangement.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cost of transportation on the cars and the steamships?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the railways these products are charged at less than the ordinary car-load rates, with nothing extra for cold storage. On the steamships the extra rate is five shillings a ton for butter and cheese, for cold storage.

Mr. BRODER. I would like to ask whether this butter and cheese that goes to Europe is thoroughly inspected before it is shipped; because you cannot take a poor tub of butter and freeze it good. If we undertake to get back a market which we have lost through not keeping our butter up to the best possible standard, we must

send our product there under the best possible conditions. Before sending it, we must take care that it is the best we can produce. If the Government take no steps to inspect the article before it is sent, we cannot expect to attain the object in view. It will not do to allow the butter to be shipped indiscriminately, without inspection. I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to have our agent there to see to the disposal of the article would not work very well, for this reason. Any one who has been engaged in the business of shipping to the English market knows that the moment he undertakes to act independently of the English dealers, that moment they will all be down on him and the article he sells. If you undertake to do anything in the English market, you must use the people there who are engaged in the business, and make them your agents, or else you will fail in the attempt. I had some conversation with an American who undertook to establish a market for poultry in England. He returned home a good many thousand dollars worse off and a good deal wiser than he had been a few months before. He tried to establish a market for turkeys, but he found the inspector in his shop about five times a day looking for stale turkeys. The English dealers had sent the inspector there, and the report got abroad that this man was selling stale turkeys, and he had to stop business. If we go into that market, we must do business through the English dealers, and we must send the very best article and ship it under favourable conditions, or we cannot hold the market. We had the market for butter in England 25 years ago ; but we sent our butter too heavily salted and not properly selected, and the result was that superior butter came in from Denmark and drove ours out of the market. There was no reason why we should have lost that market, if we had sent our butter under better conditions. Why has our butter trade with England increased this year ? Simply because the cheese market closed very badly last year, and a great many people went out of cheese and into butter because they thought they would do better with butter than with cheese. But butter has not done so well as cheese, and we shall probably have more cheese sent next year, and less butter. These are matters that will have to be kept in view in dealing with this question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The quality of the butter is not taken into consideration, except that no butter which is not sufficiently cold to be properly put into these insulated compartments is accepted, and the Government employee notes the temperature of the butter when it is put in. Any butter so bad or rancid as to injure the butter alongside of it would not be put in ; but there is no undertaking on the part of the Government to guarantee the quality of the butter that is sent.

Mr. McNEILL. I do think that the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), who is evidently an expert in this matter, are well worthy of the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. If there has been no inspection of the butter sent to the English market heretofore, I do think it would be well that the advice tendered by that hon. gentleman should be adopted ; because, now that we are making an attempt to secure the English market for our butter, as we have secured it for our cheese, there is no doubt that if we send there butter and cheese of an inferior quality, we shall not succeed in the attempt we are making. Unfortunately, our record for butter in the English market is very different from the record we have for cheese. The record of Canadian butter in the English market heretofore has not been good. The record of our cheese is very good. We want to have a good record. We want to do nothing that will lead the English consumer to suppose that we are not sending first-class butter there ; and the way to do that is to make sure that nothing but first-class butter is sent from this side. While on my feet, I would like to say that I have heard with the greatest possible pleasure the statements made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in reference to this subject. I am delighted to find that he and his Government are determined to prosecute so thoroughly the attempt that has already been made by the late Government to open up this great market for our butter. It is a market that is almost unlimited. It is a much larger market than the market for our cheese. We have secured a good half of the English market for our cheese, and I do not see why we should not do as well with our butter. But if we intend to do so, we must take the precaution that only the very finest quality of butter is shipped from Canada to England.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the point touched upon by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), and backed up by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), is the most important point raised in this discussion. There can be no question that if we wish to secure a market for our products in Great Britain, we can only achieve success by seeing that none but the best articles leave our shores. I had myself an experience in Liverpool which illustrates very well the point these gentlemen are making. I was making some inquiries there from dealers in connection with Canadian poultry, and I discovered that our prospects had been largely ruined in that market by reason of the fact that a few years ago a shipment of poultry had been made which were, to a certain extent, defective, and not properly put on the market. And the result of that inferior shipment, perhaps con-

taining only two or three birds not fit to be put upon the market, was that it destroyed our reputation in the market at Liverpool. The result would have been entirely different had there been rigid inspection of these birds before they left our shores. I think that the hon. Minister of Agriculture can do no better service than see that every product, especially perishable products, which goes from the Canadian farmers to the markets of Great Britain is inspected before it leaves our shores, for one bad consignment will certainly destroy the good reputation we may enjoy.

Mr. GANONG. It is not only the western part of Canada that is interested in the dairy business. The maritime provinces are to-day entering into honourable rivalry with the west. Owing to the liberal grant which the local government of New Brunswick, under the administration of the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), has made to assist cold storage in that province, I have no doubt whatever that from the general storage at St. John and the branches in the different parts of the province, we also shall soon have beef, butter and cheese to export to the British market; and I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is his intention that a part of this money shall be applied to steamships sailing from St. John?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With regard to the inspection of these products before shipment, I might point out that for the Government to undertake to refuse to allow certain shipments to be put into cold storage and sent to England, and to allow other shipments to be sent, would be practically impossible. It is certainly important that our perishable products, as well as anything else we send to the English markets, where we have to meet the keenest competition, should be of the best quality possible; but I think we could attain that object by carefully instructing the people to make the best possible products. I think we can attain that object by giving them instructions and showing them how they can improve the quality in these cases where they do not send what is up to the average. I do not think the hon. member for Haldimand himself (Mr. Montague) would undertake to test and inspect and brand the shipments of butter and cheese and other food products before they are put in cold storage.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot follow my hon. friend in that statement. I think it would be very advisable that these products should be branded. If any one chose to send an inferior quality of butter, of course the hon. Minister could not prevent the shipment, but he could prevent that consignment being branded as good butter, and that would be a notice to the English consumer of its quality. We would, in that way, distinguish the good from the bad, and the result would be that no bad butter would be shipped, because nobody would buy it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As regards what has been said about shipments in these cold storage vessels, we require that all space shall be held for Canadian butter or cheese, and it is only when there is no more of that offering that any American or other cheese or butter is allowed to be shipped. Of course, the hon. member knows that no Canadian butter or cheese can go out of the country without being branded as Canadian, but as to branding the quality, I am not altogether in accord with him. In reply to the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong), I may say that I have no desire to overlook the importance of the trade from the maritime provinces, and I am sure it deserves the fullest consideration just as well as the trade from the St. Lawrence ports.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to deal with shipments made in those cold storage departments on the same basis as ordinary shipments. I can quite understand that it would be rather severe for the Government to step in and say what should and should not be shipped to Great Britain in the way of ordinary trade: but I call his attention to the fact that we are liable to be called on to pay a sum of money for the purpose of promoting our English butter trade. The only way to establish a better trade is to increase the reputation of Canadian products, and as we are spending money for that purpose, I think the best possible service the department could do would be to see that he best article goes on the market, and that can only do would be to see that the best article shipped in cold storage, a part of the expense of which is to be paid by the people of Canada. It seems to me utterly absurd that a man should ship butter of a very inferior quality and that we should contribute some of the cost of the shipment of that inferior article which would help to destroy our trade rather than increase it. I am sure the hon. gentleman will see the force of what I say and give the matter his very closest attention. There is another question I would like to ask, and that is what amount of cheese has gone over this year in cold storage. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will let us know after recess.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). In reply to an inquiry that was made before dinner, I may say that of the products that were sent from the port of Montreal this season, no cheese practically was sent in the cold storage, but that from 6,000 to 9,000 packages of butter have been sent per week, but that the accounts, as returned by the steamship companies, are not in, and, consequently, I cannot give exact figures as to the number of packages or the number of pounds of these articles that have been shipped from that port this season.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing of this vote that goes to pay for advances on butter and cheese purchased to send to the British market? That was in the previous vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned, I have no more remarks to make, except that I may take a moment to recall to my hon. friend's mind what he may not be personally cognizant of, but what hon. members who were in the last Parliament will remember—that, when we initiated this policy of making advances and endeavouring to prepare a market for good butter in Great Britain, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), together with a large number of other members of the then Opposition, commented very severely on our policy in that respect, and, among other things, referred to us as "greengrocers."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to give his quotation?

Mr. FOSTER. I can give the quotation. I congratulate hon. gentlemen on their repentance and on bringing forth fruits meet for repentance in the vote before us. I congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture upon his arraying himself in the ranks of the "greengrocers."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not in the last Parliament, as the hon. gentleman knows. This vote has nothing whatever to do with the arrangement to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. That, I understand, was an arrangement which was entered into the year before for the purchase here of butter at a certain price and its sale in England by the Government at whatever price the market would allow. The last vote which was passed—which I may not be in order in referring to, but the House will bear with me, I trust—was a vote simply for "advances," and is practically used, in fact entirely used, for advances to the patrons who send their milk to the factories while the finished product from these factories is being marketed. It is simply to protect the farmers from the loss of time and loss of interest which would be involved in their waiting for the returns from the market. These advances are not to purchase butter and cheese in order to sell them again: they are simply the advances on the product of these factories. The vote is intended to be covered, and last year was covered, I believe, by the final settlement of the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not finding fault at all.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman's speculations were very successful, as my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture can tell him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I pointed out that the arrangements which the ex-Finance Minister alluded to, and which he has taken comfort to himself we are endorsing, are not at all the same as this vote, and have nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has been congratulating members on this side on their change of front on this question. The operation to which he has referred, was that of purchasing butter, and I hope that no Minister of the Crown in this Government will take the position taken by the hon. gentleman with regard to that. That butter was purchased at 20 cents a pound and sent to the old country and sold for 14·38 cents. And the hon. gentleman had the audacity to stand up on a platform in the northern part of Ontario and declare that his Government had been successful in returning to the treasury every cent that had been taken out to purchase this butter. But, when the question was asked across the House, he had to acknowledge the corn and admit that only 14·38 cents came in for every 20 cents that went out.

Mr. SPROULE. Whatever may have been the result of the first trial shipment, it is evident that the policy was successful, because the development of the trade has been going on very rapidly, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture tells us that it was much greater last year than it was at first. I have every hope that the development will go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to refer to a suggestion of the late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague). He contended that it was desirable that only the best qualities of butter should be sent to the British market. I agree with him. But he suggested that the privilege of sending in cold storage should be confined to the best quality. While it is well to encourage the introduction of the best quality that is made in Canada, I think it would be hardly fair for the Minister to go so far as to say that he

would refuse transhipment in cold storage to any but the first quality. I should have no objection, if we could so arrange it, to having butter inspected and branded as first, second or third quality. While I think it most desirable to encourage the production of the best quality of butter and of having as large a portion as possible of that sent to the English market of first quality, I think it would be hardly fair to exclude the other.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I do not see how the Minister of Agriculture could refuse to ship any butter that might be offered, but I desire to convey to the committee my opinion that the Department of Agriculture should be exceedingly careful before putting its imprimatur upon butter shipped to the old country, to see that it was first-class. The plan suggested by the hon. gentleman would meet my idea, and I should think would be practicable—to inspect the butter and grade it. But butter permitted to go through under the patronage of the Dominion of Canada, and sent in cold storage paid for with the money of the people of Canada, should not be second-class butter that is sure to do us more injury than good. Just one point in regard to what has been said by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan). It is true that the late Government brought down upon itself a great deal of criticism because it undertook to purchase a certain quantity of creamery butter and place it in good shape upon the market of Great Britain. It is true a certain sum of money was lost in that connection. But I think I shall be approved by this House, I am positive I shall be approved by the country, when I say that the small sum of money lost in making these experiments, were trifling, when compared with the splendid result which has accrued to Canada from the efforts which we then made. The increase in the butter exports to the motherland is founded upon the experiment which was made, and which advertised our butter in the markets of Great Britain. And I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the great butter industry of Australia, the splendid trade in this article that Australia has built up with the motherland, was worked up at enormous expense in the form of bounties taken from the Australian taxpayers and used as an inducement to producers to improve and increase their product.

Mr. BRITTON. I would remind the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that the point made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), was not that there was a loss, but that the ex-Finance Minister stated that there was no loss, but in the House had to admit that there was a loss.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not remember such a statement, but I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton), who was not then in the House, that, if the hon. member for South Huron did not make that attack tonight, he and other members on his side in the late Parliament made that attack, both in this House and on the public platform, in connection with the very same subject upon which they feel called upon to congratulate us now.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) was one of the gentlemen who stated in North Ontario that the butter that was sent to the British market was of such good quality that it raised the reputation of Canadian butter to a level with that of Danish butter. Last year I read a statement respecting 251 packages of this butter, a statement direct from the commission merchants who handled it, which showed that it was anything but of a quality to raise the reputation of our butter in the British market. It was in bad flavour, and part of it was turnipy. Not only that, but it was shown conclusively, upon subsequent investigation, that part of that butter was not fresh butter, it was butter that had been held over from the previous summer, that had been made with a view to consumption in Canada. I say that the late Government were not careful in the experiment they made, and I say that experiment injured the character of Canadian butter in the British market, rather than advanced it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I trust that after the conclusive argument which has been made by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) the Minister of Agriculture will not refuse a moment longer to inspect, under the most rigid system, every pound of butter that goes from Canada. I can only say to my hon. friend that when the butter was shipped by the Government as a venture for the purpose of placing it in good condition on the British market, it was inspected, as I understood, most carefully; and if such packages were sent, it was certainly due to negligence on the part of the inspector.

Mr. McMILLAN. I can assure my hon. friend that the butter was not inspected; and I can assure him that part of the butter that was made at the Black Creek creamery the summer before, was found in Manchester in very bad condition, having gone off flavour, proving that the Government did not have a careful inspection so as to have only fresh butter sent over, as they said they would have at the time they went into that arrangement.

Mr. MOORE. I believe that the item for cold storage is one of the most important items in the Estimates now before this committee. While I do not wish to criticise unduly the hon. Minister of Agriculture or any of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, still it strikes me that the item

under consideration does not quite meet the requirements of the country. In regard to the Minister of Agriculture, I may say that I believe he is competent and able to conduct properly the duties that are imposed upon him in his department. He is a practical farmer, and has devoted a great deal of time and energy in promoting the agricultural interests of the country; and I am grateful to the Prime Minister for having selected a gentleman from the eastern townships from which I come, to fill the important Department of Agriculture. But, Sir, I think the item under consideration is imperfect and too limited in its scope. It reads this way:

> To enable the Dairy Commissioner to promote the dairying interests of Canada by making provision for the placing of fresh made creamery butter and cheese on the British markets in regular shipments without deterioration in quality and for securing recognition of quality there $20,000

I cannot see why the hon. gentleman should limit the scope of this item to creamery butter and cheese, why the creamery butter and cheese makers of Canada alone should enjoy the benefit of the aid which it is proposed to give them by this item. We have heard the Minister of Agriculture say that our dairymen are as skilful and as able to make good butter as any other butter makers in the world, and I believe that is the case. They are consequently able to compete in the British market with the dairymen of other parts of the world, and I do not believe it is treating the dairy farmers fairly to exclude them from the benefit which will be derived by creamery butter makers under this item. While I desire to see the Government, whichever party are in power, exercise economy in the expenditure of the people's money, still I believe that this sum is too small an amount for the encouragement of the industry. I do not think it would be wise to limit cold storage to butter and cheese only, but I think the Government should extend assistance in this way to the exports of all perishable products which are raised by the farmers of this country and sent to the British market. We find that England imports dressed meats annually to the value of $115,678,905; eggs, $19,483,408; fruits, $23,680,348; condensed milk, $5,258,720; poultry and game, $29,415,141. These are all perishable products, and the farmers of this country are as well prepared to engage in this production as in the production of butter and cheese if they can only find a market for them. But we are debarred from the British market, which is supplied by the United States and other countries who have forestalled us in that market by means of the cold storage provided for them. I think it would meet with the views of hon. members of this House generally if that item was increased so as to include other perishable articles that I have mentioned. We find that fresh mutton is imported into England to the extent of 256,731,131 pounds; fresh beef, 227,834,955 pounds; other fresh meats, 97,287,482 pounds. Canada supplies 4 4-10 per cent of the fresh mutton; of other fresh beef, nearly nothing; and of all other meats, 1½ per cent; while the United States, with the aid of cold storage, are supplying the English people with the great bulk of these perishable products that might profitably be raised in Canada if encouragement were given to the farmers in aiding them to transport these articles to the British market in good condition.

I would also call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to another matter. It has been frequently said that the Government cannot assist the farmers of this country by legislation; but I think it did encourage the manufacture of cheese in Canada, and with the result that the production of that article has enormously increased. In 1878 we exported $3,997,521 worth of cheese. By the encouragement given to the farmers by the provincial and federal governments, the production of cheese had increased in 1895 to $14,253,002. Now, the British market only requires about $22,000,000 worth of cheese per year, and we are supplying them at the present time with over one-half of what they require. The United States are also increasing their production of cheese, and the time may not be far distant when, through other countries engaging in this work the British market may become over-stocked, resulting in a fall in prices, which we know are, in all conscience, low enough already. Therefore, I think it is very important that we should encourage the farmers in other respects than in the manufacture of cheese. But in respect to butter we have a different story to tell. I remember a few years ago when I was engaged in buying butter, large quantities of it were shipped to the English market. We paid very little attention to the quality, it was kept for some time in the store-houses throughout the country, and afterwards shipped to Montreal. There it was held until it could be shipped on board vessels, and when it arrived in the British market, it was entirely unfit for the Englishman's table. If you wish to capture an Englishman's palate you cannot do it by selling him rancid butter or stale meat. England imported, in 1895, butter to the value of $69,327,786. We exported, in 1878, butter to the value of $2,382,237, but in consequence of losing our reputation by sending to the English market poor grades of butter or butter well made and spoiled afterwards by keeping, our exports fell to $697,476 in 1895. We have heard a great deal said about depression. The farmers of the country are well aware that we are in a state of depression; but while that is the case, while the agriculturists may feel they are in a depressed condition, they are not alone—for the farmers

of other countries are suffering to a greater extent than those of Canada. To the encouragement and protection which has been given to the farmers, I attribute a great deal of their success and the elevated position they hold to-day as compared with the farmers of other countries, although they do not yet occupy the position which the importance of this calling entitle them to. If $20,000 proposed to be appropriated to promote the sale of creamery-made butter and cheese were increased to $50,000 and made to include all perishable articles raised on the farms, a great stimulus would be given to our farmers, who would be much more benefited than they will be by this comparatively small amount asked by the Minister of Agriculture to be devoted exclusively to cold storage for creamery butter and cheese. I need not occupy the time of the committee by adducing any extended arguments on this question. It will be evident that we should not restrict the encouragement to be given to our farmers merely for the sake of saving a few dollars: but the Minister of Agriculture should ask $40,000 or $50,000 to provide cold storage in order to transport in good condition all perishable articles raised in Canada in order to enable our farmers to compete with other nations. This Dominion has already spent large sums to enable our farmers to transport their products as cheaply as the farmers of other countries to the English markets where our agriculturists come into competition with those of every country on the globe, and with cheap and rapid transportation and facilities for preserving in good condition perishable articles in transit would open up a prosperous future to the farmers of Canada which cannot be secured by any other means.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Following up what the hon. gentleman has said, I should like to ask the Minister whether he proposes to bring down a vote to place Canadian meat on the English market?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That question is under consideration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman hope during the present session to be able to inform the House on this question? I think the item had better stand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; that is impossible.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to use any portion of it to make another trial shipment of fruit?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I made an arrangement this fall with the Dempster Line to take shipments of fruit. Some fruit has been shipped by that line, and more will be sent over, no doubt, before the end of the season.

Mr. CLANCY. I should like to ask the Minister if he proposes to make a trial shipment of high grade dairy butter. In order to reach the masses it will be necessary to send butter outside of creamery-made butter, which is of a high grade and most desirable to place on the English market: but there are other classes that are very useful, and I should like to know if he proposes to make a trial shipment of high grade dairy as well as creamery butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The arrangements made for cold storage are for creamery butter only. I have made no arrangements for dairy butter, although I fully appreciate the high quality of some samples made in this country. I am satisfied there is dairy butter quite equal to the very best creamery butter, but the difficulty of classification and of obtaining a uniform grade is so great that the arrangements made have only been for creamery butter.

Aid to agricultural societies $7,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any agricultural societies organized under local governments receive any portion of this grant?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is given only to agricultural societies in the North-west Territories. This fact should be stated in the item.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is the reason I asked the question, for I do not understand that any distribution is made among agricultural societies in the provinces.

Quarantine salaries and contingencies of organized districts $35,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. Minister filled the vacancy in connection with the office of port physician at Victoria? There was a recommendation for the appointment of Dr. Duncan, who has been doing the work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That appointment was filled. An Order in Council was passed by the late Government before it went out of office. Under the rule laid down by His Excellency as to signing Orders in Council, that Order has been signed by him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then my recommendation for the appointment of Dr. Duncan has been carried out, and I suppose he has charge of the office permanently?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was in charge of the office before the Order in Council was passed, and no change has been made.

Mr. PRIOR. I congratulate the Government on making the appointment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was made by the late Government.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Duncan is a gentleman thoroughly qualified to fill the position.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital..... $4,000

Mr. GILLIES. Under whose charge is this?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The Winnipeg hospital is under the charge of the local authorities, and the St. Boniface hospital is in charge of the Roman Catholic authorities. They are both public hospitals, open to everybody and anybody.

Cattle quarantine $22,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to ask the Minister a question with reference to which I gave some of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman notice. Some time ago, by the advice of the Veterinary Chief Inspector, and after consultation with the other officers of the department, it was decided to reorganize the veterinary staff of the Dominion and appoint for each county a veterinary inspector whose duty it would be to have a general oversight of the health of the various flocks and herds in that county. I am informed that a number of these gentlemen who were appointed have received notice that their services would not be required. I should like to know from the Minister on what ground he is proceeding ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I came to the department I found a large number of applications for these situations. I inquired exactly what was the nature of these appointments, and I found that they were in consequence of a recommendation of Dr. McEachren, Chief Veterinary Inspector, to the late Minister. That recommendation was made last winter, or early this spring, and Dr. McEachren was instructed to draw up a set of regulations and rules for the guidance of these officials. Immediately after that Dr. McEachren went away on a tour of inspection through the North-west and British Columbia, and he was away for two months. There were no instructions issued. The Minister, I understood, had sent Dr. McEachren recommendations, but had not ratified them, and they were not issued. There were, therefore, no instructions for these officials to act upon. At the very moment of the elections, appointments were made. A few were made from time to time as they went along, and I am informed by my officers that on the 16th June instructions were given to appoint a very large number of them Apparently, evidently I may say, there was no inquiry into their veterinary qualifications. There was no consultation with the head of this branch of the department, and the instructions which the head of that branch had intended should be issued to these officers on their appointment had not been issued. The result was that a number of appointments were made in the heat of a political campaign, in a way that I could not help considering to be prejudicial to the service, and I undertook immediately to prevent any bad effects from such action. I cancelled the whole lot of the appointments, reserving to myself to appoint officials who might be able to do that work in what I considered to be, and hope to be able to prove, a better method than that indicated by the first action of the Minister. Up to the present time I have not had an opportunity of consulting with the official head of that branch of my department sufficiently to indicate exactly what course I will take to guard the health of the animals in the way which was expected to be accomplished by the appointment of those officers. I have some proof that even in the short time these officers held their office, bad effects did occur, and I felt perfectly justified in the course I took.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) has rather imputed to me a political motive in connection with the matter. I had no such motive whatever. It is true that some delay did occur in connection with issuing the instructions, consequent upon my absence, and upon the absence also of the chief inspector, who was called away to the North-west Territories. However, what I was concerned chiefly about, was to find out the hon. gentleman's policy, as to whether the fact that these gentlemen had been notified that their services would not be required indicated that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) did not propose to carry out the policy we laid down in connection with local inspection. What I understand from the hon. gentleman to-night is, that while he reserves himself the right—which he has a perfect right to do under the rule which hon. gentlemen opposite have laid down—as to whether these officers shall be selected for the work or not, he leads the House to believe that he will carry out the system of local inspectors which the late Government pledged its faith to.

The MINSTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) is a little astray in saying that I am following the rule laid down. These appointments were purely departmental and were made by the Minister. I have grave doubts myself as to the power of the Minister to make such appointments, as I am inclined to think that they should be made by Order in Council. They were not made by Order in Council, but simply on the fiat of the Minister. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) has said that there was no political feeling in the matter. I believe him, of course, and accept his declaration, but I can say that the instructions left in the department by the late Minister were that the nominees of the Conservative candidates in the elections should be selected. Therefore, I do not consider that there was that proper surveillance and investigation into the professional qualities of these gentlemen which I think ought to be exercised in such appointments.

With regard to my policy, I may say that I expect to carefully guard the health of the animals of this country, and if in my organization of the quarantine department I find that local inspectors are necessary, I shall take steps to provide them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has not opened up such a serious matter in the statement he has made to the House. The hon. gentleman should have stated the whole facts when he stated any. If he had done so, he would have informed the House that no one could possibly be appointed unless he was properly qualified as a veterinary surgeon under the rules we laid down. If the hon. gentleman had stated that the matter would have borne an entirely different face to the House, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman does not desire, by telling half the truth, to place myself and the other members of the late Government in an improper position before the House. It is true that having laid down the rule that these officers should be properly qualified, I then took the nomination of gentlemen supporting the Government. If I were in power, I would do it to-morrow, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will do the same thing. Therefore, I do not think the hon. gentleman can claim a great deal of virtue for rather attempting to blacken the manner in which I had dealt with the matter by saying that I had taken the nomination of political supporters. I did it, I do not offer any excuse for it, and the hon. gentleman will do the same thing, and he might as well admit it to the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that while these gentlemen had to be qualified veterinary surgeons, there is a great deal of difference in the quality of professional gentlemen.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a great deal of difference between a Tory and a Liberal veterinary surgeon, in the hon. gentleman's estimation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I were to express such an opinion, I would only be following the footsteps of the hon. gentleman, who acknowledges that he appointed political supporters. But I consider it essential that something more than their political opinions should be considered in the appointment.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether in the arrangement for the appointment of these veterinary surgeons, it was decided how they should be paid—whether by salary or by fees ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were to be paid by fees, and their travelling expenses allowed. I may say that one of the dangers attendant on these appointments was that under the arrangements some individuals might very easily create work for themselves and plunge the country into serious difficulties and expenses. In justification of the action I took in regard to the cancelling of these appointments, I may say that in the three weeks during which these gentlemen were in office, some $500 or $600 of bills were sent into the department. These bills come from a very few out of the whole number. A number of them, having received no instructions, were wise enough to write to the department and find out what their duties were without taking any action ; but others, appointed in the manner I have indicated, plunged into the work, and seeing an opportunity, perhaps not particularly to make money, but to make themselves important and to gain a little cheap notoriety for themselves, incurred very heavy expenses which will have to be paid by the department. In one instance, in the province of Quebec, one of these gentlemen showed such lack of judgment that the chief veterinary surgeon had to go to the locality to investigate the matter, and we have had very serious difficulty in satisfying the people of the neighbourhood in regard to his action, and they have expressed their satisfaction that his appointment has been cancelled.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the question that was brought to his attention a few days ago, whether he will or will not relax the quarantine regulations with regard to cattle coming into the country. I understand that a request was made to him to do away with the 90 days quarantine. In my judgment, that would be a great mistake. It is most important to keep our cattle healthy, and the best way to do that is to prevent the importation of disease, which I am quite sure would occur if the relaxation urged were granted. If the hon. gentleman has considered that question, I think it would be interesting to the House and the country to know whether he has come to any conclusion in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that representations have been made to me on this very important subject. There are certain interests in the country which would no doubt like to see the quarantine regulations relaxed. While I have considered the subject, I have come to no conclusion ; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that no change will be made which will endanger the health of the animals in Canada.

Mr. McMILLAN. I hold in my hand a letter from the Chairman of the Cattle Breeders' Association of the province of Ontario in regard to the position of that association on this question of the quarantine between Canada and the United States. He says there was not a dissenting voice in the matter of the desirability of removing the quarantine regulations between Canada and the United States and of removing or

modifying those between England and Canada. The check imposed on this side upon cattle coming from abroad was considered to have the effect of making importation practically impossible. The cattle breeders are in favour of removing the quarantine restrictions between Canada and the United States, for the reason that a very large number of farmers in this country raise cattle which they cannot fatten, and for which it is believed they would find a market in the United States if those restrictions were removed. It is also found that cattle could be shipped from any port of the United States if the quarantine restrictions were removed from there. The restrictions between Great Britain and Canada at the present time are almost prohibitory. Many farmers going to England would purchase two or three cattle there and bring them to Canada, as this is absolutely necessary to keep up the quality of our cattle, but for the quarantine restriction of 90 days. While relaxing those restrictions, we should retain the right to re-impose them at any time if we found that the herds of the United States or Great Britain were injuring the herds in this country through importation.

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently either the cattlemen or the hon. gentleman are not well informed with regard to what the regulations are at the present time. Because he says that a relaxation would enable the cattlemen to export through the ports of the United States. If he were a close reader of the press, he would have noticed that only yesterday the cattlemen were exporting from the port of Boston, and that for the last three years they have had the privilege of exporting through Portland; and these are the only two ports of the United States through which, so far as I am aware, the cattlemen of Canada wish to send their cattle when exporting to Britain. Therefore, a relaxation of the quarantine regulations is not required for that purpose. With regard to the relaxation for the sake of the importation of cattle, I most decidedly dissent from their view. I do not believe it would be in the interests of the country to in any way relax those restrictions, because if we once imported disease, we would then be able to estimate the disadvantages, after it was too late.

Mr. ELLIS. What is the object of the regulation requiring the inspection of horses from this country to the United States? There is a charge of a dollar by each inspector for that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not aware, I confess, that there was a fee on horses going to the United States. Horses going to England are inspected because there have been representations from the Home Government with regard to some importations which were supposed to be affected with glanders, and we desired to maintain the high reputation which our horses have in the British markets. I have not looked into the matter to see whether or not there is the same inspection on horses going into the United States. My impression is, there is not.

Pension to Mrs. Colebroke and child..... $ 219

Mr. OLIVER. What is the reason for the difference in the pension between this year and last?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). My recollection is that last year $400 was allowed Mrs. Colebrooke for arrears.

Public Works—Chargeable to Capital—
River St. Lawrence ship channel..... $75,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a continuation of the same work as was prosecuted before?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Precisely the same.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I see that in the earlier Estimates, brought down by the late Government, an appropriation of $95,000 was made for this work. How do you account for the decrease?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sum in the Main Estimates was $75,000, and $20,000 was in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then, there is no actual reduction in this item as compared with the one brought down by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The late Government had a main estimate of $75,000, and a supplementary estimate of $20,000. Besides this, there was a special warrant for $12,000. The total expenditure last year was $110,000. I hope this year to spend only $75,000.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then, you ask for the same amount as the late Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). No, not the same amount as hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The same amount less the supplementary estimate.

River Kaministiquia $10,000

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps this would be the proper item upon which to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to another needed public work. I would ask the hon. Minister if it is the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum for the improvement of the navigation of the River Sydenham? This is a matter, as I understand, that has been before the Public Works Department for some time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to give my hon. friend

(Mr. Clancy) an answer to that question now.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to put the item in the Supplementary Estimates.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—
Nova Scotia—
Halifax Drill Hall..... $100.000
Lunenburg Post Office, Custom-house, &c., to complete..... 1,000

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the city of St. John.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Wait for the next item.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am calling the hon. Minister's attention to a matter of importance in a way that I think is quite parliamentary. I have seen discussions interjected upon items in this way, and I have been in the House as long as many of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like the hon. Minister to consider the need that exists for a drill shed in the city of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask if this $100,000 will finish the Halifax drill hall?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; the amount of the contract is $195,000. I understand that $100,000 will be needed to complete the work.

Mr. GILLIES. What is to be the total cost of this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost, including the site, the armoury, &c., will be $267,000.

Mr. BRITTON. It seems to me that the rule requiring the discussion to be confined to the item immediately under consideration, is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister at this stage to a work which I hope will be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates. Here is a very large vote for a drill hall in Halifax. Now, Kingston has not had a drill hall for four or five years. The one we had was sold to Queen's College. If Halifax is adjudged to be entitled to an expenditure of $100,000 for this purpose, I hope that at least one-quarter of that amount will be appropriated for a drill hall in Kingston, especially considering the fact that the late Government received the amount for the old drill hall on the supposition that a new one would be erected immediately. It is only fair to gentlemen opposite to say that the item for this work appeared in the Estimates, but the work was delayed.

Mr. GILLIES. Upon what system, or on what principle, is the choice of places for the construction of these drill halls made?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, we must be guided by the needs of the province. Further than this I have not made up my mind on what system I will consent to recommend appropriations for drill halls.

New Brunswick—
Marysville public building..... $8,000
Tracadie Lazaretto 1,000

Mr. DOMVILLE. I desire information as to this Marysville post office. Is this the Marysville opposite Fredericton, in the county my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) represents?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That vote was put in the Estimates to build a post office. It was understood at the time that Mr. Gibson was going to give a site. So far nothing has been done, but I thought fit to leave the estimate as it is, and negotiations can go on with Mr. Gibson, so that we may be able to see what we can do.

Mr. CAMERON. What is the population of this great city of Marysville, and what is the revenue of the post office there? Before we vote $8,000 for this purpose, we ought to know something of the circumstances. What is the population—500 or 10,000? Is the revenue $10 or $10,000? Before we pass this vote for building a post office in Marysville, we ought to understand these things.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that Marysville is a very flourishing town with a population of about 1,400. The business men are enterprising and active, and need this post office building.

Dominion public buildings—
Maritime Provinces generally—Dominion public buildings..... $10,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that a local architect in Prince Edward Island was asked to report on certain repairs to the public building at Montague, and to take steps to improve the approaches to the building and to do other small repairs. Could the Minister tell me if he has received the report from the local architect?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have no report yet, but we expect one from day to day.

Mr. QUINN. There was a question about a drill hall in St. John, N.B. Is it the intention of the Government to build a drill hall there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question has not yet been considered.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to know where it is intended to erect drill sheds during the present season. It is getting pretty close to the time that they should be estimated for. I know it has been the intention to put drill sheds in several places.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government have not yet had much time to consider where drill halls should be built. I have requests from certain towns, and in the Supplementary Estimates perhaps some votes will be proposed. But I cannot undertake to say that the Government is prepared to build many drill halls at present. Money is scarce.

Quebec—
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is proposed to be done with this $7,000 at the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We provide tools and all that kind of thing for the penitentiary. In the past we have provided the stoves also, but lately the Department of Justice has claimed that they should not provide the stoves.

Grosse Isle quarantine station..... $6,000

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $5,000 for the Grosse Isle quarantine station. What improvements are to be made which necessitate this additional outlay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I left the amount as I found it in the late estimates. It is for the following items: Bakery and baker's residence, $366.30; Catholic Chaplain's residence, $607; Catholic Chapel, $1,250; Superintendent's residence, $713; residence Assistant Medical Officer, $310; new residence, $1,121; repairs, $665; supplies not yet determined, and to cover travelling expenses and other contingencies, $1,600.

Quebec post office..... $2,500

Mr. CASGRAIN. I see $2,500 for repairs to Quebec post office. I think the repairs are sadly needed. What do you propose to do there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Repairing wall between main building and new wing, $550; iron frames, $500; gas pipes, $400; repairing roof, $600. Then there are items for painting, wood work, and travelling expenses.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The inside of the post office badly needs painting just now; in fact the inside has been in a dilapidated condition for a long time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The heating apparatus has been renewed, and I will see that the painting is improved.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether he has taken into consideration the petition of the ratepayers of Berthier, asking for the building of a post office in that town ? Berthier is an important town, being one of the earliest settlements on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. With the exception of Three Rivers, it is the most important town to be found between Montreal and Quebec. The revenue from the post office is surely more considerable than that yielded by the Marysville post office, for which a vote has just been taken; and the population of Berthier is also more considerable than that of all those small localities where post offices have been erected. The present post office at Berthier is totally inadequate to the public needs. It stands on a site that is not within easy reach of a large portion of the people of that town who have most business to transact at the post office. It is unsuitable for and inadequate to the public interests of that important town. The ratepayers of Berthier have sent a petition to the hon. Minister of Public Works asking him to take into consideration the needs of the public service in that locality. I should like to know from the Minister of Public Works whether he has taken that petition into his consideration, and also whether he has decided to put in the Supplementary Estimates a sufficient sum to build the post office asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Translation.) The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) sent me a few days ago, a petition signed by the ratepayers of Berthier. I have looked carefully into that petition. I am not ready now to tell the hon. member whether or not there will be a vote put in the Supplementary Estimates, so as to enable me to answer the appeal made by the petitioners. The hon. member will agree with me that so far I have had very little time at my disposal to enter into that kind of questions.

I may also draw his attention to the fact that, in some towns where post offices have been built, the sites on which they were built were given to the Government by the localities concerned. If the hon. gentleman is ready to tell me now that the town of Bertheir is ready to furnish the site, I may, perhaps, see my way to recommending to this House to vote the money required for that building.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) If the hon. Minister were willing to allow me two or three days before bringing in his Supplementary Estimates, I might then be in a position to give him an answer.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I should like to inquire from the hon. Minister of Public Works whether the sum of $12,000 included in this item, under the heading: "Dominion Public Buildings—Renewal and Repairs," is appropriated for the public buildings in the city of Montreal, or whether it is simply appropriated for the repairs of the post office in that town ? The reason why I put that question is this, that, as I am about to show, the Montreal post office is altogether inadequate to the needs of the public service in that city. I see that large sums are voted to build post offices in small towns. I think that the city of Montreal, which yields such a large revenue to the Dominion of Canada is entitled to receive at the hands of the Minister of Public Works the greatest con-

sideration. Of late, unheard of attempts have been made in order to find in the Montreal post office sufficient room for the needs of the public service. Everybody knows that that space is altogether inadequate to the needs of the hour, the more so as several rooms have been reserved for the Ministers who, when in the city of Montreal, are waited upon by a great many visitors, and quite frequently by numerous and important deputations. There are also other departments which admittedly are obstructed. The Railways and Canals Department have also to rent in the city of Montreal apartments for which they have to pay a rent of from $1,200 to $1,500 a year. All which goes to prove that the Government have not got in the city of Montreal sufficient space for the needs of the public service. Now, what I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works is this: Would it not be desirable, under the circumstances, to take into consideration, in connection with this contemplated expenditure, the urgent necessity of buying a site and building thereupon an edifice in which all the public offices and the various departments of the Dominion Government should be located? By so doing, the various offices could be brought together in one single building, instead of being scattered here and there, as is now the case. Up to date, a considerable expenditure has been incurred, $24,000, I think, for repairs. It would be important, I believe, to take into consideration the actual urgency of having a central building, and one adequate to the needs of the city of Montreal, which is the most important and the largest city in the Dominion, and where all the public departments could be located.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I am fully aware of the importance of the remarks just fallen from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk). The hon. gentleman will also agree with me, I hope, that the question he has just raised is too important for me to forthwith pass upon it. Such a large city as the city of Montreal would very likely require a central building like the one just described by the hon. gentleman. However, I am not prepared to give an answer just now. As to the vote of $12,000, it is for the purpose of making certain repairs to the Montreal post office. I have under my hand the details of the expenditure to be incurred. If the House wishes so, I am ready to give the details. The expenditure is the same as that provided for by the late Government. The reports which we have concerning the Montreal post office are to the effect that it would be large enough, but for some encroachments which take place somewhere about the building. I think I shall see my way to increasing the available space for the needs of the public service by keeping everybody within proper bounds.

Ontario—Dominion Reformatory $30,000

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I should like to obtain some explanation from the Minister in regard to the work on the construction of the reformatory at Alexandria.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I was sworn in as Minister I found there were differences prevailing between the chief architect of the department and Mr. Borque, the contractor for the building. I secured the services of Mr. Perreault, architect, of Montreal, and visited the spot. Mr. Perreault acted as arbitrator. The contractor was found not to be exactly in the right or in the wrong; it was understood that he would go on with the work. I may state, however, that the Government are considering whether it is a wise policy to have only one Dominion reformatory, and that difference of opinion existing to-day, and the contractor having practically ceased work, we will look carefully into the question. There has not been much work done so far, only $3,000 having been paid.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What is the amount of the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract for the main building is $95,000.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). How much has been paid for the site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government have paid $5,369 for the site.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). How much has been paid altogether, and at what dates?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government has paid only $3,000 for work done.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there not a balance now claimed by the contractor as due him?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there is a balance due to him.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Was not $3,000 only an approximate estimate, and has not more work been done since, and material placed on the grounds?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What is the cost of all the work now done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the contractor claims to have done work to the value of $6,000 or $7,000, or in that neighbourhood.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Has the Minister any doubt as to the work at that place being proceeded with?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nothing more has been done. As a matter of fact the contractor seems to have tendered at a very low price. He is a good man, he has provided the Government with a guarantee and we are safe with him; but he has not done a great deal of work, and

he has now practically ceased work, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). If this contractor is not going on with the work on account of the prices at which he has tendered, is it the intention of the Government to relet the contract and complete the work according to plans and specifications ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract is for the erection of the building. The contractor is perfectly free now to work or not to work, so long as he completes the building by a certain date, which is specified.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Is it the intention of the Government to go on with this work or not ? It is desirable, if this money is to be voted, that the committee should know the intention of the Government with respect to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor is obliged to complete the building by 2nd May, 1898. I cannot oblige him to work now. If he completes the building within the time specified, I have nothing to say.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). There are no contracts entered into with the Government on those terms, and under the specifications and terms of the contract the work has to be proceeded with to the satisfaction of the department. It is no use for the Minister to say that he cannot press the contractor, for he can do so. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work, and to bring it to a completion as rapidly as possible ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is asking me a question that is not altogether a fair one. I found on entering the department a contract which was entered into on 17th March. The contractor has received a certain sum of money, and is now going on with the work. If he completes the work in the time specified, that is all that is required, and I cannot tell him to do this or that now.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Certainly you can.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say a moment ago that the Government were considering whether they would not build reformatories in the different provinces, or at all events construct more than one. That would explain, it seems to me, why the work is not going on more rapidly. The contractor has been told probably something of that sort, and he is not proceeding with it. There are two reasons for it. First, because there is naturally no money in the department now, and secondly, that if he has to drop that contract he would rather lose less money by it and stop now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I came to the department the contractor had stopped work because there was a difficulty between him and our architect. Since then he has not resumed work in a very active way. That being the state of affairs, and speaking for myself alone, being of the opinion that perhaps it is not wise to have only one single reformatory, I did not tell him to go on for I could not do so, nor did I tell him to work because I could not do so. He has plenty of time in which to complete his work. While he is not working I am thinking a little.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Did not the Minister discharge the clerk of the works there ? I would like him to explain why he did so. Did he not tell him, though the work was under progress, that his services were not required because they intended not to do any more work for some considerable time. Was not such a notice sent to the clerk of the works ? I want to know if it is the intention of the Government to go on with this work at Alexandria, or whether they intend to have one or two reformatories ? That surely is a very reasonable request to ask. This House wants to know how the money is going to be expended, when and where. I have asked the Minister repeatedly, if it is his intention to proceed with this work, and surely if the present contractor fails to carry it out the Minister certainly has the power of cancelling his contract and letting it to another. If the contractor does not make sufficient progress to complete the work within a certain time, it lies with the Minister to cancel his contract, and such power is taken in every case. There is no use in the Minister saying that he cannot press Mr. Bourque, the contractor, on with the work. I understand he has moved everything away from the work. Am I to understand that he has no intention of going on with it ? Is the Minister aware of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may state again that when I was sworn in as a Minister I found that the contractor had quitted work. He has not resumed work very actively since, and I did not press him because after having read the contract carefully I found that I had no right to press him. I dispensed with the services of the clerk of works for the excellent reason that the work being suspended there was no use paying him. I did in his case what I did in the case of many others.

Mr. SPROULE. The question which the hon. member from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) asked, is a very reasonable one. It is, has the Minister changed his mind with regard to whether it was better to have one reformatory for the whole Dominion, or a different reformatory for each province. If the decision of the Government is to have a reformatory in each province I respectfully submit that Alexandria is not a suitable site for the province of Ontario, because it is at one end of the province. It

is an important matter for us to know as early as possible if there has been a change of policy in that respect, so that no more money should be squandered there. I have never agreed in the opinion that the selection of this particular site was a good one, because it seemed to me that it ought to be located in one of our cities and on some great through line of railway. This reformatory appears to be located in an out-of-the way place, and in a comparatively small town. If the Government decide now to change their policy, they should inform the House at once, so that there will be no more money squandered there.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). In answer to the last speaker (Mr. Sproule) I wish to say that when Sir John Thompson decided to build the reformatory in that place he did so for the reason that it was the most central locality in the whole Dominion. If you take the population of the Dominion from east to west you will find that Alexandria is as near the center of population as it is possible to get it. We are on a most important railway, the Canada Atlantic; the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway stations are only a comparatively short distance away. We are away from water which makes it more difficult for convicts to escape. We have got good quarries, and plenty of timber, and all kinds of material suitable for building purposes. In addition to that, Alexandria is almost on the border line between the two important provinces of Quebec and Ontario. We are near Montreal where any amount of supplies can be obtained if necessary, and we are within a short distance of Ottawa which can be communicated with by mail, telephone, or telegraph. Alexandria is a more convenient place for such an institution than any section of the country from which my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) comes.

The question that I want to ask the Minister is, and I want to have it answered; I want to know, Sir, if you intend to go on with that reformatory or not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry that I have not been able to make myself understood by my hon. friend. I thought I was very clear indeed, but I will try to be clearer still. Here I find a contract over which I have no more control. If the contractor goes on with his work I will pay him. If he does not proceed I cannot force him to do so, and I do not intend to force him now, because he has two years yet in which to complete this work and that seems to me a very long time.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am not asking you about Mr. Bourque. Suppose that Mr. Bourque dies and disappears from this world altogether, I want to know from you, will you go on with the work there or will you drop it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, if he dies, I will pray for his soul first, and after that I will deal with the matter to the best of my ability. I will read the contract again, and see what I can do.

Mr. WALLACE. The question which the hon. member for Glengarry asked the Minister was, whether it was the policy or the intention of the Government to go on with the construction of that reformatory at that place. He has not received an answer to that question, and I think the House is entitled to an answer before the money is voted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It seems to me that I have answered the hon. gentleman plainly. Mr. Bourque is an able man and a man of means, and I cannot suspect that he will fail in any way. He has several other contracts, and he is going on with his work, though not very rapidly. As I have said, I cannot compel him to go on any faster. I do not know what other information I can give. I do not know that I am obliged to say to-day what I would do if Mr. Bourque died.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am sorry to see that the Minister is trifling with this House. We want some civility. When we ask a fair question, we must expect a fair answer. I must say that the Conservative Government treated the Opposition in a more candid and respectful manner than this Government are treating this side of the House. I have no wish to delay the business of the session, but I have asked a straight and reasonable question: Is it the policy of the Government to go on with that reformatory at that place, or is it their policy to drop it? I want a straight answer to that question, without any equivocation. We all know Mr. Bourque; I have nothing against him; but the hon. Minister said, some time ago, that he had quit the work, and now he says he is not going on very fast. That answer will not do. I want a straight answer, and I insist upon having it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I have been in any way unfair to my hon. friend; I do not mean to be in any way unfair to him; but he cannot expect me to say any more than I have said. If Mr. Bourque goes on with his contract, and comes to me with a certificate of work done, I will pay him; but I cannot oblige him to go on. The time specified for the completion of the work is two years hence. As long as he goes on with the work, this Government is bound to pay him; there is no doubt about that. We have no intention to ask him to quit the work.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Suppose he does not go on?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If he comes to us with a proposal to quit his work, the question will then arise whether we will go on with this work or build

another house of the same kind elsewhere. But, so far, nothing has been done more than this. I found that Mr. Bourque, owing to a difference of opinion about the stone that was to be put in the foundation, had stopped work. He has not resumed the work in a very active manner, but he has resumed it to a certain extent. If he wishes to go on, we are obliged to pay him. If he offers us to quit the work, we will then consider the whole question.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. Minister to say that this contract was let at a very low price. Will he be kind enough to tell us what the amount is, and also the departmental estimate of what the work would cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think he has undertaken the work for $95,000. I think the estimate of the department is a good deal higher than that. But Mr. Bourque has intimated to me that he is perfectly able to complete his work, and, as I have said, he is a contractor of large means.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, if he is able to do it, and has means, I assume that the Government have taken proper security to indemnify them against loss. I understand that the Government have a right at any time to send their engineer and ascertain if satisfactory progress is being made with the work, so as to insure its completion within the specified time; and, if satisfactory progress is not being made, they have the right to demand that he shall proceed with the work more rapidly, or they can cancel the contract. It is quite clear that satisfactory progress is not being made with this work; and yet, so far as we can learn, the Minister has not given instructions to his engineer to have the work prosecuted more rapidly; nor has he given any reason for this not being done. Therefore, I think the hon. Minister will see the necessity of either insisting on that work being done more rapidly or knowing the reason why: because it must be apparent to him that it will be utterly impossible for the contractor to finish the work within the specified time if he does not go on more rapidly than he is doing at present. I understood the Minister to say that he has resumed the work, but in a limited way, and that all the money that is due him up to the present time has been paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; there is a certain amount due to him. He claims $6,000 or $7,000, if I remember rightly, and he has been paid $3,000; so that, if his claim is right, we owe him $3,000 or $4,000 for stone and other materials brought there. My information is to the effect that the contractor has plenty of time to complete the work within the time specified in the contract. Of course, if, during the spring season, Mr. Bourque does not proceed with the work, and we have not come to some agreement, I shall certainly urge him on.

Mr. SPROULE. That brings up another question of uncertainty. I understand that an agreement has been come to, what other agreement, then, did the hon. gentleman refer to?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question has been raised whether a single Dominion reformatory was sufficient or not. When I was sworn in as Minister of Public Works, several representations were made to me, and in view of those representations I did not press the contractors to go on with the work. The contractor, having stopped the work, representations were made to me that perhaps it would be the wiser policy to have two or three schools of the same kind. The contractor is perfectly free to go on with the work if he wants to, for the agreement is there. But he has chosen to stop the work.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two entirely different elements in this matter. One is the policy of the Government with regard to the advisability of building one or several reformatories. That the Government have not yet decided. The other is the contract between the Government and the contractor. We would naturally expect a Minister of Public Works to show a desire to have the contract completed. If he does not want it completed, he should say so. The trouble appears to be rather with the department than the contractor.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No doubt the real reason why the hon. gentleman cannot tell us whether it is the intention of the Government to go on with this reformatory on that site is that the Department of Public Works is simply building this reformatory for the Department of Justice. The latter department has to do with the settling of the site and the deciding whether one reformatory or several should be built. This may be the reason why the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is slightly embarrassed this evening in answering the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). Perhaps the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will give us an insight into the policy of the Government on this question.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The Government take the common-sense standpoint. Here is a contract which allows the contractor a certain period of time to complete the building, and he has given security to perform his part of the agreement. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Government are going to cancel that contract at present?

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend the Solicitor General should answer the question put by the Opposition. Here is a contract which the Minister of Public Works finds at a standstill. He was sworn in two

months ago as Minister, as he has frequently told us, and the work is stopped, and when he is asked why he does not urge the contractor to go on, he says: Well, I have allowed the contractor to stop work and discharged the clerk of the works. This looks as if the work was not going to be pushed at all, and as if the policy of the Government were to abandon the site. I put to the hon. gentleman this very fair question: Is there any intention on the part of the Government to abandon this site? That question calls for a plain and precise answer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government cannot have any other policy than to fulfil its obligations. The contract is there. If the contractor were proceeding with his work and were to come to me with an estimate, I would pay him, but he has plenty of time under the contract to complete the work, and we cannot oblige him to go on, and since he has stopped the work, I discharged the clerk. Now, if the contractor does not give up his work, if he does not come to us and ask us to abandon the contract, I shall certainly tell him to go on. We have security and are perfectly safe.

Mr. GILLIES. Why does he not go on?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I asked him why, and he replied: I have plenty of time. I told him that he must finish within the time fixed by the agreement, and nothing more took place.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Is this not the best season of the year to do the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not the best judge of that. The contractor is an able man and he told me he had plenty of time.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The question now is not what are the relations between the department and the contractor, or whether or not the Government can make this man go on with the work. But the question is whether the hon. gentleman has decided or not or whether the Department of Justice has decided or not, to keep to the site already chosen or choose another site, or is the whole matter under the consideration of the Government. The contractor, for one reason or another, fails to carry out the contract. Is it the intention of the Government to build that reformatory on that site or to build several reformatories, or is it the intention of the Government to build the reformatory on some other site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has not been decided at all. Nothing has been decided.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said in view of certain facts the Government had not pushed the contractor. What were they? That the security was good, that the contractor had sufficient time to complete the work, and that the contract price was reasonable. But in giving reasons before, one additional fact was stated and that was that certain parties had stated that it was unwise to build only one reformatory, in other words, that it was wise to build more than one of them. Now, the honourable gentlemen are not availing themselves of the right the department possesses of seeing that the work is pushed on as rapidly as it ought to be. I asked another question to which I would like to get an answer, but which the hon. Minister omitted to refer to. I asked what was the estimated cost of this work? The hon. Minister said the contract was $95,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that it would be in the public interest to give the department's estimate of the cost. Suppose we were obliged to ask for new tenders, it would not be in the public interest that that estimate should be made known. In any case that question does not arise now. The contract is let, the contractor has given good security, and, whatever may have been the estimated cost, it cannot change matters.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we are quite within our right in asking the estimated cost, because it is only by comparison with that that we can tell whether the contract is a reasonable one or not, and whether the money is spent wisely or unwisely. Since the contract has been let and the contractor is a competent person with financial standing to complete the work, and as we are asked to vote this amount, I think we have a right to know this estimate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think the hon. gentleman, on reflection, will see the force of the objection raised by the hon. Minister of Public Works. The contract price is a reasonable one—that has been stated. Suppose new tenders had to be called for, I do not think it would be expedient that every person tendering should have the Government estimate, because we may be quite sure that all the tenders would come pretty well up with the Government's estimate. If the hon. gentleman will think for a moment he will see that the reason is a sound one. There is no desire whatever to withhold information. On the main question the explanation is clear, I think. The Government do not intend to repudiate the contract; the work under it can go on at any time and the money will be paid. But should the contractor throw up his contract, the Government will then be open to reconsider the whole matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think we have a right to suppose that the contractor is going to throw up his contract. It was entered upon in the regular way and the contractor is a man of good financial standing. We

are bound to assume that he will fulfil his contract.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let him go ahead, then.

Mr. SPROULE. Will hon. gentlemen please restrain their impatience. If they have nothing to do but interrupt it would be better that they should leave the Chamber. I contend that we have a right to this information. We are bound to assume that the contractor will finish the work. If they do not wish him to complete the work it would indicate that there are difficulties between him and the department or in the department itself.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to refer to the extraordinary statement made by the hon. Finance Minister that if the contractor fails to fulfil his contract the whole question will be open to the Government as to what course they shall pursue with regard to the work. As I understand, the late Government came before the House with a policy for establishing a reformatory, naming the place where it was to be built and explaining the objects of the institution. Now, as a result of the contingency that the contractor has not fulfilled the terms of his contract, the Government, according to the hon. Minister of Finance, is to adopt a different policy with regard to the establishment of these reformatories. I think that is a most extraordinary proposition to make. If the Government are going to reconsider their policy they should reconsider it without regard as to whether the contractor is ready to finish his contract or not. Now is the time to submit a policy to the House and get the approval of the House for it. There is another point to which I wish to refer—the bringing in of an architect to settle a dispute between the contractor and the Government architect, Mr. Fuller. I think it is an unusual thing, to commence with, that the chief architect of the Government is to be subjected to the supervision of some outside and irresponsible architect. And yet I understand the Minister of Public Works to say that that was what was done. I think that is not a proper course to take in reference to an architect in whom the Government have confidence, and if they have not confidence in him they should dispense with his services.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor complained bitterly of being treated in an unfair manner and asked for another architect who would go and examine the work. I submitted his complaint to Mr. Ewart, and Mr. Ewart agreed that it would be better to have another architect. Mr. Perreault examined the work, and he agreed with Mr. Ewart.

Mr. WALLACE. But suppose they had not agreed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say what I should have done in that case.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Did Mr. Ewart agree to this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor and Mr. Ewart agreed that it would be well to have another architect to settle the matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It does not seem to me that the Minister of Public Works has made his case and his policy as plain to the committee as to the Finance Minister ; and I do not think he has satisfied his colleague. In the first place, if I did not misunderstand the hon. gentleman, he stated that when he was sworn in he found that the contractor was not pushing the work vigorously, and that representations were made to him whether it was a wise policy to have the reformatory there or not, and, in consequence of these things he decided not to push the contractor ? Am I not correct in that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that we have no right to oblige Mr. Bourque to go on any quicker than he was going, because he had plenty of time to finish his work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am afraid my hon. friend is evading the question. I asked whether he did not state to the committee that when he took charge of the Department of Public Works he found that Mr. Bourque was not pushing the work, and that as representations were being made as to the wisdom or unwisdom of using that site, and that consequently he did not push the contract. Now, I am within the judgment of the committee in saying that that statement was made by the Minister of Public Works. His next statement was : I will push him if he does not go on with his work. His next statement was that it was not decided by the Government whether they would go on with the reformatory there or not. The next statement was made by the Finance Minister that if he fails, then the whole question may be an open one for the Government to decide. Now, if these four answers satisfy the easily satisfied judgment of the Finance Minister as to the clearness with which the Minister of Public Works has defined his policy, I am bound to venture the suggestion that they do not satisfy the committee generally. Now, the Minister of Public Works says that on account of representation, he was loth to push the contractor ; I think I am right in saying that the word " representations " was used. Now, I think the hon. gentleman should not hesitate to tell us who made those representations. Were they made by the Department of Justice and, if so, what were the representations and in what line did they operate upon the mind of the Minister when he said that the question might be an open one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I said was this, that it was a very important question whether one reformatory was better than two or three; and I said that representations had been made, not since I have been a Minister only, but before, because my hon. friend knows that that question has been discussed over and over again. In view of all these facts, I said that finding the contractor was not very quick, I did not order him to go on, because he had plenty of time to complete his work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the hon. gentleman is treating us candidly. I asked him the simple question, Were representations made to him as to the wisdom or unwisdom of this site; and if those representations were made to him, were they made by the Department of Justice, if not by whom?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were representations made to me by members of the House, by colleagues of mine. We discussed the matter; and I had read the papers on that question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As the Minister of Finance knows very well, the Department of Justice is the one whose Minister reports upon a question of this kind to Council, as to the policy. Now, has the hon. gentleman had instructions or representations from the Department of Justice as to the wisdom or unwisdom in connection with this matter?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then who were the representations from?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated that the question had been discussed between my colleagues and myself, and between members and myself. It has been discussed in a general way, but not in such a way as to interfere with Mr. Bourque. Mr. Bourque is perfectly free to go on to-morrow if he likes, and I will pay him. The question has been discussed in an informal manner.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman then say which policy is to be accepted by the department? We have had a policy specifically announced by the Minister of Finance, and we have had a policy specifically announced by the Minister of Public Works. The policy announced by the Minister of Finance is that if Mr. Bourque fails to go on with his work, then the whole question will be open for discussion; the policy announced by the Minister of Public Works is that if Mr. Bourque does not go on with his work, he will make him. Now, which policy are we to accept?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The policy of the Government will be to comply with the terms of the contract, we are bound by this contract, and Mr. Bourque is bound also. But for the time being we have no other policy to follow than to abide by our agreement.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shakes his head. I think he is no more satisfied than the members of the committee. He knows there is an absolute contradiction between the policy laid down by the Minister of Finance, and that of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no reason which would induce me to believe that Mr. Bourque will not go on with his contract. He is competent to do so, and we have securities.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the date of the completion of the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 2nd May, 1898.

Mr. QUINN. I would ask the Minister if it is for this reformatory at Alexandria that the $30,000 are required? I would like to ask, also, how much work has been done within the last six months, and what amount of the appropriation of last year remains unexpended at this moment? We will by that means find out if it is necessary to vote this sum now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have only paid $3,000 out of the appropriation of $20,000 of last year.

Mr. QUINN. There was a revote of $13,800, that would make $33,800 for last year, of which only $3,000 has been expended. Yet $30,000 are asked for now, which will make $60,000 to expend on that work this year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot expend what has lapsed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have spent $3,000 out of $33,000.

Mr. QUINN. Why should $30,000 be asked for now if no work has been done within the last six months?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The balance of last year lapsed, and we are asking now that the amount necessary to pay for the work which will be done.

Mr. QUINN. But how much has been done within the last six months?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work was only begun in May last, and therefore there cannot be much work done yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly this is one of the oddest episodes I have ever seen in the House, and I have been in it for some time. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is in a quandary, and I think I can find an easy solution for him out of it. I

would suggest to him that he can get out of it in one of two ways—either say that it is the intention of the Government, if this man goes on with his contract, to abide by the policy which has been laid down to have one Dominion reformatory for the whole country——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that.

Mr. FOSTER. The other way is to state—and the two must be stated together, in order to make it clear—that, if by any means the contractor does not go on with this work, then it is the intention of the Government to consider the whole matter, and to adopt the policy of building several reformatories, instead of one. If the hon. gentleman will state that, he will give the committee a definite opinion as to what the Government propose; otherwise, and as it is now, I do not see how the committee can possibly vote this money. There are several ways by which a contractor may be induced not to go on with his work. A contractor may not go on from certain circumstances arising out of his own position. He may refuse to go on, and, if he refuses, the contract lapses. But there are a dozen other ways by which a contractor may not go on. He may understand quite well what is the position the Government would like him to take with respect to the contract, and he may conform to the wishes of the Government. What the Government evidently has not done is this: it has not considered its policy, and it has not decided on its policy with respect to Dominion reformatories; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite want the committee to vote a sum of money under the guise of building a Dominion reformatory, when it is open to the Government, by indirect methods, not to allow this work to proceed. I think the Government should state their policy. For two or three years the matter had been discussed under the late Government. Representations were made from different quarters as to the necessity of having a Dominion reformatory. After it had received consideration from the Department of Justice—for it has primarily to decide the policy—the Government came down to the House and asked that the policy should be carried out. That was done by the Department of Justice, and, after it was decided that we should have one Dominion reformatory and that Alexandria would be a good site, the Government came down to the House and obtained a grant of money to carry out that policy, and consequently Parliament is committed to that policy. Under it a contract has been given out, and certain work has been done. The Government ought to say right here and now whether they are in favour of having one Dominion reformatory and having it built at Alexandria, or whether they are not in favour of that policy; and to supplement that statement by saying that, if, by any possibility, this contractor does not do the work, they will take advantage of the fact in order to carry out their own policy and go against the other policy. Then they would be standing on the ground of the contract, and, if the contractor carried out his part, the Government would have to carry out theirs. But the Government has steadily avoided, through the Minister of Public Works, making any statement of policy. The hon. gentleman said that some representations have been made to him. What right has the hon. gentleman to make the work proceed slowly or rapidly, when it is a work involving a policy which did not originate in his department, but in the Department of Justice; and, if representations are to be made, they are to be made by the Minister of Justice, and the mechanic of the Government for the time being, the Minister of Public Works, is to push on the acknowledged policy of the Government, and which has received the endorsation of Parliament, and push it on as rapidly as possible. But the hon. gentleman is evidently hedging behind this question of contract, in order to hide the utter lack of agreement as to policy on the part of the Government.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It seems to me that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has taken a very unfair position before this committee. What are the facts with which we are called upon to deal? They are that a condition of things was created by the late Government which entailed responsibility upon the present one. They entered into a contract with an individual, and in consequence of the principle of continuity of government, we are bound to execute that contract, entered into with that individual. If we do not, the Government is liable for damages. Under these circumstances, the member for York says that the Government are bound to state their policy with respect to reformatories generally. We are not called upon to deal with that general question now. We have before us simply the matter of this contract and the execution of it. If, by means of any accident, the Government were relieved of the obligation that has been imposed on them by the late Government, they will then decide the question of policy; but why should the Government now be called upon to announce their decision on a question of policy, and make themselves liable to an action for damages for the non-fulfilment of the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is not obliged to make himself or the Government liable for a breach of contract with the present contractor. All we ask the hon. gentleman and his Government to do is to state plainly to this House that, if they are obliged by this contract to build a reformatory at Alexandria, they will go on and build it; if they are not obliged to do so, they will not go on and build it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have a contract between the Government of Canada and an individual. The fact of the contract having been entered into gives an assurance that it is to be executed honestly by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman go one step further, and say that, if the contract can be carried out, a reformatory will be built there; but, if by any means the contract falls to the ground, then will the Government state what they are going to do with the money?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We will state that when the eventuality occurs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The money will not be in the hands of the Government for any other purpose than that for which it is voted.

Mr. FOSTER. The vote says "Dominion Reformatory," and if, by any possibility, the contract goes to the wall, and the Government wished to erect a reformatory at another place, they would have a perfect right to construct a reformatory at Ottawa, Toronto, Owen Sound, or any other place in the Dominion. The Government would not ask the House to vote that money. If the Government are willing to add after "Dominion Reformatory," "at Alexandria," then, I think, their explanation might be allowed to go, because then they could not build it anywhere else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The last criticism made by the hon. member is not an unreasonable one. He says that under the terms of the vote, the Government could abandon the construction of a reformatory at Alexandria and build one somewhere else. I can give the hon. gentleman an unqualified assurance that that will not be done. If the construction of a reformatory at Alexandria for any reason does not go on—and I do not anticipate any reason—and the Government resolves to build a reformatory elsewhere, they will come down to the House and ask for an appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, will the hon. gentleman insert the words "at Alexandria"? If the hon. gentleman is sincere—which I do not doubt in the least—he can have no objection to these words being inserted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see that the insertion of those words would make any difference; but, when the hon. gentleman wanted to build a reformatory at Alexandria, he did not insert those words in the vote. His Estimates did not state that the reformatory should be at Alexandria, and it was simply a matter or reasonable inference from the policy of the Government that it would be built there. If the House could accept it as a reasonable inference of the policy of the late Government, it will, I trust, be no less generous with us.

Mr. FOSTER. There is this difference, that it was the settled policy of the late Government, about which there was no doubt, that it should be built at Alexandria. But both the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance have thrown doubts on the policy of the present Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You have the positive assurance of the Finance Minister. What more do you want?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). He has got the assurance of the Finance Minister that if it is not built at Alexandria the money will not be spent. That is as straight and clear as anything could be, and it would be contrary to all the traditions of the House not to accept it.

Mr. McNEILL. The Minister of Public Works has told us that the contractor is quite able to finish this building, and that he is a thoroughly responsible man. If the contractor desires not to finish the work, is it the intention of the Minister to use all possible effort to make him finish it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no other policy, as far as I am concerned, than to pay the contractor when he comes to me with the estimates.

Mr. McNEILL. That is not at all an answer to the question I asked a minute ago. I wish to know if it is his policy to endeavour to have the work carried out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He said so.

Mr. McNEILL. Oh, no. If he has said so, I have no doubt that he will repeat it to gratify me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, I can have no other policy than to execute my part of the contract. The contractor is bound and I am bound, and I cannot do anything else but execute my part of the bargain.

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite sure the Minister will carry out his part of the bargain, but suppose the contractor does not want to carry out his part, will the Minister force him to do it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot assume that Mr. Bourque will not carry out his part of the bargain.

Mr. McNEILL. In every contract there is always a possibility that there may be a failure on one side. I wish to know plainly from my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) whether it is his intention to compel the contractor, so far as he is able, to carry out his part of the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case the contractor has expressed a desire to go on, and I have expressed my willingness to pay him. He has come to my office on several occasions and he has said that he was prepared to finish the work by the time specified.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not wish to press the Minister further. I see plainly that he will not answer the question.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The Minister says that it is his intention to pay the contractor if he goes on with the work. The site has cost $5,000, and he says the contractor's claim is $7,000, and then the amount in the Estimates here, including the revote, would come to about $40,000. If the contractor goes on with the work and he pays him, there will be something like $60,000 expended. When this question came before the House, Sir John Thompson explained that the building was to be at Alexandria, in the county of Glengarry. There was no doubt at that time as to the location of the building. If the Minister now is willing to pay the contractor if he goes on with the work, and is willing to expend about $60,000, I hope he will have no objection to put the words "at Alexandria" in the vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no desire to amend the Estimates which were prepared by my hon. friends on the other side of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire from the Minister of Public Works if in this item for $15,000, any sum is intended for renewing or repairing the drill shed at Gananoque. This is a very urgent case. Some years ago the town of Gananoque presented the Government with a site for a drill shed. A few years ago the Catholic church at Gananoque purchased the lot adjacent to that, on which they erected a very fine building. They made representations to the council asking that they might petition the Government to have the drill shed removed, owing to the fact that a large quantity of powder was stowed within a few feet of their church. The council asked the Government to remove the drill shed and offered to pay $1,000 for the site on which the drill shed then stood. The Government accepted the proposition, gave the town a deed of the site, and promised to remove the drill shed within a reasonable time, the town paying the $1,000 to the Receiver General. The town then deeded the lot to the school board for the purpose of erecting a high school. The school was erected partly on the site on which the drill shed stood, and in order to make room for the building one or two bents of the drill shed had to be taken down. That was done by the school board, and the lumber and material was piled up. Now, Sir, that reasonable time has more than expired in which the Government was to remove the balance of the drill shed. We have in that town an artillery corps as well as a rifle corps, and things are in a very confused condition, they not having room in the portion of the drill shed which remains standing. The portion of the building which now stands is up against the high school on the front and up against the Roman Catholic church at the side. It was the intention that the remaining portion of the drill shed should be removed during the summer, but now it is coming near the fall, and I hope the Government will take immediate steps to oblige the military authorities and the authorities of the Roman Catholic church, by removing the balance of the drill shed at an early date. If provision is not made under this item, I hope ample provision will be made in the Supplementary Estimates and that immediate action will be taken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friends opposite will hold their souls in peace a few minutes longer we will get through the Estimates quicker. It appears to me that since hon. gentlemen have passed over to that side of the House they have got swelled heads. I would suggest that they go down stairs and soak them a while. When I bring up this question, in which the militia authorities, the Roman Catholic church and the town council of Brockville are so deeply interested, I think the reasonable demand I make ought to be complied with.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In answer to my hon. friend, I may say that the subject of the repairs to the drill shed belongs to the Minister of Militia and Defence. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. TAYLOR. This has to be re-built. I see the Minister of Militia in his place, and if the Minister of Public Works cannot give me the information, I would like to inquire of the Minister of Militia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have had the matter to which the hon. gentleman refers brought to my notice, but I have not had an opportunity yet of investigating it fully. I believe the statement he has made is substantially correct, and I can only say the Department of Militia and the Government will feel themselves bound to carry out any arrangement made by their predecessors. I promise the hon. gentleman that I will take the matter up and go through it carefully, and do whatever is necessary and right in the premises.

Manitoba—
Portage la Prairie post office..... $20,000

Mr. BOYD. Before that item is carried, I want to know if this vote of $20,000 for the Portage la Prairie post office is going to finish the building, and how much has already been expended on that building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that some difficulty has arisen about the choice of the site. Representations have been made to me that the site chosen was not the proper one, and I received to-day a telegram from Portage la Prairie, which reads as follows :—

Portage La Prairie, September 15th.

The Hon. Minister Public Works, Ottawa.

The following is a copy of a resolution passed by the council of the town of Portage La Prairie at its last meeting : That the site selected by the Dominion Government for its post office here is not a central one, either as regards population or business, and its unfairness has given rise to a great deal of well-grounded discontent among our citizens ; that its removal to the corner of Campbell Street and Saskatchewan Avenue, which is a fair and central location, will give general satisfaction to our town's people ; and that a copy of this resolution be wired by our secretary-treasurer to the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works.

(Signed) F. A. WHITTAKER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Representations had been made to me before, and I state frankly to the House what I answered verbally to those representations. I stated that if a site were offered and the city council adopted a resolution in favour of a change of site, I would then be prepared to ask Parliament to vote $5,000 to remove the building from the unsuitable place where it is to-day to the more suitable site that would be offered. The amount spent so far has been $15,223. The contractors, Viau & Lachance, have written to the department offering to take the building from the site where it is now and to put it up in the same condition that it is to-day on another site, for $5,000. The moment the citizens, represented by the town authorities, represent to the Government that the first site is not suitable, we have no other course to follow than to change it. As a matter of fact, the Government agent has never consented to the site which has been chosen, and the records in the department show that it was to a certain extent a political site. Under these circumstances I thought it was in the public interest that, if a free site were offered to us, and the town authorities adopted a resolution in favour of a change, we should consent to it.

Mr. BOYD. There has for years past been a feeling in Portage la Prairie with regard to the location of public buildings owing to the geographical position of the town. On the south side of the town there is a slough running in from the Assiniboine River, and on the north side the Canadian Pacific Railway runs parallel to the town, leaving the town proper about half a mile in width ; and for the past fifteen years or more there has been a strong feeling with regard to the location of public structures in that town. Like most of the towns in that western country, Portage la Prairie has been built in a westerly direction. Now, Sir, the local government have erected all their public buildings—the Lands Titles office, the court-house and jail, the home for incurables—at the extreme easterly end of the town. If the precedent the Minister of Public Works proposes is a good one, that is that he should entertain the removal of the post office building on account of the action of the Portage la Prairie town council, I hold in my hand resolutions passed by the town council of Portage la Prairie, and by the county council of Lakeside adjoining the town, wherein they agree to buy the site and bear the expenses of erecting the Lands Titles office, as it is known, in a more central locality. I also have a letter signed by the then mayor of Portage la Prairie to the Hon. Thomas Greenway, to which Mr. Greenway replied that the matter was in the hands of the city's representative (Mr. Martin), and that he had nothing to do with it. And as I stated in the House last session, Mr. Martin's answer to those gentlemen was that they might go to the father of lies, that he would put the building where he pleased, and he did it. It seems to me preposterous to suppose that a building on which $15,000 has been expended, which is only 150 feet away from where the post office has been for the past fifteen years, should be taken down and removed only three blocks east of where it is, and a building that is only one block west of the centre line of the town and one block east of the central school-house, and east of the centre line between the two ward schools. I have explained the locality and the feeling of the town, and I think the Government is greatly to blame in not having proceeded with the work on the site that has been purchased. As regards the new site, the Minister and the department know that the foundation is not suitable. They know that water is reached at from two feet to three feet, and that the present building cannot be moved and placed on the new site for $5,000. It would cost nearly the whole of that to excavate and put in the foundation. I cannot conceive anything more preposterous than the proposition to remove a building, on which $15,000 has been expended, only three blocks, and only two blocks east of the present population which is continually growing west as is the case with all our western towns. The whole thing is a political job.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know something about this matter, and I would like to point out that if the building is completed in its present location, it is entirely too far west and will be a source of great inconvenience for all time to come. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has told this House that it will cost an additional sum of $15,000 to remove that post office, but the hon. Minister of Public Works has informed us that the contractor has agreed to remove the building, as at present constructed, for a total sum of $5,000. Now, an additional cost

of $5,000 is not a very large item compared with the great convenience which the removal of the building will give the people of that town. As a resident of Winnipeg, I am sure that I but faintly express the sentiments of the business people of that city when I say that we have suffered for a great many years from the inconvenience of having our custom-house located at the south end of the town, far removed from the business portion, and although representations have been made, year after year, by the business people of Winnipeg, we have been unable to have our custom-house removed to the centre of the city. It is because I do not wish to see the people of Portage la Prairie suffer in the same way that I rise to say that it would be in the interest of that town that this change should be made. It is only going to cost $5,000 and if people are willing to contribute the new site, this House will be justified in voting that amount.

Mr. BOYD. That is merely the opinion of the hon. member for Lisgar which we have heard. He has not given any facts.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have given the facts stated by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BOYD. The hon. gentleman merely stated that in the interests of the town this building should be removed. Well, I do not think, in the interests of the town, that it should, because it is only one block now west of the centre of population in a town that is growing west. And it is only 150 feet from the place that the post office has been for the past fifteen years. In this town, the very same thing was done by the Liberal party in putting up public buildings at the extreme east, where parties interested had property contiguous to it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I happen to know something about this. There are two facts which confront us, and are much stronger than any expression of opinion. The first is that the Government officials refused to sanction the site.

Mr. BOYD. Why does the hon. gentleman make that assertion?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Because the hon. Minister has said so and the papers show it. The second reason is that the people of that city, through their representative, have asked that the change should be made. That one fact is worth the opinion of any number of men. The hon. gentleman's statement that all towns grow west is news to me. Towns may grow north, south and east as well as west. I see no reason why they should grow west. These facts would convince me even if I had not known something about it before, that this change should be made. We ought always to consult the authorities of the town in these matters. I know of cases where public offices were built in the wrong place, simply because some pet of the Government party had a piece of land to sell. The fact that the town council have asked for the removal and are willing to contribute their share, shows the building is now in the wrong place.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is rather a grave proceeding that the hon. Minister is undertaking, considering it as a precedent. It will be a pretty difficult thing for an incoming Administration to review everything that has been done by its predecessors and set everything right according to its ideas, especially if it goes so far as removing buildings standing upon sites that some people may afterwards think to be wrong sites. The expense would be very large, and I would just put to my hon. friend whether he can undertake a business of that kind. Here was a Government in power and a member representing a constituency in which a building was to be constructed. The amount was voted by the House and the site was selected by the Government. The hon. gentleman says that the agent of the department did not approve of it. But the Public Works Department which is superior to any of its agents, actually settled upon the site and the contract has been given and $15,000 has been expended in the construction of the building on that site. Now my hon. friend proposes to review the work of an Administration a year or two years past and to ask the House to give him the sum of money to take down the old work and put up a new one. I think my hon. friend is entering upon an undertaking which he will find a pretty difficult one, and I think he will have to give pretty good reasons before the House will give him $5,000 to be spent in this manner under such circumstances. My hon. friend has stated that he will bring the papers down. I think it would be well to let this item stand until those papers are before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That means bringing the whole question up again.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. I, for one, am not in a position to vote, and I do not propose to vote until we see these papers. I want also to see a map of the town site. It is very well for an hon. gentleman from Winnipeg to say that this site ought to be changed, but we must remember that the representative of the county says it should not be changed. And we sit here and are asked to vote for an additional expense without understanding the case. Under the circumstances and with the statement from the Minister himself that there are papers that have not been brought down, I think it would be much better to let the item stand until we see the papers.

Mr. WALLACE. I happened to be in Portage la Prairie the day that the telegram came from Ottawa that the site to which

reference has been made had been chosen by the department. I think I met only two people who were dissatisfied with the decision. The choice of site seemed to meet with the general approval of the citizens so far as I could gauge public opinion. I had the opportunity of looking at the site and it seemed to me that it was close to the centre of population. There were other reasons which the people pointed out to me which made me think that it was the most suitable location. For these reasons I think that after $15,000 has been expended —a large portion of it in making foundations, because the water comes within a few feet of the ground all over the place— to start elsewhere would be a childish piece of business and one that the Government ought not to undertake.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I stated that there had been $15,000 expended I should have said that of this $5,000 was paid for the site. Now I am offered a free site. On that question of site, what took place was this—and the papers which I will gladly bring down will prove it—my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) is the party who really made the choice of site. The agent of the department positively declined to recommend the site which has been adopted.

Mr. BOYD. Has he recommended the site proposed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has not, but he refused to recommend the other. One of the friends of the hon. gentleman—I cannot recollect his name— ordered that the present site be chosen. The matter was referred to the department at Ottawa. I say again positively that Mr. Smith declined to recommend the site. The hon. member for Macdonald at that time had powerful influence in the department and he chose the site himself. Until a certain private document was sent to me, which document was in the hands of Mr. Smith, I positively declined to have anything to do with the proposed change. That paper came into my hands and is now in my department. The town authorities represent to me that the site has been wrongly chosen. Surely they are better judges than we. We are offered a site free of charge, and the only cost to the Government will be $5,000. It is of no use to say that the building has cost $15,000 and because of that large expenditure we must not make any change. As I have stated Messrs. Viau & Lachance, the contractors for the building, have offered to make the removal and rebuild for $5,000. Something has been said about quicksand and water on the new site. The contractors have pledged themselves, and I will see to it that that pledge is in the contract, that they will make the necessary provision against quicksand and water. Otherwise I will not make the change. Five thousand dollars is not a very large sum as against the fact that the authorities of an important town like Portage la Prairie represent that the change is in the interest of the town. Under the circumstances I made up my mind that the site ought to be changed. But I say again that I did not make up my mind to that until I had in my hands a letter from Mr. Smith in which he states positively that he declined to choose the site and that the friend of my hon. friend from Macdonald tried to oblige him to recommend the site that has been chosen.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think that the member representing a constituency may not make a choice as good as that of an under official of his own ? By his own argument he is putting this contemplated action very largely on the fact that the official did not choose to recommend a site. But does my hon. friend think that there may not be other dangers in a policy of this kind ? A public building is supposed to give value to property in its vicinity. A change of this kind may be open to very serious objection on the ground that properties may increase in value in consequence, and that it may be to the interest of people to give a site worth $5,000 for the purpose of increasing the value of the property. I want to point out to my hon. friend that there are many difficulties likely to arise, if he undertakes to disturb what has been settled. Is this building of brick or stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Stone.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, you have a stone building worth $10,000 upon a foundation, and you propose to move that stone building, and the contractors are going to make another foundation, and put the building upon it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to meet a big claim in the way of extras.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one cent.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems utterly impossible for the firm to do that.

Mr. GIBSON. If the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) had been as careful, when Finance Minister, in looking after this site for a public building there as he is to-night, he would never have given his consent to putting the building where it was. I had the pleasure of visiting that town, and, although I saw a different class of men from those seen by my hon. friend from York, I can say, to the contrary of what he stated, that I heard a great many complaints. We have had complaints in this House, time and again, about the trouble caused to the

whole town by the selection made by the hon. member who represents the constituency of Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). Now, the hon. member for York criticises the Minister of Public Works, as does also my hon. friend from Macdonald, about the impossibility of taking down this stone-work and moving it three or four blocks, and re-erecting it for the cost of $5,000. Now, any one familiar with works of that kind, knows that the money has already been spent in the preparation of these materials, and it is only a question of taking them down and removing them, and putting them on another site. I am bound to say that, if the gentlemen who have the contract, are willing to do that for $5,000, it seems to me, as a practical man, that they are pretty well paid for the work, and they are able to do it for that sum of money. Now, my hon. friend from Macdonald states that they are only moving this building some two or three blocks down town. I wish he had told this committee how large the blocks are in Portage la Prairie. Why, Mr. Chairman, this building is practically out of town, and it is putting the people of Portage la Prairie for all time to come to an inconvenience for the sake of some friends of the hon. member for Macdonald. The hon. member for York says that we should not do a thing of that kind. We are here, Mr. Chairman, to do what is right, no matter whether the late Government did right or wrong. If they committed a wrong, now is the time to make it right by this alteration. I put it to the judgment of every right-thinking man on this committee, on either side, if the Government are not doing the right and proper thing in a matter of this kind affecting the welfare of a town, where the corporation are willing to present the Government with a lot, where the public officials are desirous that the building should be put, and where it is convenient to the public, although it may not be convenient for the hon. member who happens to have been a friend of the late Government. I am within the mark in saying that he would not get half a dozen men outside of his own following to coincide with his selection. I do not know whether he was interested in the lot; but I do say that the interests of Portage la Prairie were not as well looked after by the ex-Minister of Finance when he swallowed the whole thing simply upon the advice of the member for Macdonald. It is important that this building should be at once removed for the convenience of the public, and that this difficulty should be settled now for all time to come. It has been up for the last two or three sessions, and I think the Government are justified in asking this House to right a wrong, even if it should cost $5,000. I, for one, will have much pleasure in supporting the Minister of Public Works, believing that the offer he has had from the contractors justifies him in making the change, especially since it can be made without any extras, which my hon. friend from York stands so much in dread of. I think, when the hon. gentleman from York looks in front of this Parliament building, at a block which was to cost the Government $200,000, and has run up in the matter of extras alone to something like nearly $800,000, he should say very little about extras.

Mr. MAXWELL. As this case is closely related to a similar case that occurred in Vancouver, I think I ought to give a little account of the extreme wisdom of the late Government. They have always been distinguished for the manner in which they selected sites, and also for their habit of putting public buildings in places where the citizens do not want them put. Now, we have had a post office built in that city on a site that was against the wishes of almost all the citizens of Vancouver; they put the post office in a place such that, when our people look at it, they are moved to indignation. Of course, we know that the late Government was always sensible to the sweet influences of particular friends, and they had a friend out there likewise whom they wished to accommodate. That friend was referred to by an hon. gentleman opposite as a large corporation. Not long ago, in order to please a particular corporation, and against the almost unanimous sentiment of the people of Vancouver, the late Government erected a post office in a place that does not benefit half a dozen people in the whole city. Now, I say, if we can get that post office at Portage la Prairie removed for $5,000, I will heartily support the proposition. I have great pleasure in supporting the request of the citizens of Portage la Prairie in this matter, because, as in the case of Vancouver, it is time the change was made, even though it cost $5,000.

Mr. BOYD. As yet I have heard no reason given why this post office should be removed. The Minister states that the selection was made upon my recommendation, and that the papers in the department prove it. I would like him to produce them. It has been stated that Mr. Smith refused to recommend the site. He (Mr. Smith) was not sent there to recommend a site. He inspected three sites. One was the present site built on, one called the central site, which is half a block east of where the present post office is situated. These foundations he found to be good. As regards a site one block east of that, he would not report in favour of the foundation; but he refused to assent to any particular site. As regards the final location of a site, a deputation came here and waited on the Government. That deputation of leading men of the town, included Mr. McLenaghan, one of the most wealthy men in town; Mr. Garland and Mr. Newman, ex-mayors, and another Mr. Garland, and it was on the recommendation of that deputation that the site was selected, and not on my recommendation particular-

ly. As regards the statements made by some hon. members opposite that the site is out of town, I say that it is one block west of the present centre of population. Until hon. gentlemen opposite prove by statistics that such is not the fact, their statements are merely their own and the opinions of their political friends. This subject was thrashed out when Mr. Martin was in the House. He stated that it was a scandal, and that the hon. member for Marquette would be annihilated by his constitutents. What is the result? I held two political meetings, and my opponents held two, but not one word was said about the post office question, no mention was made of it. A majority of 75 registered against me in that town at the previous election was reduced to 21. If such a wrong had been done as is represented, would those results have followed? I have given the plain facts in regard to the population of the town, that the post office had been there for fifteen years, and the opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite are not sufficient to warrant the committee in making an unprecedented change; and an incoming Government would have as much right to move the post office back again as there is now for any change being made, because by that time the population would be far west of the present site.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is very well for the member for Macdonald to speak about the opinions of hon. gentlemen on this side counting for nothing; yet I fail to see that the hon. gentleman has offered anything but his own opinion. I assert that this was a political site in the first instance, and it being a political site, it is proper for this committee to consider whether a change should not be made at the present time. The sum of $15,000 has been mentioned in several instances. We have a distinct assurance that the total cost to the country will be only $5,000, and not one cent more. So keenly do the people of Portage la Prairie feel—and after all, it is the people of the town who are interested—that they are willing to contribute the site in order to have the post office located at a more convenient place.

Mr. FOSTER. Who contributes the site?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I presume the people of Portage la Prairie.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A committee of citizens.

Mr. RICHARDSON. When the matter was first mentioned to me I hesitated for a considerable time before deciding to advocate a change of site, because I saw the force of the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), that it is very undesirable to establish a precedent of this nature; but when I considered what Winnipeg had suffered in the old days by having a post office located three-quarters of a mile from the centre of population, and how the city had suffered for ten or twelve years by having its custom-house so far away from the business centre, I promptly determined that if we could secure this change at a reasonable figure—and I consider this a very reasonable figure—I was prepared to vote for it. I think it is due to the people of that town that this committee should consider $5,000 as a small sum in order that they may have a post-office located where they desire. Three blocks in Portage la Prairie are not like three blocks in Ottawa; they constitute a very considerable distance, and I am well satisfied that it is the duty of the committee to make this change. I understand the municipality did not ask for the site originally selected, and the hon. member for Macdonald has given us the names of gentlemen who formed a deputation in order to select this site. Probably the most influential name mentioned as being on the deputation is that of Mr. McLenaghan, a gentleman who does not live there at all. He left the town a year or two ago and, of course, receives no letters at that post office. Of course he could afford to be one of a deputation if his property would be benefited by the post office being located where it is. I strongly urge that this change be made. I have looked into the matter very carefully and weighed the arguments the hon. gentleman for York presented, and after doing so I have come to the conclusion that this change should be made, if the cost would not exceed $5,000, and we have the assurance of the Minister of Public Works that that amount will not be exceeded.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement made by the hon. member for Macdonald should have great weight with the Minister of Public Works, and I can assure him I am not discussing this matter as a partisan. I consider it first as establishing a precedent which should not be laid down if it is possible to avoid it. My hon. friend states that a deputation—I remember the deputation myself—of prominent citizens at that time at Portage la Prairie asked for this site, and the site was selected. Other facts have been brought out by the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency. If there had been gross injustice done that might be a proper reason for establishing a precedent and doing an act of the kind proposed, but this has not been the case. In such case the hon. gentleman would have had to meet this issue during his public canvass. He has stated, however, that he did not meet it, but that a majority of 75 given against him at the last election was reduced to 21. These are facts worth a great deal more than the statements of hon. gentlemen who are not connected with the constituency, and who are not of course

as deeply interested as are people connected with the town. I also point out that the Minister is acting on ex parte evidence. I trust the Government will not make any change under the circumstances detailed by my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not asking for $5,000 necessary to make the change.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that if the hon. gentleman does decide to make the change suggested, he will not make it until he has come down to the House and asked for $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not make any change until I come to the House and ask for $5,000.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I wish to mention one fact in connection with this. The hon. gentleman for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has represented that the movement of population in Portage la Prairie is to the west. I desire to say that the movement of population in this town is to the east. I also wish to point out to the House that the Canadian Pacific Railway were so strongly impressed with that fact, that they have erected a new station about a quarter of a mile to the east of the old one. The Manitoba and North-western station, the Canadian Pacific Railway station and the public buildings erected by the provincial government, of which that hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) complains, are now all upon the same street in that town. The business portion of the town and the business interests of the town are in that locality.

Mr. BOYD. The only point the gentleman who has taken his seat (Mr. Macdonell) has made is with regard to the moving of the Canadian Pacific Railway station. Any person who knows anything about it knows, that the station was moved in order to make a junction with the Manitoba and North-western Railway, and not because of the necessities of the town in that direction. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell) says that most of the business of the town is done on the street running from the station. Why, there is not a business house on it, except a livery stable. True, the Lands Titles office is on it, but as I have explained to the House it was put there after a resolution had been moved by the committee of the town council and the committe of the municipal council, asking them to put it west of where you propose to put this post office.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I wish to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) whether it is not true that a magnificent hotel was erected at the western end of the town, and it is now falling into ruin and decay, and is unoccupied, while a new hotel erected in the vicinity of the station is doing all the business of the town.

Mr. BOYD. It is not the case. The leading hotel in the town of Portage la Prairie is on the corner opposite the site where the present post office is built. That is the Leland House, and it is the best hotel in the town.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I would like to say a few words on this matter as I was rather astonished to hear my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Macdonell) say that Portage la Prairie is growing to the east. Anybody who has ever been in that town knows, that like every other western town, it is growing to the west, and each year the site where the present post office is built is getting more into the centre of the town. I have great confidence in the knowledge of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) as a contractor, and I have no doubt that what he says as to the cost and practicability of moving this building is correct, but his remarks about the town shows he knows little of Portage la Prairie. The blocks there are very little larger, if at all larger, than they are in Ottawa.

Mr. GIBSON. Give us the size ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I cannot give you the size of the blocks in Ottawa, but I know they are about the same size as the blocks in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. GIBSON. Twice the size.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). About the same size. I would guarantee to say that the removal of the post office from the present site to that which is contemplated will not save any person living in Portage la Prairie three minutes time in walking from one site to the other. I will further say, that 80 per cent of the people of Ottawa, live further from the post office here than do the people of Portage la Prairie from the present post office in that town. I have every confidence in the intention of the Minister of Public Works to do right in this matter, and I believe that if he leaves this an open question until he views the present site himself as well as the one contemplated, he will not consider it in the public interest to spend this $5,000 in removing the post office. As I know Portage la Prairie well, I thought it only fair to make these remarks.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) if he ever heard any complaints about the site of the post office in that town ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I have never heard any complaints. I attended two meetings held during the last election, when I spoke in the interest of my friend (Mr. Boyd) and at neither of these meetings was the question at all mooted. I do not believe that the question of the site of the post office had the slightest influence in that election, whereas, had there been any strong feeling in the matter every hon. member in the House knows, that it would have cost

many votes, and would have been thrown in the teeth of the candidate when he came before his constituents.

Mr. BOYD. Before any site is selected, and before any change is made, will the Minister come down to this House and ask for the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BOYD. Have you any objection to my putting a motion that if the money is expended it be expended on the present site ?

Mr. GIBSON. You may put the motion, but it won't carry.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister of Public Works has given his statement to the effect that no change will be made until he brings down a vote which we will pass in this House, that will be equivalent to your motion.

Mr. BOYD. Very well.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia..... $13,200

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if it is his intention to proceed with the repairs of Margaretsville pier and Hampton pier in Annapolis County, N.S. ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are just now looking carefully into that question.

Mr. MILLS. There is a large amount of correspondence and petitions with reference to Margaretsville pier to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister. This pier was taken over by the Dominion Government from a private company, with the distinct understanding that it should be kept in repair. It is now in a state of dilapidation. The late Government, had they been allowed to submit their Supplementary Estimates last session, had in view the putting of that pier into a state of thorough repair, and I trust that the present Government will follow in their footsteps in that regard. There is also the Hampton pier, and the cutting out of the channel at Clementsport, to which I have had the honour of calling the attention of the late Government quite frequently. I trust that the Minister of Public Works, in bringing down the Supplementary Estimates, will not overlook these matters. I would also call his attention to a snag which has been left from the old bridge at the mouth of Bear River, and which is a very dangerous impediment to navigation. My attention was called to it by Captain Chute, of Bear River. I may add, as an inducement to the hon. gentleman to remove this snag, that Bear River is a very prosperous town, and gives a large majority against me. I understand that Captain Chute's vessel came near being damaged, if it was not actually damaged, by this snag. I trust that the Government will also look after that.

Harbours and Rivers, Prince Edward Island $46,000

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has provided in the Supplementary Estimates for the repair of Tignish and Miminegash breakwaters ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Repairs are now going on.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether he will put in the Supplementary Estimates an item for the pier at Ste. Famille on the Island of Orleans ? He knows that the pier last year was almost carried away by the ice, and if nothing is done this season it will be carried away completely.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope to be in a position to comply with the request of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if it is intended to expend any further amounts on the harbour of Collingwood and Owen Sound other than those in the Estimates, also the nature of the work at Owen Sound ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be certainly more money spent in some of the harbours. The works at Collingwood are estimated to cost about $200,000, but this year we will not spend any more than we are applying for.

Dredging $188,000

Mr. KAULBACH. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to do any dredging on the La Have River or in the harbour of Lunenburg and also of Mahon Bay ? The work is much needed, and requests have been made, from year to year, to have it done. The promise was made me last year that it would be attended to this year. Will the hon. Minister make a note of this and see that those three works are attended to ?

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to call attention to a matter to which I referred in the House the other day. I would not do so, were it not that I am quite satisfied that it involves the risk of human life. I refer to the dredging of the bar at the mouth of the Saugeen River. If the hon. gentleman could assure me that something would be done this fall, so as to enable the fishermen, before the severe weather comes on, to get out and in with safety, I should feel very much relieved. I fear some disaster will occur, unless something can be done. I leave the matter entirely in the hands of the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very much afraid that I will not be able to do much during the fall. We shall require first a survey of Southampton habour, and then we have not a

rock dredge. It might be a good policy to have a rock dredge built, because that would save us a large amount of money. My department is not fully equipped to do such work as my hon. friend requires. I will look carefully into the matter, and see what I can do.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that a portion of this item is for Ontario and Quebec. Has the Minister an understanding as to where this dredging is to be done, or is it only to be done in case of emergency? I would ask him whether he has provided for dredging at Thornbury harbour, where it is very much needed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will do some work there.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would like to add to the request I made a moment ago, a similar request with regard to the dredging of Crooked Channel, in Lunenburg.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will look into the matter.

Mr. FORTIN. I would ask the Minister of Public Works whether any portion of this amount is to cover the expense of dredging the sandbank in the St. Lawrence opposite Pointe aux Trembles? I have been informed that that sandbank prevents the steamboats having access to the wharf during the low water of the months of August and September.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The trouble is that we have no dredges for this work. The dredges in the port of Montreal, just opposite Pointe aux Trembles, cannot work in low water. But I shall have in my possession in a few days a dredge that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has transferred to my department. This dredge was in the hands of the Montreal Cotton Mills Co., and they have had it for the past year without paying a cent. I represented to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals that he would render a great public service, if he would transfer this dredge to my department, and this he has done. The dredge is on its way to Montreal, and will be used for dredging in shallow water.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am glad that this question has come up. How could it happen that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) could have no dredging done, while at the same time a dredge could be given over to a corporation, passes my comprehension. How he could have known of this, and not protested, or how it could have been kept from him, I cannot understand.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree that if any dredge were to be given to a corporation, it should have been given to my hon. friend.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the Minister with regard to a large dredge that was furnished to his department recently. I believe its destination was the Atlantic coast of the lower provinces, and I would like to ask if she has yet commenced operations? If so, where is she working and where will she continue operations during the remainder of the season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredge was sent to Shediac, which was the point at which the contractors were bound to deliver it. We tried it there and found it to work very well indeed. Then the request came from the city of St. John for the loan of the dredge. The dredge is on its way to St. John and I hope it will arrive there safely in a few days. We have decided to allow the dredge to work during the winter season in the harbour of St. John. Our friends down by the sea have shown a great spirit of enterprise and the Government thought they were perfectly justified in lending the dredge to assist in carrying on the important work they have undertaken.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to ask how the Montreal Cotton Mills Co. has this dredge for nothing?

Mr. FOSTER. If we are going into that we shall probably take a long time and I think we had better adjourn. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GIBSON. I have as good a right to ask questions as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has. He has asked a good many pertinent questions——

An hon. MEMBER. Impertinent.

Mr. GIBSON. No; I will not call them impertinent. But I hope the hon. gentleman will not deny me the privilege which he has exercised so freely.

Mr. FOSTER. While I deny the hon. gentleman no right, I am exercising a right of my own. We have gone through a great mass of Estimates, and I do not think hon. gentlemen can ask us to sit here longer. If this question is gone into it must occupy a good deal of time.

Mr. GIBSON. I think I have the right to an answer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give it. Of course I cannot give the exact time for which the Cotton Mills Co. had this dredge as it did not belong to my department. If I am well informed they had it for a year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who gave the authority?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have done a fair lot of work, and we do not wish to push the House too hard——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Better carry this item.

Mr. FOSTER. No; better let it stand. There will be a number of questions with reference to this dredge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; not carried. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

JACQUES CARTIER AND LAVAL CONTESTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from one of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act; judgments relating to the electoral districts of Jacques Cartier and Laval, respectively, by which the preliminary objections were maintained and the election petitions dismissed.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company—(Mr. Maxwell.)

MR. J. L. PAYNE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved for leave to place on the Table of the House certain papers concerning the case of Mr. Payne.

Motion agreed to.

THE ORDER PAPER—CHANGE OF FORM

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to draw the attention of the House to a small change which has been made in the printing of routine proceedings by my direction. The questions to be put by members are each numbered. This is in accordance with an English precedent, which has been established since 1880, and I think it will in several ways work beneficially. In the first place, hon. members may either refer to a question by its number when asking for an answer, or, if they choose, they may read the question, as usual. In the next place, it has been quite apparent that, when an hon. member has a number of questions placed in his name on the Order paper, it is very difficult for members of the Government to know which one they are replying to. With each question distinctly numbered, I think the business of the House will be facilitated very much.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

(a.) Did the leader of the Government at Abbotsford, P.Q., on October 8th, 1890, make use of the following words:—"When the Liberal party comes into power it will send commissioners to Washington to propose a mutual agreement by which there will be free trade along the whole line, doing away with custom-houses that go so far to cause friction between the two countries," or words which would convey that meaning?

(b.) Did the leader of the Government, in Boston in 1891, as reported in the press of that city, say: "The first article at the present moment in the programme of the Liberal party is to establish absolute reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States, for all products of the two countries, whether natural or manufactured. Their object is, when there is a Liberal Administration at Ottawa, to offer to the United States the free entrance to our territory of all American products, whether natural or manufactured, provided the United States extend the same privileges to the products of Canada," or words which conveyed that meaning?

(c.) Did the leader of the Government, at Brampton in 1894, use, as reported, the following words:—"If we come into power, on that day I promise you a commission will go to Washington, and if we can get a treaty in natural products and a list of manufactured articles, that treaty will be made"?

(d.) Did the leader of the Government use the following words in Boston in 1891, as reported in the press:—"The proposition which we make involves the position that we should offer to the American people that which is denied to the rest of the world. In so saying, I do not forget that I am a subject of the British Crown"?

(e.) Is the leader of the Government aware that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has declared: "If it (unrestricted reciprocity) does discriminate against Great Britain we have a right to. We owe Great Britain nothing but charity for her atrocious blundering against our interests. There never was a time that Canada could not have bettered her position by joining the United States"?

(f.) In view of the foregoing declarations and pledges, has the Government sent any commission to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Canada?

(g.) If not, is it the present intention of the Government to do so, and if so, when ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I will endeavour as fully as I can to satisfy the rather fastidious curiosity of my hon. friend. (a) My hon. friend has heard me several times on the floor of this House, say that I would not be bound by the accuracy of this report. I did not use any such words or convey any such meaning. (b) I have again to say that the hon. gentleman has heard me several times say that I refused to be bound by the accuracy of the reports of the American papers. In fact, everybody who has been in the United States, knows that the American dailies do not contain the reports of speeches, unless a manuscript of the speech has been handed to them in advance of its delivery. (c) I cannot answer for the accuracy of these words, but I think I am ready to accept them. (d) I have already answered that. (e) I have been informed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he is much pleased to find that the hon. member for York has taken to studying the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that he believes their attentive perusal will greatly benefit the hon. member, and may tend to prevent him repeating certain grave errors into which he has formerly fallen ; that, as regards the alleged quotation referred to, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is inclined to believe that the hon. member has mixed up several disconnected sentences from different speeches, without regard to the context, and that the Minister will be obliged if the hon. member will specify the time and place at which and where the said speeches were delivered. (f) No, the Government has not. (g) It is the present intention of the Government to enter into negotiations with the American authorities ; but the Government believe that, pending a presidential election, the time would not now be opportune. The Government would not like to have the commissioners come back after an interview with the American authorities of three minutes' duration.

TWO-CENT LETTER POSTAGE.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked :

Has the Government, in accordance with a memorial from the Winnipeg Board of Trade, considered the question of establishing a two-cent letter rate of postage for the Dominion, and if so, what is its decision in regard thereto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). This is one of several important questions which the Government has not yet been able to deal with.

LIGHTHOUSE AT OKA.

Mr. ETHIER asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct a lighthouse at Oka, on the Lake of Two Mountains ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is the intention of the department to send an engineer to make an investigation on the spot. With regard to the necessity for this lighthouse, I am not able to answer now, or until I receive the engineer's report.

LOCK No. 1, LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. QUINN asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of lock No. 1, Lachine Canal, this winter ? 2. If so, will such work be done by contract or by day labour ? 3. If by day labour, will the system of eight hours per day be followed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (Mr. Blair). The whole subject is engaging the serious consideration of the Government.

FREE TRANSMISSION OF MAIL MATTER.

Mr. McMULLEN asked :

1. Was any mail matter other than that within the meaning of section 26 of the Post Office Act, during the recent elections, posted at Toronto and allowed free transmission through the mails ? 2. If so, by whose authority was such free transmission allowed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I beg to state that the postmaster informs me that he is not aware that any such mailed letters were posted at Toronto and allowed free transmission through the mail.

BINDER TWINE AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. ROGERS asked :

How much binder twine was manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary in the season of 1896 ? How much was sold, and at what price ? Why is it that there is so much on hand ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In answer to the first question, 500 tons. In answer to the second, ten tons were sold.

Mr. ROGERS. Only ten ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, and that is not paid for. The reason why there is so much on hand is that an agreement was made in April, 1896, under which this was to be disposed of by Mr. Patrick Kelly, who was to furnish security, as he was not a man of very substantial means, and the security was not furnished.

Mr. BERGERON. What price?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the price at which the ten tons were disposed of, because it has not been paid for.

MR. ANGUS P. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CALVERT asked :

1. Is the Government aware that Mr. Angus P. Campbell, an employee in connection with the Savings Bank Branch, Post Office Department, Ottawa, was absent from his duties for a considerable time previous to the late elections ?
2. If so, was the said Angus P. Campbell absent with the consent of the Government ?
3. Did he receive his usual salary while absent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : Mr. Angus P. Campbell formally applied for and was granted the usual three weeks "annual leave" from the 8th to the 28th June, inclusive. He received his salary while on leave.

P. E. BOURASSA, INSPECTOR OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. GUAY (translation) asked :

1. Whether it is true that Mr. P. E. Bourassa, inspector of weights and measures at Quebec, committed irregularities in paying over the amounts collected by him in the course of the year 1894 or 1895 ?
2. If so, what was the nature of the said irregularities ?
3. Was that gentleman retained in his position after such irregularities had been committed ?
4. Is he still in the employment of the Government, and if so,
5. Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the facts, to dismiss him ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). (Translation.) To the first question, Yes. 2. Mr. Bourassa had not deposited the money receievd by him within the time required for the fulfilment of his duty. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. Yes.

COPYRIGHT.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

Have the negotiations between Her Majesty's government and the Canadian Government respecting the subject of copyright come to a conclusion ?

Is the Government able to make any statement respecting the position of the question ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The correspondence in question is of a confidential nature, and has not yet been brought to a conclusion. The Government are not in a position to make any definite statement on the subject.

MR. JOHN A. BARRON, Q.C.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

Is Mr. John A. Barron, Q.C., of Lindsay, in the employ of the Government or of the Liberal party ?

Has application been made to appoint Mr. Barron to a position ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). He is not in the employ of the Government. Whether he is in the employ of the Liberal party, the Government has no knowledge, and that concerns Mr. Barron himself. Mr. Barron has made no application for an appointment.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked :

Is the following a substantially accurate report of part of a speech of the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at Amherst, Nova Scotia, 28th November, 1895, referring to the Chignecto Ship Railway :—

"Mr. Davies thereupon said, that Hon. Mr. Dickey, their present representative, had, he understood, pledged himself to secure the extension of time desired or resign his seat in Parliament. As he had not resigned, he presumed the extension had been granted. (Thundering applause.) If Hon. Mr. Dickey had failed and the Government had not discharged its obligation, when the new Government came into power, it could promise that the matter should have full and generous consideration."—(Halifax "Morning Chronicle," 28th November, 1895) ?

2. Is the following a substantially accurate report of a speech of the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at Kentville, King's County, Nova Scotia, 23rd June, 1896 :—

"Mr. Davies next took Sir Charles' manifesto and dealt with its main clauses. The Hudson's Bay Railway and the Chignecto Ship Railway were dealt with at length. Mr. Davies said he was not opposed to any reasonable project which would tend to develop the resources of Canada, but the two mentioned were preposterous." (Applause.)—("Morning Chronicle," 5th June, 1896) ?

3. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state to the House his present opinion of the Chignecto Ship Railway, and whether he is prepared to give this project full and generous consideration ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I may say that the occasion referred to was a most interesting one, and the speech that I delivered upon that occasion was received with great cordiality. I am inclined to think that if that speech were printed on the Orders of the Day it would have considerable effect on the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am told—I felt very proud of the fact—that it had some effect when delivered in the town of Amherst. The quotation read by the hon. gentleman was not in the speech itself. It was in answer to a question put me at the time. A contemporary report appeared in the "Chronicle," which, I think, was substantially correct, but this quotation, read by itself, without the question, would not be understood. There were two questions discussed. One was the Chignecto transport scheme on its merits; and the other was a question distinctly apart from the merits of the scheme, and that was, to what extent there were moral considerations which bound the Government to extend the time. I was not asked, with re-

ference to the main question, whether I believed in the scheme or not, but I was asked with reference to the moral considerations, whether the Government were bound to extend the time. I did say at the time that the matter would have my full and generous consideration, and I may say that since the opening of the session, I have implemented that promise by forming one of a committee, which gave a lengthy and generous hearing to Mr. Provan, who represented the company. With regard to the second part of the question, referring to the speech which I delivered at Kentville, N.S., the occasion on which I delivered that speech was also most interesting. That speech was a reply to one delivered by my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), who had spoken there a few days before. Some two thousand or three thousand people attended, and my hon. friend, if he turns up the report, will find it most instructive. I took considerable pains to put the facts before the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is making a speech and not answering the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the rule will be found to be this, that any hon. member may put a question on public affairs either to Ministers or other members of the House, and that any answer should be confined to the question put, although, in the case of Ministers of the Crown, May lays down that very considerable latitude is allowed them.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not want to know whether it was an interesting occasion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Were it not a very interesting occasion, I would not have been questioned at all about it. I admit that basic fact. It was a most important occasion. 2,000 or 3,000 electors were present, and I venture to say that my friends and myself who addressed that meeting made most interesting speeches, and I commend them to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish you would make some of those speeches in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will do me the honour to read my speech, he will find that it was a résumé of a speech which I did make in the House the previous session on the Hudson Bay matter, and which the hon. gentleman, I think, did me the honour of listening to at the time. I have not read the report of the speech to which the hon. gentleman calls my attention, but have no reason to doubt that I did denounce as preposterous a proposition then in the air, and attributed to Sir Charles Tupper, relating to the Hudson Bay Railway. As regards the last question, my opinion of the Chignecto Railway has not changed.

BRIDGE AT THE MOUTH OF THE BEAR RIVER.

Mr. MILLS asked:

Is the Government aware that the remains of the piers of the old bridge at the mouth of Bear River, a tributary of the Annapolis River, are dangerously in the way of navigation? Has any step been taken towards removing the same? If not, does the Government intend to remove these impediments to navigation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). To the first part of the question I desire to answer that it has been reported for the past ten years to this department that the piers in question interfered more or less with navigation. As yet no direct steps have been taken towards removing them. The impediments are the property of the province of Nova Scotia, whose attention will be called to the fact of their interfering with navigation, with the view of having them removed.

RESTRICTION UPON OYSTER FISHING.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Whether a petition has been received by the Government from certain persons in the city of Charlottetown praying that the restriction to fish for oysters above the North River Bridge, North River, Charlottetown Harbour, be removed, and if so, what action the Government has taken or intends to take thereon?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Requests have been made of the nature referred to by the hon. gentleman, but no action will be taken upon them, pending an examination of the oyster beds which is being made by Mr. Kemp, the Oyster Inspector.

DUTY ON LEAF TOBACCO.

Mr. DUGAS asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to levy a customs duty on foreign leaf tobacco?
2. If so, what amount?
3. If not, what do they purpose doing with a view to provide a more remunerative market for the farming class who cultivate that article?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). The subject by its very nature ought to be dealt with when the revision of the tariff is undertaken.

SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. McINNES asked:

Was any person delegated by the late Government to inquire into and report on the additional cost of living in British Columbia, having special reference to the salaries of civil servants? If so, what was the nature of such report?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). No record can be found of any such inquiry having been made.

INQUIRY INTO ALEGED MALADMINISTRATION.

Mr. CAMERON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to issue a commission such as was issued by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, shortly after his accession to power in 1878, to inquire into the acts of his predecessors in office ?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to issue a commission to inquire into the various acts of departmental and official misconduct, negligence and maladministration charged against the late Government for the last eighteen years, and for the various sums of money that have been illegally taken from the public treasury during that period ?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to call your attention to question No. 2, and to object to it on the ground that there is a statement of fact there, and not only a statement of fact but one involving a charge which the hon. gentleman, I think, had better make in another way.

Mr. CAMERON. In which part of the question ?

Mr. FOSTER. In the second part.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman state specifically which part of the question he objects to and on what ground.

Mr. FOSTER. The objection I take is to the second part of the question in which the hon. gentleman who asks the question, states as a matter of fact that sums of money have been illegally taken from the public treasury.

Mr. CAMERON. I did not state that. I speak of sums of money charged to have been taken. Everybody knows that charge is made.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) will take the English as it is. The hon. gentleman cannot even annotate a question of his own which is staring him in the face. The question says :

2. Is it the intention of the Government to issue a commission to inquire into the various acts of departmental and official misconduct, negligence and maladministration charged against the late Government for the last eighteen years——

There is no objection to that. But the question goes on :

--and for the various sums of money that have been illegally taken from the public treasury during that period ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the imputation contained in the question is against the rule as laid down in the English practice. May says :

A question may not contain statements of facts, unless they be necessary to make the question intelligible, and can be authenticated ; nor should a question contain arguments, inferences, imputations, epithets, nor ironical expressions.

Mr. LAURIER. I think this comes within the objection in that it covers an imputation, and I think the hon. gentleman had better confine the question to specific cases.

Mr. CAMERON. In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will strike out the latter part of the second division of the question, the words :

And for the various sums of money that have been illegally taken from the public treasury during that period.

The PRIME MINISTER. That subject is engaging the attention of the Government at the present time.

TAY CANAL LAND DAMAGES.

Mr. CAMERON asked :

1. Have any claims for damages to land been made to the Government occasioned by the building of the Tay Canal ?

2. If so, who are the claimants and how much is the sum demanded by each claimant ?

3. Have any sums been paid on account of such claims ? If so, to whom, and when were such sums paid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). As to the first portion of that question, I may say that there have been claims to a very large amount and presented by very many parties against the Government for damages to land occasioned by the building of the Tay Canal. As to the second and third portions of the question, I would suggest that my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron), if he desires to have the material laid before the House, might move for a return.

Mr. CAMERON. It will be too late this session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I can furnish my hon. friend with a statement for his own private use. It would be inconvenient to answer him verbally, there are so many persons having these claims.

Mr. CAMERON. But I do not want it privately ; I want the information for the public.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will lay it on the Table if it can be done in a regular manner.

Mr. CAMERON. I have put the question and I desire an answer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has ample time to move for the return, because the return could be laid on the Table at once.

Mr. CAMERON. But it could not be reached.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to point to my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) that if he allows this question as a precedent, he will be in honour

bound to answer other questions, which will be very inconvenient for him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to go out of my way to accommodate the hon. gentleman who desires this information, yet I do not feel like standing up here and reading a formidable array of names and figures.

An hon. MEMBER. Lay the statement on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot lay an answer to a question on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will furnish the information to the hon. gentleman privately——

Mr. CAMERON. I do not want it privately; I want it for the public.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Move, move.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest that if the hon. Minister is not prepared to answer the question at present——

Mr. CAMERON. He is prepared. He has the information there.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask if it would not be allowable under the circumstances——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a question of order, I would——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can really allow no discussion whatever at this stage. The matter is entirely between the hon. member who has asked the question and the hon. Minister who has undertaken to answer it. The answer may be given or may not be given by the hon. Minister, just as he chooses, but we cannot have a debate of any kind upon this question.

TAY CANAL—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. CAMERON asked:

1. Have any claims for damages to land been made to the Government occasioned by the building of the Tay Canal?
2. If so, who are the claimants and how much is the sum demanded by each claimant?
3. Have any sums been paid on account of such claims? If so, to whom, and when were such sums paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes; claims have been made for damages to land occasioned by the building of the Tay Canal. 2. The claimants' names and amount paid in settlement of each claim are:

William McLean	Paid	November	24, 1883	$	1,000 00
Wm. Beveridge	do	March	11, 1884		300 00
Widow A. McVeity	do	May	14, 1884		350 00
Archy McLaren	do	December	3, 1887		1,100 00
do	do	August	13, 1888		79 75
R. E. Matheson	do	do	11, 1888		500 00
George Graham	do	October	18, 1888		100 00
Jas. Arthur and J. Oatway	do	November	15, 1888		201 00
R. Stone	do	do	22, 1888		300 00
S. T. Dowson	do	do	19, 1888		1,000 00
E. Cameron	do	do	3, 1888		75 00
Wm. Nievens	do	do	21, 1888		75 00
Corporation of Elmsley	do	December	4, 1888		500 00
J. R. Matheson	do	do	5, 1888		400 00
J. Templeton	do	do	6, 1888		550 00
David Low	do	do	22, 1888		250 00
J. M. McMaster	do	do	18, 1888		500 00
E. G. Malloch	do	November	30, 1888		100 00
F. S. Walker	do	September	14, 1889		700 00
Canadian Pacific Railway Co	do	July	11, 1890		250 00
Wm. Beveridge	do	September	13, 1890		130 00
J. Armstrong	do	do	16, 1890		44 87
R. Frizzel	do	do	30, 1890		15 08
Mary Oliver	do	April	18, 1892		1,250 00
Ann McNicholas	do	August	30, 1888		300 00
L. Badour	do	April	27, 1889		325 00
T. Sweetman	do	October	25, 1891		220 00
W. J. McLean	do	January	4, 1876		100 00
Amounts paid				$	10,715 70

The claimants' names and amount of each claim :—

James King	$ 4,000 00	Richard Gould	$ 525 00
James Wilson	350 00	John Matthews	1,200 00
Robert Smith	(No amount mentioned.)	David McLean	(No amount mentioned.)
Richard Frizell	300 00	S. T. Dowson	do
Ebenezer Frizell	2,000 00	Thomas McVeitty	200 00
W. J. McLean	250 00	Frank J. Spalding	400 00
W. R. McLean	1,800 00	Charles Foster	1,800 00
George Groom	600 00	Benjamin Kerr / John Kerr	1,200 00
William Beveridge	1,000 00	Daniel McKay	562 50
Daniel McNaughton	1,000 00	John Beveridge	360 00
Robert Wilson	750 00	Joseph Moody	200 00
Alonzo Kane	1,500 00	Total	$25,997 50
Wm. Frizel	4,000 00		
Richard Boulton	500 00		
John Armstrong	1,000 00		
J. S. Moore	500 00		

3. Yes, $10,000 was paid in settlement of the claims for $25,997.50, and of cases in which no sums were mentioned. Paid to Messrs. Hall & Hall, solicitors for the claimants. The $10,000 were paid on the 2nd June, 1896.

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. CASEY. When I was endeavouring to get your ear a few moments ago for the purpose of making a statement——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman must be in order.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a question of privilege, and I will explain the question of privilege if hon. gentlemen will keep order. I say when I rose a few moments ago endeavouring to get your ear for the purpose of making a suggestion by which questions might be answered without involving so much trouble on the part of a Minister, an action took place on the part of an official of this House which I do not propose to submit to without a protest. The Sergeant-at-Arms came over here between the seats for the purpose of informing me that I was not in order, and could not speak then, which is a perfectly gratuitous statement on his part, and a thing which it was none of his business to attend to. He had no right here at all, he had no right to speak to me while I was speaking, he had no right to offer me his opinion as to whether I was in order or not ; and I wish to call your attention to the matter, and to ask your opinion of his conduct in that connection.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member I hope is mistaken. I am sure——

Mr. CASEY. No, I am not mistaken, distinctly.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope he is.

Mr. CASEY. I make the statement on my honour.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure it would not be proper for the Sergeant-at-Arms to interfere with the action of any hon. member in this House, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will feel that he has been mistaken, and has misunderstood the action of the Sergeant. He cannot speak for himself at present, and I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the matter to rest there. I entirely agree with the hon. member that it would not be a correct thing for the Sergeant-at-Arms to interfere with hon. members.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, I know I am not mistaken as to the facts, and I thought it proper that the attention of the House should be called to it. I think it is proper that this official of the House should be given to understand that such a thing should not take place in the future.

NAVIGABILITY OF HUDSON'S BAY.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked :

Has the Government reached any conclusion with regard to sending an expedition to Hudson's Bay and Straits to investigate the navigability thereof, with a view to settling beyond peradventure the question of the practicability of the Hudson's Bay Railway as a commercial enterprise ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I beg to assure my hon. friend that the Government will consider it their duty, at an early date, to have the question of the navigability of Hudson's Bay and Straits exhaustively investigated.

BINDER TWINE AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked :

1. How much binder twine has been manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary since the Government instituted the industry, and what the cost has been ?
2. What is the gross amount that has been received for the twine ?
3. Was any of the twine sold on credit, and if so, to whom ?

4. Is any money owing to the Government on account of twine, and if so, by whom ?

5. What time has elapsed since the debts, if any, were due ?

6. Have any steps been, or will any be taken to enforce collection ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I may say to the hon. gentleman that this question opens up too large a field of inquiry to be answered at this time. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he move for the papers.

FISHING LICENSES ON LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. BOYD asked :

1. Have commercial fishing licenses on Lake Winnipeg been extended by changing the date of closing from the 1st of September to the 5th of October ? If so, why has such extension of time been granted ?

2. When was the date of closing of the said licenses changed from the 5th of October to the 1st of September ?

3. Why was the commercial fishing season shortened at that time ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes ; to encourage the "chilled" fish trade recently introduced and to place commercial fishing on an equality with domestic fishing. 2. 8th May, 1894. 3. Because commercial fishing at that time was almost solely to supply the Selkirk freezers. The freezers were as a rule filled by the end of August and the shippers could not conveniently handle the catch after that date.

THE QUESTION OF PROHIBITION.

Mr. DAVIN (for Mr. Roche) asked :

Was the leader of the Government correctly reported in the Winnipeg "Tribune," October 16th, 1894, as having said the following :—"The question of prohibition was discussed at the convention in Ottawa last summer. The Liberal Government would take a plebiscite of the people on this question. The people would be asked to give a plain 'yes' or 'no' as to whether they desired the passage of a prohibitory law. If they said 'yes,' an Act would be at once submitted to parliament. He, the speaker, hoped the people would say 'yes' ?"

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have been asked that question so often I am afraid I cannot remember the particular occasion to which the report has reference. My memory is not equal to the task of remembering all those answers.

MAIL CLERK AUSTIN.

Mr. CAMERON moved for :

1. Copies of all correspondence between the Postmaster General and the Inspector of the Stratford District, respecting leave of absence obtained by one John Austin, a mail clerk, during the months of January and June, 1896.

2. A copy of all correspondence between said John Austin and the said department or any of its officers respecting said leave of absence.

3. A statement showing the number of days the said John Austin was absent from his duty in the months of January and June, 1896, and causes of such absence.

He said : As the Postmaster General is in his seat I desire to offer a few remarks in regard to the motion before the House. This young man, John Austin, who is mentioned in the motion I have submitted, is a resident of the township of Ashland in my riding. Prior to the by-election of 1892 he was promised a position in the service of the Dominion Government. Not only was he promised a position, but two young men who live within a distance of two miles of each other were promised similar positions. These young men were all Irish Catholics. The by-election in 1892 took place, when I was defeated. Shortly after the election they were all appointed mail clerks in the service of the Dominion. Three other young men, who were Protestants, were also promised positions in the service. They never obtained positions, but the Catholic boys did ; that, however, does not concern me, for the representative of Huron could appoint a dozen if he pleased. But I do object that two of those young men in the service of the Government made themselves offensive during the by-election of January last and the general elections of June last. I know that young men in midwinter do not generally take part in by-elections and canvass among Irish Catholics in a constituency on a holiday. I asked the post office inspector by what authority those young men obtained permission to leave their official duties to take part at the by-election and also at the general election. I received a letter from Mr. Hopkirk, stating that Austin was absent by leave of the authorities at Ottawa. What I desire to know from the Minister is whether or not leave was obtained by those young men to absent themselves from the discharge of their duties for two or three weeks in January, and at least ten days, I am informed, in June last. I tell the hon. Postmaster General here and now that beyond all doubt, and it is admitted by one of them, they took part in the political campaign in January, 1896, and personally engaged in the campaign of June, 1896. I also desire to know from the Postmaster General how far he proposes to allow officials in the department to dabble in politics. Those two young men stood at the church door on the Sunday before polling day and distributed lying and scandalous printed dodgers against me with a veiw to influence my Catholic friends in the township of Ashland against me. It was a gross and outrageous act on their part. I should like to know, first, whether Austin had a right to be absent from the performance of his duties in January and also in June ? In the second place, I should like to know if the country pays employees to

engage in active political canvass, and especially if it pays them to distribute lying printed dodgers at the church door against one of the candidates in the election. I draw the hon. Postmaster General's attention to these facts. It rests with him to deal with these men. I am in a position to prove these facts, and I state these facts on my responsibility as a member of the House. I ask the hon. Minister to deal with these men and to mete out to them justice, but that is the very thing they do not want; at all events I want him to deal out justice, and not keep them in the public service if the statements I now make are correct.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend has called the attention of the House to the case of post office railway mail clerks in his riding. I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the House to similar conduct on the part of other officers of the late Government. It appears to me that these leaves of absence granted to officials of the various departments just prior to the last elections were very general indeed. In my town there is an officer in the customs who was appointed railway mail clerk. It was found for some reason or other that he was not able to perform the duties of that service, either because he was unable to pass the examination, or because he was too old for that service. Not being able to remain in the service for which he was appointed, the post office, he was changed, on the recommendation of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), in whose constituency he was a resident, to the Customs Department in my own town. Now, Sir, strange to say, after the late Parliament had expired, this gentleman, who had been an active politician in the county of Haldimand, not only at one election, but at several elections, and who had been appointed to the position by my hon. friend the late Controller of Customs (Mr. Wood), I believe, upon the recommendation, no doubt, of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague)—strange to say, after the House had come to an end on the 28th of April, 1896, the then Controller of Customs, the Hon. Mr. Wood, by telegram gave this man three weeks' leave of absence, and on the 20th of May, 1896, he gave him a further leave of absence of one week. Now, instead of going away to enjoy himself upon a trip, which one would infer the leave of absence was intended for, this man went to the county of Haldimand and spent the whole of that time, and more too, in most offensive work there for the Conservative candidate in that county. The information that I have is that, during these two periods of his leave of absence, he went through the county, making speeches and canvassing for the Conservative candidate. My information, furthermore, is that, in prosecuting that canvass, he was offensive to a degree. I desire to call the attention of the department and of the House to this fact, because it seems to me that it was an organized piece of business that the heads of the departments should grant leave of absence to their officers, wherever it was found that these officers could render service to the political party then in power. I appeal in this case, as well as in the case my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) has mentioned, that not only the Government is to blame, but that the officers who sought for and obtained leave of absence for the purpose I have mentioned, should not be continued in the public service of this country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection to the motion being adopted. I am sure my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) would not desire me to say now how, on an investigation, the judgment of the Government ought to be. A charge has been made against Mr. Austin, who is mentioned in this notice of motion. That charge will be duly investigated, and, so far as I have to do with it, I shall endeavour to do justice in the premises. I may say, generally, Mr. Speaker, that very many complaints have been lodged with me of a similar character, but, in consequence of their delicate nature, rather than arrive at a hasty decision during the pressure of sessional work, I have thought it wiser and fairer to take ample time so that I might do no injustice to the accused. I tell my hon. friends that, when the time admits, every charge will be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. FOSTER. This reminds me to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) when he will lay on the Table of the House the papers on which he based the discussion of Friday with reference to the Cape Breton mail service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, heard me state yesterday that immediately, in fact on Friday evening, I gave instructions to the Deputy to prepare them. On leaving the House yesterday, I renewed these instructions to the Deputy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is more familiar with the method of keeping the records in the archives, and he will understand it when I say that the Deputy told me that these papers were in the vault, and he could not get them on Friday night. He told me yesterday that on Saturday he had given them out to a copyist, that the file was now in the hands of a copyist outside the building, and he hoped on to-morrow or next day to bring the copies to be compared. My hon. friend need not feel at all alarmed about there being any delay in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman say he had employed copyists outside the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not employing any one outside the department. The Deputy Minister told me they

were being copied by a person outside the department. I did not understand that he meant a person not in the service of the department, and I did not ask him particularly. I do not know whether the person whose name he mentioned is an official or not, but I will give the hon. gentleman that information, too, if he desires it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like to know from the Government what they are going to do with the postmasters who prostituted their positions at the last elections to serve the Tory party. Some of these men spent their whole time receiving Tory literature and newspapers, and distributed them from door to door by giving these papers to young men who went into the post office, and who carried these dirty sheets into the houses of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see that, if the discussion pursues this line, we will never come to a decision on the particular question before the House. The point raised by the hon. gentleman must be brought forward in some more general way. The debate, certainly, has taken a wider range than it should. This is a specific motion with reference to one particular clerk, and I do not think a general discussion on the whole post office service would be at all in order.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. You are right, Mr. Speaker, and I bow to your ruling, but——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I admit that some remarks have been made outside of this motion, and that was the reason, no doubt, why the hon. member made the point.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no hesitation in answering the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette) and in saying that any one who has distributed dirty sheets, is an offensive partisan.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I wish to put just one question to the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) is going to ask a question of the Prime Minister with reference to the statement that has been made. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to ask a question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I should like to know from the Premier if we will be obliged to have an investigation in these cases, or will the written declaration of the member elected, or of the candidate, be sufficient to cut the heads off these Tory postmasters ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I should like an answer to my question, and, if I do not get it, I will bring the matter up again.

MAIL CLERK DALTON.

Mr. CAMERON moved for :

1. A copy of all correspondence between the Postmaster General and the Inspector of the London Division, respecting leave of absence obtained by one Dalton, a mail clerk, during the months of January and June, 1896, and of all applications made for such leave of absence and replies thereto.

2. A statement showing the number of days the said Dalton was absent from his duties in the months of January and June, 1896, and reasons for such absence.

He said : I do not propose to make any observations on this motion, further than to say that the young man Dalton, whose name is mentioned in the resolution, was appointed at the same time and under similar circumstances as the man Austin, and he engaged in precisely the same work that is in my judgment, scandalous political canvassing during the by-election in January, and the general election in June. I may say to the Postmaster General that I did not ask him to dismiss these men without an investigation, nor do I ask him now. All I ask him to do is to write to these men and tell them that charges of such and such a nature are preferred against them, and ask them if the charges are true. If they answer that the charges are true, the duty of the hon. Postmaster General will be a very simple one. If they deny the charges, then the responsibility must rest on the Postmaster General as to what steps he shall take. All I ask is that he shall take steps to deal with these men in the most effectual way he can.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no objection to the order being made. Nothing that I said was intended to imply that my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) desired anything so unfair as a judgment without a trial. His whole request was that the accused should be called upon, and that the charges should be fairly investigated.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for :

Copies of all reports passed by the Treasury Board and of all Orders in Council submitted to His Excellency between the 23rd of June and the 8th of July last.

Mr. HAGGART. I made a motion similar to this, and I would ask the hon. leader of the Government when copies of these Orders in Council will be down ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The order has already been largely complied with. I placed the papers unofficially in the hands of Sir Charles Tupper yesterday, and I hope to-day to lay them before the House.

Motion agreed to.

BATTLEFORD INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved for:

Copies of all correspondence bearing on the subject of the confinement in a close cell of an Indian boy at the Battleford Industrial School which was alleged to have caused the boy's death.

He said: I may say that some uneasy rumours have been in existence in the Battleford district with regard to the death of this boy. The country has expended a very large amount of money on these industrial schools, and I think it would be in the public interest that the House should learn all the facts connected with this circumstance; and if it should be found that no blame can be attached to the officials of the school, there will be general cause for satisfaction. It is with this object that I make this motion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Can my hon. friend give me an idea of the time the death of the boy is alleged to have occurred?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I could not state the time very accurately. I was assured that the death of the boy had occurred in consequence of negligence. I neglected to ask about the time, but I could get the information for the hon. Premier to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

THE MINING INTERESTS OF CANADA.

Mr. BOSTOCK moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it will be in the interest of immigration, and the development of the Dominion, that the Government should collect through the Department of Agriculture all the information possible with respect to the mining interests of British Columbia, and the other provinces of the Dominion, and distribute it.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, before I discuss this question, that I was not aware, at the time I drew up this motion, that there were certain statistics published by the Geological Department at the present time; and, in making the motion, I do not wish to be understood as pressing for the compilation of these statistics by any particular department. But the hon. members of this House must recognize that at the present time a large mineral development is going on in British Columbia, especially in that part of the province which I have the honour to represent. It is of great importance, not only to the settlers and the miners in the province, but to the rest of the people of this Dominion who are taking an interest in the development of that country, that there should be reliable statistical information brought up to date as to what is being done. Not only in the Kootenay country, including East and West Kootenay, but also in the Boundary Creek country, in Okanagan, in Lillooet and in Cariboo, a large amount of mining development is in progress. We have had returns from the Kootenay country which will before very long call the attention of investors and other people to what is going on there. I would like to read a few statistics showing the output of the West Kootenay country within the last few months.

Unfortunately, owing to the lack of statistics I am only able to give a few figures with regard to the output of that country, and I cannot say what has been done in the other parts of the constituency, but I have here some figures which show that for the year ending 30th June, 1896, the output from West Kootenay, which went out by the way of Nelson, was as follows:—

30,673 ounces of gold.....	=	$ 552,135
1,459,629 ounces of silver....	=	969,215
11,647 tons of copper.....	=	129,250
6,020 tons of lead.....	=	220,849
		$1,871,449

Making a total value of ore sent out through the customs at Nelson of $1,871,449, to which must be added what is estimated to have gone out by way of Revelstoke, 6,410 tons, value at $100 per ton, or a grand total of $2,512,449. That is up to the 30th June of this year, and it shows a very considerable increase over the year 1894, which is the latest year of which I have been able to obtain any statistics. The figures given in the report of mineral statistics and mines only bring the matter up to 1894, and they show that the output of the camps of British Columbia for 1894 was $456,000 of gold, and the value of silver amounted to $470,219, or 746,379 oz. You will see, Mr. Speaker, by those figures, that we have had a great increase in the output of the mineral produce of British Columbia, and everything shows that we are going to have a much larger increase. I would like to read an extract from a report made by one of Bradstreet's men, who was through that country a short time ago. He reports as follows:—

The engineer of one of the largest smelting companies in the United States has reported that the Rossland Camp alone will produce after the 1st October this year 1,000 tons a day, or 365,000 tons per annum, amounting in value to about $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 a year. And the Slocan and Ainsworth Camps should produce 50,000 tons, or $5,000,000.

According to this report, which we must take as a reliable statement coming from the source it does, we are justified in looking forward to a great development in that country, which is going to attract an enormous increase of population, who will make their living in the country, and also attract the attention of capitalists throughout the world to a field of investment to which they have not had the opportunity of turning their attention before. We have also in the Kootenay country enormous fields of coal which require development, and which only wait the attention of capitalists to yield

the most profitable results. We find that the mining business in West Kootenay has been most profitable to the men who have been engaged in it up to the present. The returns, so far as I have been able to collect them, from the principal mines in that country, show that the War Eagle, one of the best known mines in the Rossland Camp, has paid up to June, 1895, $82,500 on a capital of $500,000, and the Le Roi, another large mine in that district, has paid a total of $200,000 of dividends up to date. The Slocan Star, in the Slocan country, which is a silver mine, has paid a total of $300,000. These figures show the amount of business being done in that country, and the large field which exists there for investment. It is only natural that we should have at present a number of companies floated in the eastern provinces for the purpose of interesting investors in the mining development that is now going on, and we find that some of these companies are being put upon the market in eastern Canada in a very loose and unsatisfactory manner. It will be a great drawback and disadvantage to our province if some steps are not taken to check the indiscriminate floating of such companies, in which the prospectuses issued are most unsatisfactory and contain exceedingly misleading statements. From the way such prospectuses are drawn up, they would appear to be drawn up solely for the purpose of misleading the investing public. I have here a prospectus, which has been published in one of the papers in the east, the prospectus of mines called the "Nest Egg" and "Palo Alto." In that prospectus, the names of leading men in the province of British Columbia are printed as being connected with these mines, but after it was brought out in Toronto, one of the gentlemen whose names appear on the prospectus, wrote that he had nothing to do with it. It will be interesting to the House if I read one or two of the replies given by gentlemen whose names are mentioned in this prospectus, as being connected with these mines. Mr. Turner, the Premier of British Columbia, telegraphed as follows:—

I know nothing about the prospectus of the Nest Egg and Palo Alta. I do not guarantee any statements made by Geo. A. Case. He has no authority to act for me.

Mr. Turner is one of the gentlemen whose names appear as being interested in the Nest Egg, and, of course, being Premier of British Columbia, his name would naturally tend to make investors in the east think that the property was a good one. Mr. E. V. Bodwell, a leading lawyer in Victoria, telegraphed:—

I am not in any way responsible for the prospectus of the Palo Alto or Nest Egg mines. I do not know what statements they contain. I do not know Mr. Case and he does not represent me. I own some shares in the Palo Alto, but have no interest whatever in the Nest Egg. No one has any authority to deal with my name in connection with either the Nest Egg or Palo Alto.

Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney's name—the present Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia—was also mentioned in this prospectus. He was in England when the prospectus was brought out, but Mrs. Dewdney telegraphed that the Lieutenant-Governor was not in any way responsible for the statements made in that prospectus. This is a very good specimen of the way in which these prospectuses are being got up and the use that is being made at the present time of the names of leading men in the province for the purpose of getting investors in the east, who cannot learn a great deal of the development of that country, to put their money into these concerns. I hope the Government will see their way to taking hold of this matter and that they will be able to introduce some legislation that will prevent prospectuses of this kind being placed upon the market and that they will hold those interested in getting up these companies responsible to the public generally for the statements that they make in these prospectuses, that these statements are true. A leading newspaper in Rossland, speaking about these foreign companies, says:

Especially some provision should be inserted in the Act which will prevent foreign companies from disposing of their holdings without consulting their shareholders and even in opposition to their wishes.

I may say that that paragraph has reference more especially to one company that was organized and floated under the laws of the state of Washington whose directors were enabled to entirely override the wishes of the shareholders, and disposed of the mine in a way that was a great detriment to the shareholders and a great damage to the camp generally. Now in the province of British Columbia we are very anxious to see foreign capital brought into the country, and we recognize the undesirable character of some of these companies that are now being floated on the market of the east. If this sort of thing is allowed to continue and the investors lose their money, it will be a great setback to the development of mining in British Columbia, and we shall have to suffer the consequences. I hope that the information that can be collected through the Geological Survey will be brought up to a later date than it is at the present time, and that, if possible, the staff now engaged in the department in compiling the statistics may be increased, so that more reliable information may be brought forward and placed before the public. I move this motion feeling confident that some steps will be taken by the Government to assist us in this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the House, I am sure has listened with very great interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from Yale and

Cariboo (Mr. Bostock). The present condition of mining development in British Columbia, I may say without exaggeration, is the hope of this country. We all look to British Columbia as being the province of all the provinces which is to attract immigration from abroad, as we know that gold discoveries have always proven the greatest attraction to immigrants in all parts of the world. The motion of my hon. friend, as I understand him, contains two points. First he declares the desirability of making the mining wealth of British Columbia well known not only throughout this continent, but throughout the world. My hon. friend is aware, and, in fact, he has adverted to it, that at the present time the Geological Survey is doing valuable service in that direction. One of the functions at present devolving upon the Geological Department of Government is to collect and to publish as soon as may be after the close of the calendar year, full statistics of the mineral production and of the mining and metallurgical industry of Canada; to study the facts relating to water supply, both for irrigation and for domestic purposes, and to collect and preserve all available records of artesian or other wells, and of mines and mining works in Canada. This duty is now well attended to; and I was glad, I am sure, as was every member of the House, to hear my hon. friend state that the gentleman now in charge of the Geological Department, Dr. Dawson, is a most valuable officer. I am sure we may all rely that in his guidance of his department Dr. Dawson will take all necessary steps to meet the views of my hon. friend. I am informed that at the present time the department is making special effort to distribute information on the subject of these mines all over the different provinces of the Dominion. I cannot speak particularly of what he has done in other provinces, but I can speak from information received as to what he has done in the city of Montreal. He has distributed collections to the following institutions:—Polytechnic School; Righteous Order of Sacred Heart; McGill College; High School; Montreal College; St. Mary's College; Sisters of Congregation of Notre Dame; Mount St. Mary's Institute for Deaf Mutes, Mile End; Sisters of Congregation of Notre Dame, St. Jean Baptiste; St. Laurent College; Deaf and Dumb Institute, St. Denis Street; Montreal College of Pharmacy; Department of Agriculture and Public Works; Industrial School; Mount St. Louis Academy; Montreal Jail; Panet Street School; Convent Museum, St. Laurent; Monument Nationale; Ville Marie Convent, Notre Dame de Grace; Mother House; Congregation of Notre Dame; Our Lady of Good Counsel. If more is to be done than is done at the present time, I am sure we may rely upon the effort of Dr. Dawson to meet the important requirements of the mining development of British Columbia. But the most important part of the remarks made by my hon. friend were those referring to the efforts of speculators to place upon the market bogus schemes and spurious organizations. This is an unimportant feature. It is not new; the same thing has been experienced, I suppose, in every mining country in the world. Similar attempts were made in Australia and California. I do not know at present whether the law is adequate or is not adequate to meet this growing evil. This is a matter which must lie more directly within the scope of the Department of Justice. All I can say at the present time is that the Government will ask the Minister of Justice and his department to ascertain whether or not the law is adequate to meet such spurious schemes as those which have been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend. If the issuing of such bogus prospectuses cannot be prevented, if the law of the land is not adequate to meet offenders of this kind, the law of the land is deficient and must be amended. I would say that if the officers of the Department of Justice report to the Government that the present law is not adequate to reach such offenders, then, next session, the Government will consider it its duty to have the criminal law amended so as to bring such offenders within the law and thus prevent, as far as possible, repetition of the offences. My hon. friend is aware that nothing tends so much to injure the growing interests of British Columbia as the investment of sound money in such bogus enterprises. All I have to say to my hon. friend at present is that the Government will deem it their duty to have this subject properly investigated in order to see whether legislation is demanded in this direction. In the meantime I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman's attention has been drawn to this subject by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock), because I think it has occurred to a great many people, both in the House and out of it, that while there are many valuable mines being developed there to-day, there is reason to believe that a number of bogus schemes are being placed on the market, for which money is being got out of people who cannot afford to part with it without getting something in return. It seems to me, from reading the Toronto and Montreal papers, and papers in other parts of the country, that a special effort is being made to boom these mining schemes by every species of advertising, that will finally result in doing injury to that line of business, as the boom did that which formerly occurred in Winnipeg and Manitoba in real estate. Mining claims which is taking place there, will follow the same course, and be somewhat of the same character. Now, while it is very desirable to develop these mines as rapidly as possible, it is also desirable to prevent people from placing before the world schemes that can only result in taking

money from the people fraudulently, for which they are not likely to get anything in return.

Mr. TISDALE. I think probably that if hon. gentlemen who are troubling themselves so much about this matter, were a little more conversant with the broad nature of our criminal law, they would find in it plenty of provisions that would answer their purpose. I do not know whether it is one of the duties of the legislature to take charge of special interests, or to prevent the advertisement of particular interests. The proposition covered by the notice is one that involves very broad questions, and I think it arises from want of knowledge of the present criminal law which, in Ontario, at all events, is very wide with regard to frauds or attempted frauds, in any way, shape or manner, by false representations or anything of that sort. I think if the hon. gentlemen who are anxious about this matter, would look into our criminal law they would find that an extension of that legislation along certain lines would cover any cases that it does not now cover. I may say that when our criminal law was lately codified, and had the advantage of the legal talent of both sides of the House, all these matters were very carefully considered. I do not believe in bogus advertising, or bogus companies, or bogus notices; but I think that if hon. gentlemen will examine our law as it exists at present, they will find that it would be pretty difficult, without making the remedy worse than the disease, to make the law any more efficient or any broader than it is at present; and they will find that there is no particular necessity of attempting to enlarge our criminal law upon these lines.

Mr. PRIOR. I was unfortunately called out of the House just before the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) brought this motion up; but judging from the remarks which fell from the leader of the Government, I presume that the hon. member for Yale said something about bogus companies in British Columbia. Now, the hon. gentleman is member for a district which includes, there is no doubt about it, the richest mining country in the world to-day, that is Kootenay; and I would say of the hon. gentleman that I believe he knows the district as well as any man in British Columbia, for he has spent a great deal of his time there, and I know he has seen almost every mining property there to-day. Now, I know perfectly well that there are some men at the present time who are placing schemes on the market that, to say the least of it, do not give much encouragement for a man who knows much about mining. But at the same time, I will say that I think the very large majority of the mining schemes that are placed on the market to-day in British Columbia are bona fide speculations. Everybody who knows anything about mining, knows that from first to last it is a speculation; and no man, unless he has sufficient capital to warrant him in going into the business, has a right, from a business point of view, to put his money into a mine. I speak from knowledge, because I was brought up as a mining engineer, and I know more about it than the majority of people. But I will say this, that I believe there is no mining country in the world that shows the same satisfactory evidence of rich deposits as British Columbia to-day, especially the Kootenay district. But if men deliberately go and speculate in companies when they know nothing about mining, and know nothing about the companies, know nothing about the men who are at the head of those companies, it serves them right if they lose. I should advise any man in this country, or any other country, before he puts his money into a mining speculation, to find out for himself who the men are who have put it on the market, and who are interested in the management of the mines. If he does this and finds that the men who have the management of these schemes are men of standing, men of integrity, men of experience, and if he wants to have, as they say, a flutter with a little money, he may do so. But he is very foolish indeed if he puts his money into them without ascertaining who has the management. I am very glad indeed that the hon. member for Yale has brought this matter up, because since I have been here in Ottawa, since June last, I have seen that a great deal of interest is taken in Montreal and Toronto and elsewhere in British Columbia mines. I should be very sorry, indeed, not so much for the speculators themselves as for the name and credit of British Columbia, if men in the eastern portions of this Dominion were to put large sums of money into these mines, and find out afterwards that they had been fooled. But if they make a proper selection, they can invest their money with a fine chance of making large returns.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The hon. member for Yale has brought an important matter to the attention of the House. As he says, we have great natural and undeveloped resources in British Columbia, and it is in the interest of Canada at large that those resources should be made known. It is, therefore, doubtless the duty of the Government to endeavour, as far as possible, to make those resources known in order to bring about their development. Now, that being the case, he goes on to say that the system now pursued will operate to the prejudice of the development of those mines because companies are being incorporated, not for the purpose of developing the mines, but rather for the purpose of enabling speculators to deal in stocks to the prejudice of the development of the mines, and consequently to the prejudice of the development of the country. The hon. gentleman suggests

a remedy for that difficulty. Take the case of mining companies; there are two points to be considered. First, these mining companies are incorporated, not under the laws of Canada, but according to the laws of the adjoining states of the United States. Being incorporated there they offer no such guarantee as is offered by companies incorporated under the laws of this country, and therefore it is said if those companies are incorporated in the United States, the reason for their incorporation there is that our laws are not intended to meet such cases and would not permit certain transactions to be carried out as may be carried out under the laws of the adjoining states. Under the incorporation laws of the United States, you may issue a certain amount of stock, and that stock may be sold at 10 cents on the dollar. That cannot be done here, where, when such stock is issued, a shareholder is liable for the full amount of the stock. We should amend our laws to meet exigencies of that sort. We should inquire into the condition of the United States laws which have been framed and subsequently developed by experience acquired among the people there. We ought to take the laws of the United States in their present condition and examine them, and see how far we could incorporate their provisions into our own statutes. But we are met with this difficulty, as to how far this Parliament can deal with questions that affect property and civil rights, which are under provincial jurisdiction. That is a difficulty which I refer to, but which I do not now discuss. Again, there is another difficulty. These companies are issuing prospectuses which contain false statements of facts, such as that certain gentlemen occupying prominent positions and whose names are a guarantee of responsibility are connected with the companies, when in reality they have no connection with them. There is a difficulty here. Those prospectuses are issued broadcast throughout Canada; they are issued here and go to Quebec and beyond the Atlantic to London. The investor reads them. He looks at the prospectus, and sees the names of our public men connected with these enterprises. This is an inducement for investors to invest their money in these enterprises. It is true, as the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Tisdale), has stated, that our criminal code would meet such a case. I am strongly of the opinion, without stating anything definite, that there is doubt about that point. The border line between false representation, involving false inducement to enter into a bargain of this sort, and a warranty is very shadowy and very hard to define; and therefore I say it is very doubtful if the criminal code would reach such a case. Suppose it did reach it after considerable difficulty, does this House not think that it would be rather a precarious remedy in the hands of an investor to which he might have recourse, for example, an investor in England, to endeavour to remedy an evil of that sort. It seems to me we should provide a remedy. To put the matter in a nutshell: In the first place, it is important to know how far this House might introduce legislation affecting the incorporation of these companies and so meet the conditions existing in the mining country of British Columbia, which do not exist in the case of ordinary commercial enterprises; in the second place, supposing that to be beyond our power to deal with, if it is a matter for the province of British Columbia to deal with, and if the province does not act, should there not be general legislation introduced here into our criminal code such as would enable us to deal with this class of cases. These are points to be dealt with as regards legislation, and as they have been brought up they may be considered; and no doubt between this and the next session the people of British Columbia, who are primarily interested and who could easily remedy the evil, because there can be no doubt as to their right to legislate in regard to it, might amend their local laws; and if they did not act in that direction, then it might be possible for this Dominion Parliament to take action.

Mr. DYMENT. I merely rise to say that I thoroughly concur in all that has been said by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and if I might presume to give the Minister of Agriculture some information, I would inform him that if he decides to gather these facts that will be of value to the people of this country, he can obtain as valuable information in the district of Algoma as in any part of the Dominion. I desire to enter my protest very strongly against the tendency that has been shown by hon. members who have debated this question to look to British Columbia and pass over Ontario, and that portion of the district which I have the honour to represent, the Seine River and Rainy River districts which do not take a back seat even to British Columbia in regard to mineral wealth. We have a grand country there, and I think the time is opportune to make an investigation and gather all the information possible, and distribute it throughout the country.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), and also the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment), have done good service in bringing this matter before the attention of the House. The hon. Solicitor General has made some very thoughtful remarks in regard to amendments of the law; but possibly, pending the amendments of the law, the best way to protect a man against being cheated is the publication of all possible information. In Ontario we have a Bureau of Mines, especially charged with the duty as regards mining, and which gives very valuable information res-

pecting the mines in Algoma and elsewhere. I would urge that even if it were necessary to create a new department of that kind here for the purpose of giving information regarding mines, in cases where the province does not attend to it, it might be well, both as regards the interests of Canada and those of foreign investors, that such a department should be established. Foreign investors would be more likely to write to headquarters at Ottawa for information regarding Canadian mines than elsewhere, and I believe this information could be well obtained through the existing department of the Geological Survey. I throw out the suggestion as to whether the collection of these details might not be carried out by the Geological Survey, rather than by the Department of Agriculture. That survey has, of course, devoted its attention to ascertaining what deposits of minerals are in the country. I do not know whether it could properly take any notice of commercial transactions concerning them. It might be necessary to create another department like the Bureau of Mines in Ontario, which would not only take account of the deposits of ore, but of the efforts made to develop them. The kind of information we require is : (1) Facts in regard to the deposits ; (2) information from the mine-owners, not given on the authority of the Government necessarily, but given under oath or in some authentic way, of the steps they have taken to develop their properties. I would ask the Government to consider under what department this information might be properly collected and supplied. I may say that the Geological Survey has of late years been largely engaged in Nova Scotia in exploring and mapping out private properties such as coal mines, and I do not know why that benefit should not be extended to mines of other minerals in different parts of Canada.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I am in full sympathy with the remarks that have been made on this matter, for I believe that in no country in the world of the same size is there so great mineral wealth as in Canada. In Nova Scotia we do a little to spread information about our minerals, but at the present time it is somewhat difficult to obtain reliable information generally in the Dominion of Canada. There should be some central place where a man from abroad could obtain proper information, not only as to the quantity, but as to the character of the minerals in a certain district. We do not want in this country a repetition of the same senseless excitement as they had in the United States in regard to their minerals. I am glad to see that the people of British Columbia are taking a more sensible view of the matter than did the people of Nevada and California, where fortunes were made at the expense of others. I am glad that the people of California are standing on the merits of their country, and that alone. The suggestion that there should be some bureau established in which reliable information could be obtained by investors, is well worthy the attention of the Government. As our mineral wealth is, next to our agricultural wealth, the greatest in the Dominion, I think that the Government might very well undertake an expenditure with this object in view. I do not know what is the case in other provinces, but in the province of Nova Scotia the royalty obtained from minerals is a great factor in carrying on our local business, and it would seem to me that the provinces might co-operate with the Dominion in carrying out this project. There may be men in Ontario, Quebec or Nova Scotia who wish to obtain reliable information about the minerals in British Columbia, and it seems to me there should be a central place where they could obtain that information. The development of our mineral resources is a real and tangible thing, and it would be much more sensible to spend money in developing them, than to expend it in trying to promote some hot-bed industries in this country. I believe that we have more mineral wealth than the American republic has, and that means, of course, more than any part of the world. We are only now beginning to realize our vast resources in this respect, and I am sure that the Government, in proposing any scheme to develop these resources, will meet with assistance from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I believe that the day will come when our whole country north, as far as we can go—and Canadians can go further north and live and thrive better there than any other people—will be found to be an inexhaustible bed of mineral wealth. I agree with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the thanks of the House are due to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bostock) who has brought this matter up. A wise expenditure by the Government in the direction indicated by the motion, would, I believe, be of great and lasting service to Canada, and would be productive of the best results.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before the motion is carried, I would like to say a few words in reply to that portion of it which seems to belong to my department. In the statistical branch of the Department of Agriculture there is a great mass of information in connection with the mining industries as well as with other industries of Canada. It is not an infrequent thing for people from abroad to write to the Dominion statistician to obtain information, and I can assure the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. Bostock) and other gentlemen who have spoken in this respect, that the statistician is very able and very willing to give all the information at his command in regard to this, as to other matters of interest to investors. The mining question, however, is largely one of a purely scien-

tific nature, and that part of it, as is well known, is dealt with by the Geological Survey. The Geological Survey is possessed of immense information in regard to the mining and mineral wealth of this country, and although the details may be more scientific than are wanted by investors or practical miners, I am satisfied, if they would go to the bureau of the survey, they would find a good deal of information of a practical, as well as of a scientific nature to assist them. I am quite sure that any information that is within the reach of the statistical branch of the Department of Agriculture, will be gladly placed at the disposal of anybody inquiring for it; and, what is more, I think I may say that the attention of the statistician could be particularly directed to the mining development of the country for some little time to come, so that greater details of such information might be given to those who need it.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock), who has introduced this matter to the attention of the House, has dealt with the subject very exhaustively indeed, and has given a lot of very valuable information; information which, I think, not only this House, but the greater number of the people of this country have been sadly in need of. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture has stated that abundant information may be had from the reports of the Geological Survey, and that they contain a great deal of information with regard to our mines. With all due deference to the hon. Minister, I submit that the departments ought to be more aggressive in the future than they have been heretofore, and ought not to rest satisfied with gathering information and retaining it within the four walls of the archives. They ought to take steps to disseminate that information, in the same manner as is done by the province of British Columbia. I have in my hand a report of the provincial mineralogist of British Columbia, Mr. Carlyle, in which he gives a very exhaustive account of the mineral resources of the Trail Creek mining district. In that report, which the government of British Columbia has circulated very liberally, there is reliable information, and information which, I find, is being sought through every medium, apparently, but the right one. Probably those seeking that information may not be aware that the province of British Columbia has been as enterprising as it has in respect to its mineral resources. If the Dominion Government were to take the same means and adopt the same methods as have been adopted by the province of British Columbia. I think that a great deal of the difficulty which is apprehended in respect to the investment of capital in British Columbia would be obviated. Now, I submit that the danger, which is very imminent, in connection with the investment of money in these mines in British Columbia, does not lie in the province of British Columbia, but rather without it. The danger, especially to small investors, lies very largely in this great province of Ontario, as is shown by the extracts which have been read by the hon. member for Cariboo from the Toronto "Globe" and the Toronto "Mail and Empire." Within the last few months these papers have contained most glaring advertisements of various schemes, some of them legitimate, others illegitimate; and I am led to infer, from what the hon. member for Cariboo says, that people foisting those schemes on the public have committed acts bordering on crime. If this Government took steps, and immediate steps, to spread broadcast the information which they may have in their bureau, they would do a great measure of justice to their own country and also protect outside investors. Because, after all, we are not yet independent of investors without our own Dominion. We must cater to them, and offer to them every facility and at the same time every safeguard. I wish to emphasize what I stated before, that the danger to investors does not lie in the province of British Columbia. So far as the province of British Columbia is concerned, I think it furnishes every safeguard that it could be expected to furnish under the circumstances. The Government of that province affords sufficient protection to life and property within the province. Its school system is one of the best in the Dominion of Canada, if not on the continent of America; and this is an important consideration, because, after all, one of the objects of a government in assisting to develop the mining resources or any other resources of a country is to attract a desirable class of settlers; and one of the first things that influences an intelligent settler is the school system. I say, then, so far as that is concerned, that our school system is a very excellent one. The officers appointed to enforce law and order are tried and competent men. So I might go through all the elements which one wishing to invest in the country, and to settle there, would ultimately look for, to show that every safeguard is afforded to people coming to the province of British Columbia to invest their money and to reside there. So that it is quite obvious that the onus lies on this Government to take steps, and immediate steps, to further this great industry—an industry that is bound to be, if it is not now, the greatest in the Dominion of Canada; an industry to which the Dominion of Canada must look for a great deal of its prosperity and advancement, and we ought to leave no stone unturned to furnish the fullest information respecting that industry. I did not intend addressing the House on this matter, to supplement the valuable information which has been given by the hon. member for Cariboo. I rose simply because I felt an apprehension that there might be some misconstruction put upon the remarks

made by the hon. member for Cariboo and some of the other hon. members when they emphasized the danger existing from these wild-cat schemes. I feared that some of the hon. members of this House, and some people outside of the House, might be led to infer that the danger lay within the province, whereas it really lies outside. I would humbly suggest that if there is any information in any of the departments with regard to these mines or any other mines, immediate steps be taken to distribute that information, and that the method followed by the province of British Columbia be adopted, of getting out a report and having it sent to various centres and to all who may be interested in the mining development of that province. I would again refer to the report of Mr. Carlyle, the provincial mineralogist of British Columbia; and I think it would repay every member of this House, and any person who has any idea of investing in British Columbia or removing there, to read that report. The information contained in it is most reliable, compiled as it is by one who has absolutely no selfish ulterior interests to serve in its compilation.

Mr. BOSTOCK. After the assurance of the hon. leader of the Government, I would, with the permission of the House, withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38.

Mr. BRODER moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that some suitable recognition should be made by the Government to the volunteers of 1837-1838 for the valuable services they rendered in defence of their country at that time.

He said: I am quite aware that this matter has been brought to the attention of the House on different occasions, but as nothing has yet been done, I must ask the indulgence of the House while I attempt to say something which may lead the House to make some suitable recognition of the services rendered by the volunteers of 1837-38. I wish to say, at the outset, that there is no desire on my part to say anything which may bring up unpleasant recollections of the past. Whatever may be said, on either side, as to the merits or demerits of the contending parties in 1837-38, we can say this, that the men who went out to defend their country in those days should have some recognition at the hands of the people. If these men had halted at the threshold of our country's needs to discuss whether or not they were wrong or whether or not those opposed to them were in the wrong, this country would not be a British colony to-day. We have to recognize this fact, that those who were actively engaged in the aggressive movement against the constituted authorities of this country, at that time, did afterwards, in their older and more mature years, give strong expression to the sentiment that their success would have been a calamity to Canada. I am glad to be able to acknowledge that many of the men who were then in the aggressive movement afterwards filled high positions in our official life and did good service for their country, as has been recognized not only by those who sympathized with them in their early days, but also by those who opposed their views. And the value of their services in these later days was not only recognized by the Canadian people but by the home authorities as well. But while I am willing to give them all the credit they deserve, as regards their integrity and devotion to the interests of this country subsequently, I think that we ought not to lose sight of those men who left their homes and families and took their lives into their hands to defend our country. These men, too, are certainly entitled to some recognition at our hands. It is the duty of every man, not only to stand at the door of his home and defend his family, but when duty calls, to stand at the gate of his country and defend it against the invader. I feel that this country has been derelict in the discharge of its duty towards the men who filled the breach in these days of danger to our existence as a portion of the British Empire. Many of these men are still living and feel, as they go down the vale of life, more and more keenly the neglect of their country. I wish to say that many of the descendants of these men are to-day fighting the battle of life, sustaining their parents in their old age, who fought their country's battles. I am glad to say that there are not many of them in indigent circumstances, because they were made of the kind of stuff that will succeed anywhere. I do not put their claim on this ground. I put it on the higher ground that every man who stands up in the defence of his country has a right to some recognition. That is the principle which was acted on by this country in the near past, and on which England and the United States and all civilized countries are accustomed to act. I am quite aware that there are men in this House who express themselves as favourable to those in rebellion on the ground that by their agitation they precipitated the bringing about of responsible government; but that was not the object these men had in view. Their object was to sever this country from England and make it a republic. And in that object they do not deserve the credit which some people give them. In the life of the late Lyon Mackenzie, written by his own son-in-law, Mr. Lindsay, I find a letter written by Mr. Mackenzie to his son on the 5th March, after he had been in exile.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). What year?

Mr. BRODER. The year is not given, but it was about nine years after he had been

in exile and incarcerated in the United States for breach of the neutrality laws. I think it was in 1846. On the 5th March, he wrote to his son in Albany:

> You never can, never will, know what I have borne and suffered in many ways. Yet I am here, healthful and (somewhat) hopeful, though poor and within a week of fifty-two.

And he adds:

> After what I have seen here, I frankly confess to you that had I passed nine years in the United States before, instead of after the outbreak, I am very sure I would have been the last man in America to be engaged in it.

In this letter he admits fairly that he had made the great mistake of his life, and in a subsequent letter he admits that the success of the movement which he was leading would have meant the ruin of this country. I shall read an extract to prove the position I take. Mr. Mackenzie says, in this other private letter, written about the year 1849:

> A course of general observation during the last eleven years has fully satisfied me, that had the violent movements in which I and many others were engaged on both sides of the Niagara, proved successful, it would have tended to injure the people of Canada, whom I then believed I was serving at great risks; that it would have deprived millions, perhaps, of our own countrymen in Europe, of a home upon this continent, except upon conditions which, though many hundreds of thousands of immigrants have been constrained to accept them, are of an exceedingly onerous and degrading character.

As many hon. gentlemen are aware, there were formed during these times in some of the border cities of Michigan, Ohio and New York, organizations called Hunters' Lodges. The whole object of these bodies was to extend republican government on this continent. The men forming these organizations sympathized with the movement on this side of the line, and even gave it aid. I wish to read the obligation taken by members of these Hunters' Lodges, in order to show the tendency of the movement on the other side of the line, and on this side also, so far as it was sympathized in by these Hunters' Lodges. The city of Cleveland was the centre for these organizations, but there were lodges also, as I have said, in Michigan and New York. The following is a quotation from the obligation to which I referred:—

> I swear to do my utmost to promote Republican institutions and ideas throughout the world —to cherish them, to defend them; and especially to devote myself to the propagation, protection, and defence of these institutions in North America.

It is an historical fact that these Hunters' Lodges sympathized with the movement here, and that Mackenzie was to some extent aware of their movements and had some hope of support from them, is asserted by his biographer, who is his own son-in-law. Now, whatever the results may have been, the objects sought by those who were engaged in the movement must be considered. There were constitutional means by which the reforms sought could have been brought about. None of us can endorse or sanction the appeal to force in order to bring about constitutional changes in the country. I wish to say that, while we recognize what has been done, whilst we are willing to forget all distinctions of the past, and what was done in the hopefulness and enthusiasm of youth, while we may sympathize with the feelings of these men, we cannot but admire the men who fought to defend the institutions of this country. While we respect the feelings of the others, we cannot but feel the highest regard for those who sought to maintain the institutions under which we live. These men were pioneers who were engaged in hewing homes for themselves and their families out of the wilderness, and they left their all to take part in defending the institutions of their country. I contend that this Parliament should recognize in some tangible way the services rendered at that time by these men, and that a proposal to this effect should find a response in the heart of every hon. member of this House. I do not mean to discuss this question in the sense of reflecting upon any class of people in the country who were engaged in the movement which was opposed by the men of whom I speak. But the sense of justice and fair-play which pervades the people of Canada, irrespective of class or party, will own the merits of these men, and will desire to have it recognized in a suitable manner.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before this motion is put, I desire to say a few words with regard to it. This is not the first time that this proposal has been brought under the attention of members of this House. I remember that eight or ten years ago a similar motion was presented. I entirely differ from those who favour this proposition and from the speech which was delivered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) who has just taken his seat. I am of opinion that, if any recognition is to be given to those who took part in the rebellion of 1837-38, that recognition should be given to the rebels. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the rebels on that occasion rendered a great and lasting service to the people of this country. I contend that at that time the upper and lower provinces were ruled over by a tyrannical government, by whom injustice was done to the people of the country, and whose acts were worthy of condemnation by every man with the spirit of liberty in his bosom. I contend that there was no other course open to the rebels than the one which was pursued by them, and, therefore, that the rebellion was justifiable. That it was so was shown afterwards by the report that was made by Lord Durham, when he was sent out to this country to investigate the troubles. For these

reasons, I am of opinion that this resolution should not carry. You have only to go to the grounds at the western end of this very building to find a monument erected to the memory of one of the chief rebels of that day—Sir George E. Cartier. What was the history of Cartier after this rebellion? He was taken into the councils of his country, and became a leader in the Conservative party. And, when he died, the Conservatives of this country erected a monument to his memory. If we are to enter upon this matter, we ought to take steps to remember and honour the men who secured for us responsible government, from which flowed the other liberties which we now possess. If I had my way, I would have a monument erected on the other side of this building to William Lyon Mackenzie, the leader of the rebels in Upper Canada. Even now, if we have a form of government in this country that was working, not in the interests of the people, but in the interests of a family compact, as the government of 1837 was, and if there was no other way open to the people to secure redress, than by a show of force, we should be justified in rebelling. If the British Government had treated the people of the United States properly, that country might have been a British colony to-day. I contend that this resolution should not meet with support from the members of this House.

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

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Customs and private individuals, and all representations made by Boards of Trade throughout Canada, concerning the appointment of a Board of Commissioners or a judge for the settlement of disputes between the departments and individuals.—(Mr. Quinn.)

Return showing the subjects of all Minutes of Council passed by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and approved after his resignation in 1878, and before Sir John Macdonald took office, giving dates and all circumstances connected with such resignation; also showing the subject of all Minutes of Council passed by the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell after he had resigned, and approved by His Excellency before Sir Charles Tupper took office, giving dates and all circumstances connected with such resignation.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Copies of all petitions and other documents addressed to the Government asking that the eight-hour system be adopted in the public service.—(Mr. Quinn.)

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) to confirm an agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 11) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 12) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Georgian Bay Canal and Power Aqueduct Company.—(Mr. Maclean.)

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893.—(Mr. McLennan, Glengarry.)

FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to call the attention of the Government to an important statement purporting to have been made by a member of the Government on a topic of interest to the whole country, and particularly to the section from which I come, and that is the proposed fast line of steamers from Quebec to England. In a report handed to me and to which my attention has been called, Mr. Dobell is reported as having made the following statement at a meeting held in Quebec the other day, as reported in "La Semaine Commerciale":

> This meeting was of more than ordinary importance. The presence of a member of the Government gave rise to observations made on the question of the fast line of steamers, the bridge and other topics. Mr. Dobell stated that Quebec would not receive any advantage from the establishment of a fast line of steamers, as a line running 17 or 18 knots was sufficient for the needs of the country, and the fast line could only be useful to Quebec when other great enterprises shall have been accomplished, such as the Great Northern Railway, the bridge and the deepening of the canals.

I should like to ask the Government whether the hon. gentleman was authorized as a member of the Government to make that statement; and if so, whether he was then expressing the opinion of the Government on this important question.

Mr. DOBELL. I have no hesitation in replying to the hon. gentleman who has called my attention to the report of a meeting of the Quebec Board of Trade. I appeared there in my capacity as president of the board, and I spoke on the same lines as those I have followed for a great many years past. I have always called attention to the inadequacy of the passenger service that is now conducted between Quebec and Great Britain. The subsidy is too mean, it is not sufficient to maintain such a line of steamers as we should possess. At the same time I have always claimed that a

20-knot steamer is too costly, and that the wants of this country are more in the direction of having extra good accommodation, larger steamers, but at the same time the passage money, not more costly, that Canadians desire to cross the Atlantic with all the comfort that it is possible to give them, but they do not want to pay more than $75 or $80 for the passage. We have not people in this country who are prepared to pay £100, which was often paid from New York, and if we had 20-knot steamers from Quebec, I believe the enterprise would end in disappointment. I do not think there is any more danger in running a 20-knot line of steamers from Quebec than an 18-knot line, but I believe it would be too costly as compared with any advantage which this country would derive from it. It would involve an outlay of $750,000 a year. An 18-knot service—I have never said 17 or 18 knots, and I have always claimed that we should have 18 knots—could be performed from Quebec to Liverpool in the same time as a 20-knot service would perform the voyage from New York to Liverpool. The working of this line would cause a saving of about half the cost, we would have accommodation in the way of cold storage, and more capacity for general cargo. Besides, I believe that before long power will be applied to steamers in a more economical way than is the case to-day. I am told that 20-knot steamers from New York cost a very large sum in repairs, and that an 18-knot service suffers from far less friction and is performed with more comfort and ease than a 20-knot service. But I claim this, that we ought not to ignore or to treat lightly the offer that has been made by the British Government to assist us if we adopt the 20-knot service, but I have not seen any evidence yet that the British government would not be prepared to help us if we adopt an 18-knot service. My idea is that if the British government were approached they would be perfectly satisfied with an 18-knot service, if we could show them that it would be better for Canada and would be attended by about half the cost and give greater accommodation both to passengers and cargo than a 20-knot service. I may also state this to the House, that I have it on the authority of one of the heads of the Cunard service that nothing would tempt them to build another 20-knot steamer. I state that on the authority of a gentleman who is practically at the head of the Cunard service in Liverpool, the reason being that they find it too costly. I repeat, that I spoke at the Quebec Board of Trade in my capacity as president of that board. I believe this Government is acting wisely in not allowing itself to be forced to give a decision on the tenders submitted. Those tenders will be before the public ere long, and the people will see what reasons we had for not deciding hastily, for I believe that in a very short time we will be able to make a contract on much better terms. I think every indication points to that, and we shall, I believe, prove to the country that we have saved them a very large sum of money and that we are indebted to Mr. Chamberlain, too, for not having closed the late contract without the acquiescence of this present Parliament. I think, Sir, that on every hand we have to congratulate the country that we were not forced into accepting that tender, which was called a tender, but which I did not consider as a tender, because we were bound and the other side were not bound, and I do not think that is a position for a great country like Canada to be in. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, have no hesitation on my own behalf in taking the responsibility of saying, that I advocated delay, and that I also advocated that before we went into this we should see what other large ship-owning companies will do for us to provide a service at less cost.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement which has just been made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) is too important to be allowed to pass without some little remark. It is a most important statement which he made—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman can discuss the question now.

Mr. FOSTER. I can put myself in order by moving a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Not now.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Maxwell for :

Copies of all petitions or memorials presented to the Government on the subject of Chinese immigration.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). This question of Chinese immigration is one very little understood by us in the east, however well it may be understood by our friends on the Pacific coast. I now rise, as I did the other day, not so much to discuss the merits of the question, as to do what I think every member of this House would do in my place. I think that no member of this House who would have had the honour of being chosen to accompany a distinguished man who was looked upon as the guest of our country, and who was to be treated with honour when he was our guest ; there is, I think, no member of this House, who having heard the remarks made by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) who would not have felt it his duty to get up and, if not in any way to support such a policy as appears to be obnoxious to British Columbia, at all events to help to redeem the word he had given : to

stand by these men and not to abandon them. That is the position I mean to take now. I do not want to support any policy this evening either of one kind or another in relation to the Chinese. I understand too well the difficulty that exists, and I know that hon. gentlemen will believe me when I tell them that what I will say this evening I say in my own personal capacity. Never have I had any communication with my colleagues on the subject, and I am perfectly persuaded, so far as I know, that they have never even considered the question of the treatment of the Chinese in British Columbia. It is only my own opinion that I will take the liberty of giving to the House, in answer to the character given to these poor Chinese by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell). I thought it was my duty to study the question. I have studied it as carefully as I could from this report which has been characterized by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) as outrageous, but which I characterize as one of the best reports that have ever been laid before this House. Before I went to meet Li Hung Chang, I was convinced that he would bring up the subject. I expected to hear reproaches from him in connection with the way his countrymen were treated in this country, but instead of hearing reproaches from him, I heard him say, and he repeated it several times, that it was a comfort for him to be under the shade of the British flag where there was justice and equity for every one. Never a word of reproach was uttered by him, only he asked me not to abandon his fellow-countrymen. As I have said before, this report on Chinese immigration which has been characterized by the member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) as an outrageous report is perhaps the best report which has ever been laid before this House. I got a copy of it bound and prepared with every possible care in order to do credit to our country, and I presented it to Li Hung Chang in order that he should study it, and learn from it what can be said against his countrymen as well as in favour of them. If any one takes the trouble to read a part of this report, he will find that everything that could ever be said against the Chinese has been said against them. Every accusation of immorality, and every accusation of crime was laid against them, and you will understand readily why it is so when you know, that the evidence was not only taken in British Columbia, but also in California where there is a bitter feeling against the Chinese. I tried to draw the attention of Li Hung Chang to that report, in order that he could learn for himself what were the serious objections against his countrymen. On the continent of America where there is already one colour and race problem to settle, I understand how imprudent it would be to take upon ourselves the solution of another problem, and to have a yellow problem added to the black problem. The conclusions of this report, especially those prepared by the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, prove how well he understood the question, and how prudently he drew the attention of the country to the difficulties which were in the way. The concluding words of that report said :

> That therefore if restrictive legislation were considered opportune, it should aim at gradually-achieved results, and the history of the question, as well as the evidence, shows that by legislation regulating, not excluding Chinese labourers, every purpose can be effected which those who apprehend evils from Chinese immigration could and actually do desire.

He speaks of "regulating," and in this respect you can see at every stage how carefully and prudently the question is stated. You will find in the report such words as these :

> The best friends of the Chinese must admit that it is indispensable to regulate that immigration.

I want it to be perfectly understood, Mr. Speaker, that I speak only in my own personal name and not in any way as representing the ideas of my colleagues in the Government who, to my own personal knowledge, have not considered the subject. I speak merely in order to redeem as well as lies in my power the character of these men who have been treated in what I consider such a cruel manner by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell). There are three points of view under which this question can be considered. It can be considered first, from the point of view which was adopted by my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell), and which represents the idea of those whose mandate he was executing here, and whose mandate he declared it was his bounden duty to carry out. There is another way to consider that question, and it is to consider it from the Chinese point of view. There is a third way of considering that question, and it is certainly the way the great majority of the members of this House consider it. On the one side, the hon. member for Burrard cannot find opprobrious terms enough in which to qualify the morals of the Chinese who are settled in British Columbia, and to show how fatal their presence is in that province, forgetting completely the services they have rendered. If their usefulness is gone now, we ought, at all events, still to remember what they have done. The third opinion, which stands between that of the advocates of the Chinese on the one side and that of the opponents of the Chinese on the other, is the opinion of those disinterested men who, without adopting exclusively the views of either one party or the other, can express themselves with the generous, manly feeling with which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) expressed himself the other day when he asked, what was the meaning of this in a country like ours ? Was it possible that

we were going to exclude any one class of people because we were not able to compete with them? Was it possible that we were going to acknowledge our inferiority? Every hon. member of this House must remember the generous sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough in answer to the accusation brought against the Chinese by the hon. member for Burrard; and that is the way in which a disinterested man would naturally feel inclined to look upon the question.

I would like for a moment to be allowed to deal with the question from the Chinese point of view. There are two points to which I propose to draw the attention of the House. First, what is the material result accruing to British Columbia from the presence of these Chinese immigrants; and, secondly, what is the moral and intellectual effect produced by them? Without following the example of the hon. member for Burrard, without trying in the way in which he did to stamp the character of those who supported the Chinese, I would say that, after all, they are only poor heathens, and if their ideas of the treatment of their neighbours are not so elevated as ours are, let me tell you that they had among them more than 3,000 years ago, a man, Confucius, who, although he did not rise to the height of the Golden Rule of Christianity, yet expressed the negative of the same truth when he said: "Do not do to others what you would not have others do to you." So I think I can fairly say something on behalf of those poor heathens whom the hon. member for Burrard has given up the idea of converting to Christianity. And, by the way, I must say I was painfully affected by that declaration. I had thought there was hope even for the poor Chinese, that they might be converted to Christianity. At all events, we send missionaries among them to try to convert them; and I am astonished to hear the hon. gentleman declare that it is perfectly useless to think of converting them in British Columbia. Is it possible that in a Christian country it is useless to try and convert the Chinese to Christianity? Is it possible that where they are surrounded by churches and Christians, and such excellent examples as are presented by those who live around them, there is no chance of converting them? Then, what is the use of sending missionaries all over the world to seek the heathen and to attempt to convert them in the wilder regions where they live?

As to the material advantages of the presence of the Chinese in California and in British Columbia, there is no doubt that they have done a great deal to open up to civilisation those two countries. California and British Columbia would not have been redeemed perhaps for a generation or two but for the building of the several railroads that cross the continent, and carry to those countries the population of the east. At the time those railroads were begun it was next to impossible to transport any great number of labourers from the east across the prairies to work upon them, but it was the easiest thing in the world to bring the Chinese across the Pacific in ships. They were brought, and it was by their labour that those great railroads were completed. And not only so, but they were utilized in redeeming those valuable swamp lands of California, tule lands, which, once drained, give the most wonderful returns, and which cannot be drained by European labour, but must be drained by Chinese or Negro labour. I will spare the House a number of quotations which I might make from this report to show the services rendered by the Chinese in helping to construct those great lines of communication, which have opened up the far west to the people of the east.

Mr. WILSON. Give us the quotations.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I might give many of them; but here is one statement by Mr. Briggs, who, though most bitterly opposed to Chinese immigration, was nevertheless fair enough to admit:

> I think the Chinese have been a very important factor in the development of our public works, and in the development of the resources of the state up to a certain period. We have outlived that day.

That is to say, their usefulness is gone, and now we do not want them any more. We are ready to cast them away like useless tools, after we have grown rich by their aid, after they have done work for us which we could not do ourselves. There is a very striking passage in that report showing the way in which the Chinese were treated in California. On the 4th of July, 1852, they were actually invited to join the great procession which celebrated that day. They were still wanted, because their services were still appreciated. In 1862 they were not invited any more, because the people had begun to feel that they could do without them; if they had joined the procession in 1872 they would have been stoned; and they are treated in the same way now, because their usefulness is gone. It is said that they make their money, and then go home to spend it. Well, I would like to know what we do when we go to China? I would like to know if the hundreds and thousands of Englishmen and other Europeans who go to China, go there to settle, or whether they do not go there to make money and then return and spend it at home. This is the position that Europeans occupy in China, and I do not see why they should reproach the Chinese with the modest ambition of coming here and trying to earn a little money and then return home and spend their savings in comfort in their own country. And we must not forget that we forced our way into China at the point of the

bayonet, and that, by the opium war, we forced on the Chinese the use of that drug, with the indulgence in which we now reproach them. I think it is a shame for Englishmen to reproach Chinese with being opium smokers, when they remember the iniquity of Great Britain in forcing, at the point of the bayonet, the use of opium on the Chinese. That was one of the most shameful acts that ever disgraced the fair fame of a civilized nation. As to the moral and intellectual aspect of the case, every one knows that the Chinese civilization is much older than ours. Every one knows that 2,000 years ago, when we were utter barbarians, the Chinese had reached a very high state of civilization. We know that they then had the use of the compass, gunpowder and the printing press, and a number of other valuable things, which with us are only the production of our modern civilization. We ought to look upon such a nation with respect, in memory of its past, even if it be now in a state of civilization inferior to our own. This decadence we can easily account for, when we consider the isolation in which that country has itself kept for so long a period, and the same isolation we are cultivating ourselves, when we seek to drive these people from our shores. We know very well that in China instruction is the one means by which every man gains promotion and may rise to the highest grade in the service of the state; and a nation which has such a grand past and in which instruction takes the precedence of everything else, is certainly one deserving of some consideration at our hands. As to their habits, I know that the habits of the Chinese are such that I would not advise my friends in British Columbia or anywhere else to adopt. But as I have said, the opium habit is one with which Englishmen ought to be the last in the world to reproach them. As to their bad morals, I might quote again this report, only I think my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) does not like me to quote much from it.

Mr. MAXWELL. What book is that?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The report of Mr. Chapleau and Judge Grey.

Mr. MAXWELL. I have that, and the hon. gentleman may quote all he likes from it.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. If I were to quote all I like, I would quote the whole of that book. Instead of being the outrageous report which my hon. friend described it to be, it is, in my opinion, one of the fairest reports we could find anywhere. It is a report in which everything is contained, both on one side and the other. I might quote something more in connection with the example which the Chinese give Europeans in commercial matters. I have a book here written by a man who is well known by all who take an interest in Chinese matters, Mr. Robert K. Douglass. Speaking on the morality of the Chinese, he says:

> The Chinese are in no way behind us in that respect; in fact I know of no people in the world I would sooner trust than the Chinese merchant and banker. I may mention that for the last twenty-five years that bank has been doing a very large business with Chinese at Shanghai, amounting I should think to hundreds of millions of taels, and we have never yet met with a defaulting Chinaman.

This is a quotation which the author gives from some remarks by a Shanghai bank manager. I wish to state exactly the position which I take in this matter. I do not take the position that this question does not deserve serious consideration, or that this immigration must not be regulated carefully, nor do I pretend that we must open the door wide to all who choose to come and join in this immigration. I do not even outline any plan in which I would propose to treat the Chinese, but my only purpose, in rising to address this House, was to say that they do not deserve the character given them by my hon. friend the member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell). They have come here to earn their living honestly, and deserve to be treated like honest men, who do an honest day's work for an honest day's wage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue announce that he was placing before the House his own sentiments only in relation to this matter, and that the Government is in no way bound by his statement this evening. I should be very sorry to see the Government occupy the position on this question that is occupied by the Controller of Inland Revenue. The hon. gentleman has evidently been brought somewhat under the influence of the great Chinaman, Li Hung Chang, who visited Canada a few days ago, and who was escorted by the hon. gentleman from Niagara Falls to North Bay. No doubt the hon. gentleman saw in the person of that distinguished Chinese gentleman and the members of his suite, Chinamen of the very highest type and education, who impressed him with a very favourable idea of the character of the race to which they belong; but I do not suppose my hon. friend has come into contact with that class of Chinamen who are objected to by the Anglo-Saxons of the Pacific coast. If he were as familiar with that type of Chinese character as he evidently is with the educated and high-toned character of which Li Hung Chang is a specimen, his experience would be a better guide than it is at present, in my opinion. But this very individual, who evidently produced so favourable impression on the Controller of Inland Revenue, is a man whose character, I am afraid, my hon. friend does not thoroughly comprehend. I am afraid

that if he knew all about Li Hung Chang, his admiration of that gentleman would be somewhat diminished. I remember one or two historical facts in connection with his career that possibly have not come under the observation of my hon. friend. At the time of the Taiping rebellion, some years ago, when General Gordon marshalled the Chinese forces, and subdued the rebels after thirty or forty engagements, the leaders of the rebellion surrendered the city of Soo Chow to General Gordon on the pledge that their lives would be spared. The city was surrendered upon this express condition. General Gordon gave his pledge that this should be the case. While General Gordon was arranging terms of capitulation and other matters in connection with the surrender of the city, the gentleman, who has so favourably impressed the Controller of Inland Revenue came upon the scene, and he promptly ordered that the heads of the Wangs should be cut off, and they were decapitated accordingly. General Gordon heard of this, and, in a towering rage, he seized his revolver and went upon the track of Li Hung. That eminent statesman hid in closets and climbed over the roofs of houses and finally took refuge in a boat where Gordon could not reach him. But had Gordon found him, the Controller of Inland Revenue would have been prevented from holding sweet intercourse with him. This gentleman produced such an unpleasant impression upon the mind of General Gordon that that distinguished soldier tore up his commission and shook off the dust of China from his feet. He said that no English gentleman could serve under such a government or associate with such people. The Chinaman may have reformed since that day, but I am afraid that, though child-like and bland, he is the same man that he was when he beheaded his enemies in this dastardly and inhuman manner.

The question of Chinese immigration is, I confess, a very difficult one. I can respect the feelings of my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell) and to some extent enter into those feelings as well as into the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and others when they plead for the right of asylum for these people upon this continent, when they plead that these people should be allowed to come here to settle, to come into contact with civilization of the west, that they should be brought under Christian influences and that the Christian people of this country should welcome them to our shores for the purpose of christianizing them. A great deal of the theory and this expression of sentiment does credit to my hon. friend's generosity and sympathy. But I have noticed in California, in Oregon, in Washington, in British Columbia—in all these states and provinces of the Pacific coast an intense feeling of hostility to the Chinese. That hostility exists there where they come in contact with these people. These expressions of sentimentality if I may be permitted so to express it, are heard here where we know nothing about these people. I am bound to say that it is a very significant fact that all the population upon the Pacific coast are averse to the importation of the Chinese. My hon. friend alludes to the fact that in San Francisco in 1852 these people, the Chinese, were invited to join in the 4th July celebration, while in 1862 they were not invited. When they were new comers in 1852, when their character was not understood they were invited, and in 1862 when their character was understood the people did not care to associate with them. It is impossible to secure assimilation between the Chinese and the Anglo-Saxon; you cannot get any such thing as homogeneity between the two races. The Chinaman remains a Chinaman; he remains a heathen. He comes here not to become a citizen, not to become a permanent resident; he remains an alien, he remains a stranger in a strange land. He comes here with all his peculiarities and all his vices—and these make a most loathsome list. If you want to find what they are, read the 1st chapter Romans, where St. Paul describes the vices of his time. The Chinaman is addicted to every one of them, and after the Anglo-Saxon has been in contact with these people for a short time, he makes up his mind that the presence of the Chinaman is an evil, that it works nothing but evil, and that for his own safety, for the preservation of society and of the institutions of the country, it is absolutely necessary that restrictions should be placed upon this emigration. Now there is the Pacific slope, an inviting country, and there across the ocean, is a nation of 400,000,000 of people. Do you want to see the Pacific states and provinces Mongolian? That is the question. Remove the barriers, remove the restrictions upon immigration, and you will have upon that coast not Anglo-Saxon states and provinces, but states and provinces that are Mongolian, with the great mass of the people of Chinese. And the Chinese will flow over the mountains to the plains of the West. And thence they will find their way to the provinces and cities of the East. There would be practically no limit to Chinese immigration if restrictions were removed. It is not that those who are opposed to Chinese immigration are inhospitable in their feelings, it is not that they wish to deny to any class of the human family equal rights and privileges, it is not that they do not desire to see the Chinese christianized,—it is the instinct of self-preservation that compel the Anglo-Saxon to demand that barriers shall be set up against this flood that would pour in upon them and subvert their institutions.

Now, it is useless to tell us that we can permit the importation of any kind of people into this country and that we are guilty of infraction of human rights if we impose any

restrictions upon these immigrants. In the country to the south of us we see evidence that due care has not been exercised with regard to the immigration into that country of undesirable classes—not Chinese alone, but Italians, Bohemians and other peoples that have come to the United States in such numbers as to change to a considerable extent the complexion of society and to endanger in some instances the institutions of the country. It is now felt by intelligent Americans that this flow of immigration should have been regulated, should have been checked, that certain classes of this immigration should have been excluded. The country is realizing the full effects produced by this evil and is now, at the eleventh hour, proposing to take the measure that should have been taken at the outset to exclude that class of immigration that has proven dangerous and threatening to the institutions of the country. Such being the experience of the United States, let us be warned by that experience, and let us realize that this is not a question of sentimentality, it is not a question whether Chinamen shall be allowed to come here and be brought under conditions that shall improve him mentally and morally, but the question is:—Shall multitudes of depraved heathen with all the vices of heathendom be allowed to come into this country, to swarm, to overrun, to override the population that we must look to to make this Dominion a great country? It is not a mere question of population, it is a question of what kind of population you shall have. A population of five millions such as we have in Canada to-day is better than a population of ten millions of some other kinds and better than a population of 20,000,000 of Chinamen. I simply rose to say, Mr. Speaker, that in considering this question we must avoid being influenced by mere sentiment, that we must realize thoroughly that a great many things are to be considered, and that we must recognize that the instincts of the people who come into contact with this element are to be respected. I for one would be very averse indeed to the adoption of a policy which was protested against by British Columbia, if British Columbia was to receive the full influences and consequences of the adoption of that policy. If Chinese immigration is distasteful to British Columbia, and if British Columbia is the province which is to receive Chinese immigration, then, I say, we should respect the prejudices, if you please to call them so, but they are convictions rather—I say we should respect the convictions, respect the desires of British Columbia in this matter. I pay great attention to the views placed before this House by British Columbia members, and I find there is no divergence of views among them, and I know there is no divergence of views among the people of British Columbia with regard to this question. It is simply a question with them, shall this province be an Anglo-Saxon province, or shall it be a Mongolian province? They take the view that they would rather have it an Anglo-Saxon province. They are going to fight for the realization of that dream, and I shall do nothing, as a member of this House, to interpose any obstacle to the realization of their desires in that matter.

Mr. PRIOR. However much the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) and myself may differ on subjects with regard to the trade policy, I am glad to see that there is one subject on which we are both fully agreed, and that is with regard to the legal exclusion of Chinese from the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman has, in a lengthy and very eloquent speech, given this House very full information in regard to that question, and, therefore, I need not speak upon it at any length to-night, nor repeat what he has said, because, although I was not present when he spoke, I read his speech with great pleasure—leaving out the question of the report which the Controller of Inland Revenue has spoken about, because it is so many years since I read it that I could not give an opinion. I will say that the hon. member for Burrard has spoken nothing but the exact truth in regard to Chinese in British Columbia. Now, I know there are a large number of gentlemen in this House, as there were in the last House, who think that this is a matter that does not need much attention from the Parliament of Canada, that it is a question that solely applies to the province of British Columbia. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen present, on both sides of this House, that it is a matter of the greatest importance, not only to them but also to large masses of the wage-earning population of this Dominion. This is not a new matter. It has been brought up time and again for years past, by hon. gentlemen who have represented the different sections of British Columbia. There may be some present here to-night who remember when Mr. Bunster spoke on the subject, when Mr. Baker and Mr. Shakespeare expatiated upon it in this House, and also when I myself brought it before the attention of the Government of the day. I remember perfectly well begging for the sympathy of the Government in regard to the employment of Chinese on the fortifications which were to be built, and which are now building, at Esquimalt, near Victoria. The officer in charge there was, I understood, about to employ Chinese, and I applied to the Government to get them to use their best endeavours with the Imperial authorities not to allow any Asiatic labour to be employed. I am very glad to say that very little, if any, Chinese labour has been employed; but still they stated that they had a right to employ it, and would do so if they saw fit. Now, this Chinese question was a serious one many years ago, but not nearly so serious as it is at the present

moment; and I will tell this House, if you will allow me, the reason why. In British Columbia, in the earlier days, there was a much smaller population than there is at present, although it is not very large yet. But wages were very much higher than they are now, times were good, and there were very few labouring men indeed who, if they wanted work, could not obtain it at remunerative wages. At the present time, I am sorry to say, and for the last two or three years, it has been the case that there have been large numbers of men, good, honest, faithful labouring men, who have not been able to get regular and steady work at anything like decent wages; and they contend, and I think with a great deal of truth, that the principal cause is that Chinese labour is employed by private individuals and others in the province of British Columbia.

Now, the hon. member for Burrard said that he and all the other members from British Columbia were pledged up to the hilt —I believe those were the words he used— to do their best to get this Chinese Exclusion Act passed. Now, I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman on that point, because I myself personally gave no pledge whatever. The matter was never brought up on the platform at the last two elections I ran, and I do not remember the subject ever having been mentioned. But the reason why it was not brought up, I presume, was that every one of my constituents knew exactly where I stood on the matter. They all knew perfectly well that I, together with the other British Columbia members, believed most sincerely that the influx of Chinese should be stopped. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Burrard said that he believed the leader of the Government and also the leader of the Opposition were in full sympathy with him on this question. I have a copy of a telegram that was sent by the leader of the present Government in May last, addressed to Mr. J. C. McLagan, Vancouver, B.C.:

> Chinese immigration restriction not a question in the east. Views of the Liberals in the west will prevail with me.
>
> (Sd.) WILFRED LAURIER.

Now, I do not quite agree with that telegram, because I say that this Chinese question is equally a question in the east as it is in the west, for although the west is the gateway through which these heathen, as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) calls them, enter the Dominion, still they are just like cholera, if they are not stopped they will spread from the west to the east. Now, I may say that I know the late Government was fully in sympathy with British Columbia members in regard to this question, and that on every occasion when the matter was brought before them, they showed that they were in sympathy. So far as I recollect, on all occasions it was simply the international question that debarred them from passing some act. I may at once say that I know full well that the principle of the exclusion of any man is wrong; but I think that circumstances alter cases. If we were trying to exclude a lot of men who had the same mode of living as we have, or as Canadian or British workmen have, I say it would be wrong to try and exclude them. But where we have men who live in a totally different manner, I think that should be taken into consideration. The white men have to make a decent living, they have to make decent wages to be able to keep what they consider a proper and decent house over their heads. They marry and raise children, which the Chinese never do in our country. The Chinese live 15 or 20 in a small room, they live on food that no white man could exist on; and, therefore, I do not consider that we are violating any correct principle when we try to exclude such men from our country. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) went very fully into the moral aspect of this immigration. The hon. gentleman, from his early training and from the calling he has followed for so many years, is far better qualified to deal with that subject than I am, and I will, therefore, say very little in regard to the morals of the Chinese. I may say this, however, that there are just as good Chinamen as any other men in the world—some of them. There are first-class Chinese merchants, well-educated men, resident in Victoria to-day, and there are plenty of the labouring class of Chinese who are good honest men, and can be trusted almost as well as some white men. Their vices are different from the vices of white people; but we all know that white people have vices which none of us would seek to condone. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) drew the attention of the House to what has been going on in the country to the south of us. He showed, and very properly showed, that for many years the Americans have been allowing a stream of immigrants to come in that have in the end proved to be a burden on the communities in which they have settled, and a menace to the good government of the country. Those people, although they were what we call white people, were an undesirable class; still, as regards the majority of them, whatever wages they earned, they spent on their families and themselves in the country in which they settled, but such is not the case with the Chinese, nor with the Japanese either. They come into the country and work for wages which it would be cruel and most unfair to ask any decent white man to accept; they save all the money they can, the majority of the labourers living more like pigs than men, and send out of the country every dollar they can possibly save. I say men like that cannot possibly do any good to the country and assist in building up this country to the position to which we desire it to attain. Unfortunately, there are plenty of white men who are obliged to work for very small

wages; that is the case in every country in the world. There are various kinds of work, however, such as clearing land, where the owner cannot afford to pay large wages; but I contend it would be far better for Canada as a whole, if the Chinese were excluded, and we were to get some of the cheap labour of which you have so much in the east, and send it to British Columbia. I am informed there are men working in Montreal to-day for 70 cents and 80 cents a day. There is no Chinaman in British Columbia who could be found to work for such wages. So, instead of the Chinese, who are employed by nearly every contractor or manufacturer, give us some of this cheap labour to be found in the east, and let it do the work, instead of the Chinese. I think every hon. member is aware that for years I have been a consistent protectionist. I believe in protecting the industries of the country, but I also believe in protecting the labour of the country. I believe that, whether a man is a Liberal or a Conservative, a free trader or a protectionist in regard to the commodities produced in the country, you cannot point your finger to a single workingman who is not a strong protectionist so far as his own labour is concerned. Now, what do we see? Workingmen joining unions—the majority of them belong to unions. What is the purpose of those unions? They are for nothing but the protection of the labour of the unionists against outside and unfair competition. That being the case, they will not allow white men, even their own brothers, to work on the same job with them, unless they belong to the union with which they are connected. If that be the case, do they not believe in protection to labour just as much as we believe in protection for the manufacturers of the country. We are told there is an international difficulty here. I always firmly believed there was, because it seemed to me, at first sight, that the Chinese might, if they "cut up rough," and we kept them out, keep our people out of their country. But what do we see? We find New South Wales, a dependency of the British Crown, as much as Canada is, has passed a law imposing a tax of $500 on every Chinaman going into that colony, a tax which the people of British Columbia ask to be imposed on Chinese coming here. If it is lawful and proper to enact such a law in New South Wales, why is it not possible to do so in Canada? I firmly believe that the Chinese and Japanese in British Columbia and Canada now should be treated honestly and fairly by us; but I say this, and in regard to it I agree with the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), that we have plenty, if not too many, Chinese already for the class of work for which they are fitted, and for which we could not get cheap white labour. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) came out to British Columbia a few months ago, in company with the hon. the Premier, and he spoke at a meeting held in Victoria, when, I may say, he "took the house;" but I could wager a good deal of money that, if the hon. gentleman had delivered there the speech he gave to this House the other day on the Chinese question, he would have been hissed off the platform. There is no doubt that the general feeling of the public in British Columbia is deadly opposed to Chinese immigration. The hon. gentleman said, the other day, "We should open our gates to all from other lands." Well, Sir, I, for one, must protest emphatically against that doctrine. I do not think any member of this House wants to see our labouring men brought down to the level of the Asiatics, and it is impossible for the white man to live, if he has to compete with such labour. The hon. gentleman further said, "We must bring our best moral and spiritual efforts to bear on them." I do not think that will make very much difference to the wages they will work for and the way in which they live. I have heard it said in the States that the only good Indian was a dead one; and the majority of the people of British Columbia believe that is the case with the Chinese. The hon. gentleman again said, "If we exclude them, we give up our claim that we are able to compete successfully with them." We do not intend to try to compete with Chinese or Japanese labour; it is impossible with the different mode of life of the white man that he can compete with such labour. I also wish to warn this House against the competition we are bound to receive in the Japanese in their own country, where they are carrying on manufactures. Perhaps hon. members have not taken notice of these facts, but a short time ago the Americans sent a commission to Japan to find out what competition they would have to meet in that country, and they found the Japanese were building mills of all descriptions, were turning out goods, such as cotton, iron-work, engines and other kinds of manufactured goods at such prices as rendered it impossible for our manufacturers or any other manufacturers in any civilized country to compete with them. With the cheap transportation such as we have now across the Pacific, a very short time will elapse before Canada and the United States, and even Great Britain, will feel the effects of that severe and serious competition. There are a certain number of people in British Columbia who contend that they cannot do without Chinese. The owners of canneries declare they must have Chinese to work in those establishments. They have my most heartfelt sympathy in their efforts, because they have to compete with the American canners who utilize Chinese labour, and I must say that unless they can obtain cheaper labour than the white labour in British Columbia at the present time, they would not be able to compete successfully with the cannery men to the south of us, and on the Alaska coast. I must say also that the Chinese do make first rate household servants; and that up

to the present time it has been very hard indeed in British Columbia to get girls to fill these positions. However, I cannot help thinking, that if the number of Chinese were reduced, from some portion of the Globe or other we should be able to get as many white domestic servants as are needed. Sir, as long as the Chinese are allowed to come in people will employ them, because it is only human that when you want work done you try to get it done as cheaply as you can. I wish to say in conclusion that I am heartily in accord with the resolution moved by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), and I sincerely trust that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will look upon the matter seriously and not as a joke, because it is no joke. I trust that the Government will by some means or another find a way in which they can put a stop to these Chinese hordes now coming to our country, either by imposing a higher tax on them or by passing some law which according to their mind is more effective than a tax.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Speaker, when I heard the able and comprehensive explanation of this Chinese question which was given to the House last week by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), I thought it was unnecessary for anything more to be said in justification of the position which is taken on this question by the people of our western province. It seems, however, that notwithstanding the convincing and complete argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell), there is still some diversity of opinion among hon. members upon the question of increasing the restrictions upon Chinese immigration. As this matter is undoubtedly one of the most vital consequences to British Columbia in general, and to the district which I have the honour to represent in this House in particular, I wish to endorse the remarks which have been made by different speakers who have spoken in favour of increased restriction, and I wish more particularly to refer to a few of the arguments which have been advanced by hon. gentlemen who hold a different view. The first member who expressed an opinion different from that of the introducer of this motion was the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and Sir, I must confess that I was surprised to find that hon. gentleman take the position which he did, because we have always regarded him, and in fact we know that he is still, a stalwart friend of those who are labouring under unjust and unfair conditions of society, and on this occasion it seemed peculiar to find him in opposition to those whose interests he has always championed. But, he explained away the surprise of most of us when he stated to the House, that there were practically no Chinamen in the province of Nova Scotia. Sir, if there were Chinamen in Nova Scotia and if that hon. gentleman were brought in contact with the evils of the presence of large numbers of Chinese, he could not hold the views which he at present does. If he lived in British Columbia or in any place where there are a large number of Chinese, he would see the interests of the white men undermined by Chinamen in the most unfair manner. He would see the white labourer driven from his work; he would see white farmers forced off their farms; he would see white families reduced to the verge of starvation; he would see these things as we see them in the west, not in individual instances but in numberless cases, and seeing them I know that he would sympathize with those of his race who are looking to this Parliament for relief. The hon. gentleman, in justification of the position which he has taken on this question for the time being—I say for the time being because I believe that both he and the Controller of Inland Revenue after further ventilation of the question, will be inclined to accept the views held by those members of the House who are most directly concerned—I say the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) has advanced certain arguments in favour of his present position, to which I wish to refer briefly, because I have no doubt there are other members of this House holding similar views.

The first idea suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) was, that the movement in favour of restricting Chinese immigration was something of a class agitation which is supported by the working classes only. That is altogether a mistaken view of the situation. There can be no doubt but that the first effect of the presence of this large number of Chinese is manifested upon the working classes, but, Sir, it is equally true that the injurious effect falls upon all other classes of the community. The farmers are as much interested in this question as are the workingmen, and it is not too much to say that the tradespeople are also similarly interested. It must be remembered that while there are about 20,000 Chinamen in British Columbia, these Chinamen observe a rule not to patronize any white establishments if it is possible to do otherwise. The great bulk of their supplies and provisions are imported direct from China. Now, if these 20,000 Chinamen were not in British Columbia, there would be somewhere about 10,000 white men to take their places, and the majority of these being in all probability heads of families, the condition would bring an enormous trade to the merchants of that province. The fact is, that all the people of British Columbia, no matter what their calling in life, are desirous of restriction being placed upon further Chinese immigration. I shall not dwell upon this phase of the question at the present time, because in a very few months there will be a monster petition presented to the Government asking for further restrictions to be placed upon the immigration of Chinese, and when that petition is presented to this House it

will be found that the signers of it include not only workingmen, and tradespeople, and farmers, but also those who are engaged in industries, which it is contended by pro-Chinese advocates cannot be carried on in British Columbia without Chinese labour. But, if it were argued that this question were a mere question of competition, and that the object was for the workingmen to get rid of this competition ; even if that were the basis of our objection, I confess that after the discussion that I heard in this House last Wednesday evening I would expect to find a great deal of sympathy with our movement, for, Sir, when the Alien Labour Bill was before the House, hon. gentlemen on both sides endorsed the principle of keeping out American labour. In British Columbia we do not complain of fair competition. The point which we take is not so much that Chinese labour comes into competition with our white labour, but that it creates a condition of affairs which makes competition impossible. You will see that this is so, when you consider the habits of the Chinese in that province. In the first place, while we have about 20,000 of them, we have as a matter of fact, only about 50 Chinese women. That means that nearly the whole of the 20,000 Chinamen of British Columbia are unmarried. Now, as most of the white men are married you will readily observe that even were these Chinamen equal in other respects to unmarried white men that in competition against married white men, they would have a decided advantage in the labour market. There is another point which makes the advantage of the Chinamen more apparent, and it is that they come to British Columbia without any idea whatever of accommodating themselves to the customs of our people. They live and work there as mere dumb animals. They engage in no phases of society which involve social obligations. The result is that, not having any appearances of self-respect to keep up for themselves and their families, they have thus an additional advantage in competing against our people.

Another point which has been referred to is this. They and their ancestors before them, owing to the over-populated condition of China, have adapted their stomachs, so to speak, to do with the least possible nutriment. They have inherited the capacity to live on the minimum of food which is necessary to sustain life, and this necessarily implies, in so far as the rate of wages is determined by the necessaries of life, that these people can undermine the white labour.

Therefore, on account of their lack of social obligations in the community, on account of their single blessedness, so to speak, on account of the fact that they can live on next to nothing, you will see that they are in a position to undercut our labour at every turn. It is absolutely impossible for white men to compete against Chinamen in the field of labour. The result is that a white labourer must either cast his self-respect to the winds, and must degrade himself to the level of that vile product of congested Asiatic life, or he must seek other fields of labour. This question, then, comes to this. White labourers in British Columbia cannot compete against Chinese labour ; they will not, on account of their self-respect as white men and British subjects, consent to degrade themselves to the condition of the Chinese, and the question arises will they be forced to leave British Columbia ? Will British Columbia, with all its wealth of natural resources, and with its assured future, become the heritage of the degraded Chinese, or will it become the glory of Canada ?

The hon. member for Guysborough threw out the suggestion, and it has been endorsed by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue, that we have broad acres of unoccupied land in this country, and that it is certainly the right of the Chinese to come in and occupy them if they see fit. There is no doubt that it is desirable that our broad prairies should be peopled ; but I think it is equally undesirable to have them populated with the refuse of humanity. We want men to come to this country who will make good citizens, men who will thicken the backbone of this country ; but to say that all the magnificent opportunities of this country should be thrown open to the riff-raff of humanity is a proposition which I do not think this House will entertain. There has been a complaint heard throughout the country, and I think also in this House, against the degraded elements of European life being dumped into this country. I think that complaint is well-founded. But the fact is that the worst elements of European life are Pilgrim Fathers in comparison with the scum which rises from the social conditions of the over-populated and semi-civilized Empire of China.

The hon. Controller of Inland Revenue has eulogized the character and the morality and the intellect of the Chinese people. I would say that, so far as the better classes of Chinamen purpose to come to this country, there is at the present time, so far as I understand the law, no obstacle in their way. The present law merely excludes the Chinese labourer. In that law we have not gone so far as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has gone in his Alien Labour Bill, which has been endorsed by this House. That Bill, as I understand it, is directed against all outside countries, and is intended to prevent foreign labour coming into competition with out labour. We do not go so far as that. The Chinese restrictionist wishes to prohibit only the Chinese labourer from coming into this country. There is at present no restriction whatever on Chinese merchants, Chinese students, Chinese tourists, or Chinese ambassadors. They are allowed to come into this country, and there is no serious objection to them. It is only upon

that degraded class which comes to this country in slavery, and remains in slavery while here, that we desire to place restrictions.

The hon. Controller of Inland Revenue, as I have said, extolled the Chinese character. He has been lately brought into contact with Earl Li Hung Chang, and there is no doubt that that eminent Chinaman has made a very favourable impression upon our Controller. But I would point out to that hon. gentleman, that in China, where there are four hundred million Chinamen, there is but one Li Hung Chang: and it would be just as reasonable to attribute the virtues of the Hon. William E. Gladstone to the Whitechapel wretches as to attribute any virtues which the hon. Controller has seen in Li Hung Chang to the degraded Chinese who are imported into British Columbia.

The hon. Controller has extolled the morality of Chinamen in opposition to the experience of the people of the west and the experience of almost every person who has come in contact with the Chinese people there; and, as he has referred to books, I shall speak by the book also. I have here the report of the Minister of Justice of this country for the last year, in which I find a statement of the nationalities of the convicts in the penitentiary of British Columbia; and I find that out of 108 convicts in that penitentiary 36 are Chinamen. There are more Chinamen there than native-born Canadians. Now, at the outset, there are not more than 20,000 Chinamen in British Columbia, this means that while not more than 20 per cent of the people of British Columbia are Chinamen, upwards of 30 per cent of the convicts in the penitentiary are of that nationality. I do not know that that stands very well beside the contention of the hon. Controller in regard to the morality of these people. But, Sir, it is certain that the fact, as disclosed by the report of the Minister of Justice, is well known to all persons who live in British Columbia; and if I had here the report of the common jails of the province, it would be found that that report would make it more apparent still that the morality of the Chinese, as we know them in British Columbia, is of the very lowest kind.

The hon. Controller also extolled the intelligence of the Chinaman. In that connection I have looked up the statistics of the asylum of British Columbia and I find that out of some 109 inmates 20 are Chinamen. So you will see, if you speak by the book, that it can easily be proved that the class of Chinamen which we have in British Columbia are neither of the very highest moral or intellectual standing. But we, from British Columbia, upon this occasion, need not confine ourselves to books as must the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue, who lives 3,000 miles away from the condition of affairs which we have described to-night. He has gleaned all his information from works written by parties whose interests I do not know; but the representatives from British Columbia have personal knowledge of this question and are agreed in declaring that a different condition of affairs exists in that province from that which the hon. the Controller would lead this House to believe exists, and I think that hon. members will be more inclined to take the view of my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), backed up as it is by the unanimous expression of the experience in British Columbia, and by legislation in the great nation to the south of us and down in the Australian colonies, than the views which are to be found in the works of unknown authors.

But the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) furthermore sought to raise a prejudice against our agitation in this matter, by saying that we are copying the legislation of the United States just as we had taken our protectionist theories from that nation. Well, I do not know that the judgment of a nation of seventy million people is to be disregarded altogether. I think quite the contrary, but if there are any objections from free traders to our adopting the judgment of that great protectionist nation to the south on the Chinese question, I would refer them to the colony of New South Wales. That colony, which has strong free trade proclivities, has passed the identical legislation which the people of British Columbia are now asking this Parliament to pass. But the point we make is this, that wherever Chinamen have been brought in contact with Anglo-Saxons, whether in the United States or Australia or British Columbia, there has been the same unanimous desire on the part of Anglo-Saxons to be rid of their presence. Everywhere we find the same unanimous verdict that the two people cannot live together in the same country, to their mutual advantage.

There is another argument which has been advanced in this discussion, though I do not know that it has been strongly advanced, but it is one which, if it were well based, would be one of the strongest arguments that could be advanced by pro-China advocates. That argument is that undoubtedly, while it would be to the advantage of British Columbia to have Chinamen excluded, yet that advantage would be entirely provincial, and that the national trade of Canada with China which would be interfered with is of more importance than the mere provincial benefits which would accrue to British Columbia from the exclusion of the Chinese. Now, I have looked this matter up, and so far as I can gather from the statistics in the Statesman's Year-Book, I find that for the three years prior to 1892, when the Americans passed the Exclusion Act, the United States exported to China goods to the value of 4,000,000 taels, and that during the three years after the passage of that Act, the annual value exported, averaged 6,000,000 taels, or an increase of 50 per cent after the Exclusion

Act was brought into effect. It is therefore idle to contend that if we raised our restrictions on Chinese immigration, there would be any falling off in the trade between Canada and China. The case of the United States is on all fours with ours. They have shown greater hostility than the people of British Columbia have shown and are now asking this Parliament to give expression to, but notwithsanding that, the people of China bought 50 per cent more goods from the United States, after the Exclusion Act, than they did prior to that Act. There is a reason for this. The Chinese are not only unsentimental in trade as in other things but are otherwise very peculiar. They are conservative, they do not wish for any change in their system of civilization. They wish to go on, as they have been going on for centuries, undisturbed by outside nations, and the result is they look upon all outside countries with disdain. They do not exercise any discrimination whatever, but class all outside people as foreign devils, no matter to what nationality they may belong. The result is that when they make purchases from these outside peoples it really makes very little difference to them whether they purchase from a Canadian, a German or a Frenchman. There is another reason which explains why trade increased with China, even in the face of apparent hostility. It is this. The whole trade with China is done through commission agents at the sea ports of that country, so that the Chinese themselves are not brought into immediate contact with the people they purchase from. Therefore, I do not think that we need attach any weight to this trade argument, when considering the legislation asked for.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and one or two others spoke of humanity in connection with this question, and they suggested that it is every man's right to go where he wishes on this globe without restriction. The hon. member for Guysborough spoke of a common fatherhood, and I shall not enter into that view of the case, but let me point out one fact in this connection. While it may be true that the Chinese do not place any restriction in a technical sense upon the immigration of Canadians into their country, as a matter of fact that statement is very far from being correct in the practical sense, for while the Chinese may have no law against Canadians or British subjects entering China, yet, as a matter of fact, there are conditions existing there which attain the same object. It is well known that if a white person attempted to enter the interior of China, he would simply take his life in his hands, and that is the most effective exclusion that can possibly be inflicted on an outside people. It seems to me that when Li Hung Chang melodramatically implored the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue not to abandon him, he had, no doubt, in his mind the fact that he was about to enter the far interior of this country, and, remembering the massacres of foreigners which have taken place in the interior of his own country, he feared lest a similar fate might await him here. Just exactly as a white person on the coast of China would no doubt have to appeal to the Imperial authorities of that country for protection, if he attempted to enter the interior, so Li Hung Chang appealed to our hon. friend: "Do not abandon us." If the question of humanity be considered, I would suggest that the highest and most practical kind of humanity requires that we protect the interests of those who are nearest and dearest to us.

Now, there has been a question raised as to the jurisdiction of this Parliament to interfere. It has been contended that there are international difficulties in the way. It appears to me that it is rather late in the day for these difficulties to arise. The proper time for these difficulties to have been ventilated was in 1885 or 1886, when the first restriction was placed upon the Chinese immigration. We have acted upon that restriction law for ten years. Having endorsed the principle for that length of time, it seems to me that it is rather late in the day to attempt to criticise it or to attempt to upset it now. But, in connection with this question, it is well to note the fact that, when Earl Li Hung Chang interviewed the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain in Great Britain, and made some kind of protest against the restriction which was placed upon this immigration into Canada, Mr. Chamberlain informed him that in these matters the colonies were entirely self-governing. There we have the opinion of one of the highest authorities we can possibly have, that it is competent for this Parliament to deal with this matter as it sees fit. We have the further fact that in New South Wales, which is a British colony and in the same position as we are—in fact, in a less advantageous position than we are—they have placed a restriction of $500 upon Chinamen coming into that colony. If they have the jurisdiction to pass such a law, surely we have similar jurisdiction in this country. The position, then, is just this: It has been found in British Columbia, in fact it has been found wherever the Anglo-Saxon race has been brought into contact with the Chinaman, that the presence of the Chinaman is incompatible with the enjoyment by the Anglo-Saxon of the opportunities of his country. And, as there seems to be no doubt that we have the right in this Parliament to put further restrictions upon immigration of Chinamen to this country, I hope that hon. members will consider the facts which have been laid before them in this discussion, that they will consider this question from the point of view of those who are most in contact with the conditions complained against, and those who are most interested in it, and when, in the near future,

a definite proposal is laid before the House, asking for relief by restriction upon the entry of Chinamen in to this country, hon. members will be prepared to grant that relief, which is so urgently needed and so unanimously desired by the people of British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I must appeal to hon. gentlemen to let us go home now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had a pretty late sitting last evening, and I have some private and unofficial information, which I hope is not correct, that we may be late to-morrow night. Unless hon. gentlemen interested in orders yet to come, object, I will consent to the adjournment. I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE presented the second report of the committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House, as follows :—

That a complaint was lodged with your committee by Mr. D. Monet, M.P., against Messrs. Lucien Lasalle, Joseph Bouchard, Peter McLeod and J. B. Vanasse, four translators of the debates of the House of Commons, that they, while in office, took a prominent part in active political strife since 1891 ;

That notice of said complaint was sent to the above-named translators, with the request that they furnish the committee with an explanation ;

That the four translators appeared before your committee, and were examined in connection with the said charge ;

That Joseph Bouchard admitted he attended three public political meetings during the last election, having a seat on the platform, and that he addressed one of these meetings at Larose's Hall, in the city of Ottawa ;

That the report of the said meeting, as published in the Ottawa "Daily Citizen" of the 12th June last, and filed with your committee, stated that Joseph Bouchard addressed the meeting in French, and indicated that he strongly supported the fiscal policy af the late Government, as well as its policy with regard to the Manitoba school question ;

That the said Joseph Bouchard, although he contended that the report of the "Citizen" eulogized too highly his speech, admitted that he advocated the return of the Government's candidate and endorsed the trade policy of the Government as well as its course with regard to the Manitoba school question ;

That Peter McLeod admitted that all the parliamentary correspondence which appeared in "Le Trifluvien" over the nom de plume of "E. Liane" was written by him ;

That a portion of this correspondence was translated and filed with your committee ; that in this correspondence one honourable member of the House of Commons was referred to as a young blockhead, and the leader of the Opposition as the leader of the traitors who had pocketed his honour and dignity, etc. ;

That J. B. Vanasse admitted the accuracy of the charge made against him of having on the public platform referred to the then leader of the Opposition and to one of the candidates in the county of Richelieu as renegades and traitors of their race and religion.

In view of the above related facts, which in the opinion of your committee convict the said Joseph Bouchard, Peter McLeod and J. B. Vanasse of having improperly interfered in politics, your committee recommend their dismissal from the staff as translators of the debates.

With regard to the case of L. Lasalle a majority of your committee are not in favour of recommending his dismissal.

Your committee beg to submit, herewith, the minutes of proceedings and all documents produced before them in connection with this case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As this report is one of a good deal of importance, I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government if he would be good enough to have the evidence printed, and to fix a day for the consideration of the report.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The whole report will appear in the Votes and Proceedings to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that there is no intention of proposing the adoption of this report until next week.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I intend to move that it be concurred in on Tuesday next.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question before the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was going to say that before the motion for the adoption of the report, we should have the evidence printed.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question of the adoption of anything.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. GIBSON. I beg to move the adoption of the first report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that this report, as read to the House, contains an important recommendation relating to the internal economy of the House ; and I think that report, as well as the report of the Committee on the Debates, should have the ordinary notice of two days before they are considered by the House. I do not suggest

that they should be put on the regular notice book, which would probably put them far back in the session ; but if the hon. gentleman gives notice that after two days, Monday or Tuesday, or any other day, he will move that the report be considered, that motion may be considered when motions are called, which will satisfy the rules of the House.

Mr. GIBSON. If I have the consent of the Government, I will give notice to bring this motion up on Monday.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to several notices on the Order paper for the production of correspondence between the High Commissioner and the Government, and I would like to say to my hon. friend that these papers were prepared at the end of last session, in response to a motion made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), but they were not completed in time to be laid on the Table. They are all now ready, and I would ask the hon. leader of the House to be good enough to lay them on the Table, in anticipation of a motion, because it will be very important to have them when discussing the motion proposed by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The papers are all ready and will be brought down in a day or so. I have thought of that.

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT ORDERS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved :

That, for the remainder of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Mondays after Private Bills, and on Wednesdays, with an hour for Private Bills after half-past seven o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are very anxious to reach the end of the session, and I do not object to the motion, but I think that as much latitude as possible should be allowed with regard to matters that really require to be brought before the notice of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I have some important notices on the paper. Some of these are undoubtedly such as I think will commend themselves to the Government, and they can wait, but there is one subject of eminent importance, and that is the doing away with a state of things most undesirable and indeed discreditable. Last session I attempted to do so, and so did another member who is no longer in the House. I refer to the Bill entitled an Act to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act. When I tell the hon. First Minister that the state of the law at present places in the hands of irresponsible people——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he cannot anticipate the discussion of any question on a motion of this kind.

Mr. DAVIN. With your leave, Sir, the First Minister has made a motion, and before I vote for it, I want to give a reason why I shall either vote against it and call for a division, or else make a suggestion to the First Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may give a reason, but I wish to draw his attention to the rule that he cannot discuss the subject of any motion on the Order paper on a motion of this kind.

Mr. DAVIN. I could not be guilty of such a breach of order under any circumstances, especially with yourself in the Chair. However, I need not enter into the nature of my motion, because I think the hon. First Minister and his colleagues thoroughly understand the position. What I would suggest is that if the Prime Minister takes these days, he should put that Bill on the Government Orders.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to call attention to this matter, and the hon. First Minister can reply to both at once. As there are some notices of motion here for correspondence and so on, the hon. gentleman might allow us, on Monday next, to go through those that do not require discussion so that the material might be ready for use at a subsequent session if not now.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). We have passed through the paper once or twice already, but if there are any such motions, I suppose the House will have no objection to taking them up on Monday. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I understand that his Bill is the same as that which was introduced last session by Mr. Martin, which certainly dealt with a very important subject, and after giving the matter consideration, the Government may find its way to putting it on its own orders.

Mr. MACLEAN. In previous sessions when the Government took Mondays, their orders took precedence after questions, and not after private Bills. I think that private members should retain the right to put questions on that day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That is quite right and we will amend the motion to that effect.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ABBE PROULX.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the attention of the Government to a paragraph which appears in its journal "La Presse," of the 16th inst., published in Montreal. Here is the paragraph :

L'Abbé Proulx on an Official Mission.—His Parishioners Notified of his Absence on very Important Business.

On Tuesday of last week, the 8th September, l'Abbé Proulx, of Saint-Lin, received the following despatch, dated Ottawa, September 8th, 1896 :—

Rev. Abbé Proulx, Curé of Laurentides.

Everything is ready, be here to-morrow.

W. LAURIER.

On Wednesday morning l'Abbé Proulx took the train at Montreal. It was not known what his destination was. On Thursday morning he was met at Montreal and on Friday he took the train for New York and took passage on one of the trans-Atlantic steamers for Europe. Last Sunday his Vicar, l'Abbé Martel, from the pulpit read to the parishoners of St. Lin a letter from their parish priest in which he stated that he had to leave them, that he could not give the reason which caused his absence, but that he was leaving Canada on most important matters and that he certainly would do his duty.

Now, Sir, it was currently reported in Montreal that the important mission of l'Abbé Proulx was in connection with the school question of Manitoba. I should like to ask the First Minister if the telegram I have just read to the House, and signed by him, or supposed to be signed by him, is correct, and if so, whether l'Abbé Proulx has left on an important mission connected with the settlement of the school question of Manitoba, whether he goes on that mission sent by the Government, and, if the hon. gentleman can say so, what is the nature of the mission which he is called upon to fulfil ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). M. l'Abbé Proulx is not on an official mission for the Government. I sent that telegram referred to, to l'Abbé Proulx. It refers to personal matters concerning which I have no information to give.

RETURNS.

Mr. CASEY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that a return was moved for last session showing the expenditure and details of the expenditure on Port Stanley harbour under the last great grant that was made by this House for that purpose. I suppose that return has been prepared, and I would like to know if we are to have it this session.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The papers referred to will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know when the return asked for last session by Mr. Tarte, covering the instructions to G. H. Young, inspector of customs, in regard to the conduct of Thomas Scott, will be brought down.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. May I ask the First Minister—I understood him to say that l'Abbe Proulx had not left on an official mission—but I did not understand——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question put by the hon. member for North Wellington has not been answered.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I may say to my hon. friend from North Wellington that the matter he refers to had not previously been brought to my notice, but I will make inquiries in the department as to the papers he speaks of.

L'ABBE PROULX.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Now, if I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the First Minister. I understood the First Minister to say that the Abbé Proulx had not left on an official mission, but I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Abbé Proulx was not invested with a mission, that his trip was not undertaken on a mission confided to him.

The PRIME MINISTER. I tried to satisfy my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron), but I do not know that I shall be able to do so. I think he has the school question on the brain. Let him set his mind at rest. I never spoke a single word to the Abbé Proulx about that question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is not an answer to my question.

THE ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before proposing a motion for Committee of Supply, I may be permitted to speak a word of explanation. On Tuesday I gave notice that I would ask the House to take special action to-day with reference to a provision for the immediate needs of the public service. But in view of the progress that has been made with the Estimates—the excellent progress, I may say, and I hope I may add that the progress may be continued—I shall not deem it necessary for the House to carry out that suggestion, and for the present it may be postponed.

17TH SEPTEMBER, 1878.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is his intention to move

to-day that the House adjourn at six o'clock so as to enable us to celebrate the eighteenth anniversary of a very important event in the history of Canada ?

The PRIME MINISTER. What event ? I have entirely forgotten about it.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to mention, for the information of the House, that I have received intimation that His Honour the Deputy Governor, about four o'clock, will request the attendance of members of this House in the Senate, when assent will be given, I suppose, to the Supply Bill.

PRINTING BUREAU—PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask the Finance Minister—in reference to the remark he made a short time ago—whether he has funds in hand to pay the employees of the Printing Bureau for their services up to date, and if so, whether these services will be paid for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not know that I can give the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) a very specific answer. It had not been my intention to pay the employees of the Printing Bureau out of the appropriation by Governor General's warrant, because it was pointed out in the House that it was, perhaps, a little in anticipation of the need. If the Estimates make the rapid progress we anticipate, I think we would prefer to have these payments come out of the general Appropriation Bill, rather than out of the Governor General's warrants. But we will reserve that, in case of delay in the Estimates.

Mr. McNEILL. I made the remark because I had understood that payments were due to these employees, and that the men were much in need of the money.

THE MORRISON MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Postmaster General if the papers relating to the Morrison contract, called for on Friday last, are ready to be placed on the Table ; if not, when will they be ready ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I stated yesterday——

An hon. MEMBER. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes ; the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) put the same question to me, and I gave an explanation. I stated that on Friday evening, after the discussion, I had instructed the Deputy Postmaster General to produce the papers and have them copied at once. On Tuesday I asked him for them. He told me that he had not been able to get them on Friday evening, because they were in the vault, and it was after hours, and he had not charge of the vault. He said he had given them out to be copied by a young lady—do you want the name ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes ; be particular.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Miss Seymour.

An hon. MEMBER. How old is she ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All young ladies are very young. He said they had been delivered to her to be copied. Yesterday, on returning to my department, in consequence of the inquiry of the ex-Minister of Finance, I asked him again, and he told me that I would get them to-day or to-morrow. I asked him before coming up to-day if he received them yet from her, and he told me he had not, but that they would be here to-day, and I suppose they will.

SUPPLY—FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government to a very important statement which I see in the " Hansard " of yesterday, made by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) in regard to one of the most important questions that, I think, is under the consideration of the Government. Now, it will be remembered that the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated that the question of the Fast Atlantic service was receiving the careful consideration of the Government ; and it was also stated, I think by that hon. gentleman that none of the tenders were exactly completed, but that the whole subject was receiving the careful consideration of the Government. Now, I think this House had a right to the earliest information and the earliest announcement from the Treasury benches, of the decision of the Government on that important question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, will put himself in order by a motion, if he is proceeding to make a speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will defer my remarks until the motion is made to go into Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret very much that, owing to having taken a cold last night, I am in a somewhat unfit condition to make any extended observations to-day ; but I regard this question of such supreme importance to Canada that I read

with great astonishment the announcement that my hon. friend from Quebec West, one of the members of this Government, had assumed an attitude of open and avowed hostility to the proposal of a twenty-knot service between Great Britain and Canada. However, I pass by that point to deal for a few moments with what I regard the great importance of the Government giving this subject the attention that it deserves before they arrive at any premature decision to prevent such service being carried into effect. I may say, Sir, that this House has for a long time past been making every possible effort to get a fast Atlantic service. When the House voted 100,000 pounds a year, for ten years, for that service, and when efforts were made to secure its being taken up by capitalists in England, I received a communication from the present Duke of Devonshire, then the Marquis of Hartington, saying that he was satisfied that unless the Government of Canada were prepared to add to that appropriation and make it 150,000 pounds, it would not be possible to obtain the service. I placed myself at once in communication with the then Premier, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, who authorized me to say that the Government would apply to Parliament for the sum of 150,000 pounds per annum for the purpose of securing so important a service. Subsequently, and shortly before that great conference was held here at Ottawa, in which the Imperial Government was represented and the Australasian and South African Colonies were represented, by direction of the Government, I, in conjunction with the representatives in London of the Australasia Colonies, waited upon the Marquis of Ripon, and pressed upon him the importance of the Imperial Government being prepared to give substantial assistance in aid of this project, and we gave the assurance that it would receive the hearty support of Canada and of Australasia. I may say, Sir, that no person knows better than my hon. friend from Quebec West, that a gentleman who has taken a very prominent part in relation to Imperial defence, at once attacked this proposal unless it was accompanied by a substantial pledge on the part of Canada and Australasia that we would contribute largely to the support of the Imperial navy. Finding that public opinion was likely to be prejudiced on this important question, as my hon. friend from Quebec West knows, I delivered an address at the Royal Colonial Institute, at which the Marquis of Lorne presided, for the purpose of placing before the British public and the press and Parliament of England, the great importance of this fast Atlantic service, and the importance which Canada and Australasia attached to it. On that occasion I set forth the great importance to Canada of taking advantage of the geographical position of this country, and having such a service between Great Britain and Canada as would draw this great Dominion and the mother country more closely together. I pointed out that with a twenty-knot service it was quite feasible, in fact it was obviously practicable, for Canada to be able to deliver mails and passengers in the city of New York in a shorter time than it could be done by the fastest ships that now sail on the Atlantic directly from Great Britain to the United States; and that so far as Canada was concerned, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and all these important centres in Canada, and so far as the western states were concerned, the gain would be such as to enable Canada, at all events, to perform the mail service for a very large portion of this continent. Now, in that connection I had the great satisfaction of seeing my hon. friend from Quebec West give me the most ardent and able support. When my proposal was attacked, as it was attacked, by Sir John Colombe, he was answered in a very strong and able speech by my hon. friend from Quebec West, who pointed out the great importance of this measure to Canada and the mother country; and I take this opportunity of thanking that hon. gentleman very much for a speech that, delivered before a crowded assembly, did a great deal to strengthen public opinion, and to inform the press and public men of England of the great importance of this measure. Now, I may say that at this conference that took place in Ottawa, as the First Minister knows, a resolution was arrived at approving in the most hearty manner of the proposal to shorten the distance between Great Britain and Australasia by having a fast line of Atlantic steamships running between a port in Great Britain and Canada, and between Vancouver and Australasia. Hon. gentlemen need not be told that the action of that conference received the most hearty, enthusiastic and eloquent endorsation from the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of First Minister.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message from the Honourable Sir Henry Strong, Deputy Governor, by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. Speaker, Sir Henry Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

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

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Honour the Deputy Governor was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bill:—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $446,500 required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the annual drill of the militia during the financial year ending the 30th June, 1887.

SUPPLY—FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the proceedings of the conference, were followed, I am informed—I had not the pleasure of being here—by a motion in this House to appropriate £150.000 sterling for the purpose of securing a fast Atlantic service, and that motion received the unanimous assent of the House, or at all events it was passed without a division. That action, of course, strengthened the hands of those on the other side of the water who were seeking to secure the co-operation of Her Majesty's Government. I do not think this House can attach too much importance to the great advantage to Canada of having the Imperial Government and Parliament join in promoting enterprises in which both Canada and the mother country are interested. I believe it would be difficult to overrate the importance after having constructed, as we have done, a great trans-continental line of railway from Halifax to Vancouver, of any steps calculated to make that great line of internal communication the great highway of the nations, a highway not only between Great Britain but between Europe and the far east, China and Japan, and also with the provinces of Australasia. All these objects are prominently kept in view in connection with this proposed fast line service. The Imperial Government were approached on behalf of Canada and of the Australasian provinces, and they were pressed strongly upon this question, and as I have already stated, the Marquis of Ripon, who was then the Colonial Minister, was most sympathetic, and the Earl of Rosebery, who was then the Prime Minister, took a most lively interest in the question. They secured the appointment of a large departmental committee, respecting the various departments of the Government, the Admiralty, Post Office, Colonial Office, Treasury, and one or two others, and this question was receiving the attention of this committee when the change of Government took place. When Mr. Chamberlain became Colonial Minister, the matter was pressed upon his attention. He promised to give the most prompt consideration through this departmental committee, which had been previously formed, to the importance of pressing this matter to a conclusion, and at a very early day he was in a position to assure me that Her Majesty's Government, having fully and carefully considered this important question, were prepared to join with Canada, and apply to the Imperial Parliament for such assistance as would be required to carry it out. I will not go perhaps quite so far as that; but I will say that what the Colonial Minister communicated to me was that he was not prepared to say that the Government would give £75,000 a year, because it was necessary to ask for new tenders, and the service might not require that amount in addition to what had been voted by the Canadian Parliament, but what was intimated to me was, that Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to guarantee one-third of the cost when that was definitely ascertained after new tenders had been received. That was done, as the hon. gentleman knows, and it was done with the unanimous consent of this House. The leader of the Government will remember that when the late Government were unable to carry anything through this House owing to the obstruction with which they were met, a very striking exception was made in regard to that measure, and a Bill was allowed to be passed amending the previous Act in such a way as would enable the Government promptly to call for tenders. Those tenders were made, and very properly so, subject to the approval of Parliament. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) in his remarks last night was not warranted in arriving at the conclusion that we were indebted to Mr. Chamberlain for a contract not having been closed without the acquiescence of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, because we had no power to close the contract. The hon. gentleman will see that under the Act we were compelled to submit whatever contract we made to the approval of Parliament; we could not act without the approval of Parliament for it was a condition on which the Act was passed, as hon. gentlemen opposite will remember. Tenders were called for as early as we could establish the form and character of the service required, and prompt action was taken by the Government because we knew that unless a contract was entered into, subject, of course, to the approval of Parliament, it would be impossible to secure what we were aiming at, and that was to have this service go into operation two years from the present season. I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce to say that none of the tenders were strictly formal, and as regards that point the hon. gentleman is undoubtedly correct; but the only point that was informal in the tenders was the time allowed after accepting the tender for parties to make their financial arrangements. I believe I am safe in making that statement.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The fact was that the tenderers reserved the option to go on or not, as they pleased. It was not merely a question of time; they took to themselves, in so many words, the option to go on or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have mentioned the reason. But it was not for the purpose, as has been explained, of making the necessary financial arrangements, because any one knowing the position of the Allan Company which tendered, and the great wealth of the firm in Glasgow, must be well aware that whatever as regards any undertaking into which they entered the firm was in a position to command financial

strength necessary to carry it through. But the object they had in view, as stated by a very able gentleman connected with that firm, Mr. Dunlop, who is well known as the representative of the firm in Glasgow, was to secure time to make such arrangements with the great carrying companies, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway, as would not leave their enterprise at the mercy of the action of those companies. No doubt the Minister of Trade and Commerce is aware that that qualification was distinctly withdrawn. The present High Commissioner in London told me he had an interview with Mr. Dunlop, and pointed out to him that on account of the doubts prevailing as to the tender of the firm being an absolute tender, that difficulty was at once removed by withdrawing that restriction and thus making the tender absolute, in which position the tenderer must go forward. That being the position of this question, I did hope that after all the efforts Canada had made, and in view of the great importance of this subject, there was no doubt but that the present Government would proceed with all their energy and power to secure its accomplishment. I have shown the very strong reason that Her Majesty's Government had for believing that this question was regarded not only by the late Government, but by all parties in this House, as one of supreme importance. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) stated last night:

> I have not seen any evidence yet that the British government would not be prepared to help us if we adopted an 18-knot service.

It is right for me to say to the hon. gentleman that I had it in the most clear and distinct manner from the Colonial Minister that he would not feel himself justified in asking Parliament for a single pound of aid to this service if it were not a 20-knot service. He attached such great importance to shortening the distance between Great Britain and Canada to the narrowest possible limit, that it was absolutely a "sine qua non" that it should be a 20-knot service. That requirement was put in the tenders under the conviction that not a particle of assistance could be obtained from Her Majesty's Government for any less speed than twenty knots.

Now, Sir, I cannot understand the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). When I came to Canada I had the honour of receiving an invitation from the Quebec Board of Trade, of which the hon. gentleman was president. He then very kindly offered that the Quebec Board of Trade should do me the great honour of entertaining me, and that, as I believe, was for the chief purpose of enabling me to put distinctly before them the great advantages that would arise from this proposed fast Atlantic service. The hon. gentleman knows that the communication in summer was to be between Quebec and a port in Great Britain, and in winter between Halifax and Great Britain. The hon. gentleman will hardly underrate the importance which I have always understood the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec, and the people of Quebec, have felt in this enterprise. I have taken the best possible means of informing myself in regard to that, and I have been completely misled if this is not a project which commends itself to the most hearty approval of the enterprising citizens of Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Hear, hear, everybody there wants it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) can hardly underrate the attractions which the St. Lawrence route would present to the great tide of pleasure-seekers, and the great tide of passenger traffic which is passing to and fro between this continent and Europe throughout the season. The hon. gentleman cannot underestimate the advantages of a service which would enable passengers before going on the open sea to overcome seasickness, that bane of travel on the ocean. The hon. gentleman cannot possibly underrate the great attractions to that tide of travel passing from the American republic to Great Britain, which an ocean voyage of three days instead of six days would present.

I can well understand, Sir, the opposition that our proposed fast line would receive from such as the Cunard Line, of which I believe the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Dobell) is the agent in the city of Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) shakes his head. Well, then, I have been misinformed as to that. I know the Cunard people well, and I have always known the hostility of these great steamship lines sailing from New York to any such formidable rival as a Canadian fast Atlantic service would present. They would be more than men if they did not use every means in their power to endeavour to counteract the competition, which I am satisfied they would have every reason to dread. Not only would this fast Atlantic service be the means of drawing the great commercial cities of Canada closer to the mother country, but it would also be the means of making Canada the great highway between the east and Europe. A letter or a passenger could go from London to Yokohama via the Canadian route, and across that line of steamers on the Pacific subsidized by us and the Imperial Government, in one-half the time required by the Suez Canal, the next shortest route. Letters have been delivered in twenty days from Yokohama from London, whereas more than double that period is required by the Suez Canal. I have seen a number of passengers who have travelled from the east by the Canadian route, and such was the pleasure and comfort of the voyage that they have told me that nothing would ever induce them to go by any other route. I

draw attention to that as a very important matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) will also see how anxious the people of Australasia would be that we should have a fast Atlantic service which would shorten the voyage between Australia and the mother country. And, Sir, not only would the fast Atlantic service which we propose be of great importance for mails and passengers, but every one knows that one of the most important conditions in the invitation for tenders which we sent out, and one of the most important conditions in this contract which we proposed to make —and which I was in hopes would be made at an early date between the Allan Company and this Government—one of the most important considerations was that they were to provide all the cold storage required. The contract embraced ample provisions for cold storage, making it, in my judgment, of the greatest advantage to all the farming interests, as well as to the population generally of Canada. All the perishable food products, such as fruit, meat, vegetables, eggs, butter, cheese, in fact, everything that our farmers want a market for, could, if this fast Atlantic service was established, be placed on the British market practically in as short a period almost as they could be obtained from Scotland. The hon. gentlemen opposite must see that it would be impossible to underrate the direct pecuniary advantage this would be to the great farming population of Canada—and there is no portion of our farming population so deeply and vitally interested in this as are the farmers of the province of Quebec. They would have cold storage provided at the city of Quebec, to which they could at once send their produce in the freshest possible condition, to be transferred the next day to the steamer; and in that way they could reach England within five days, bridging the Atlantic as it were. Under these circumstances, I regret most deeply the statement of the hon. gentleman. I regret it, not from a party point of view at all. I believe that the greatest injury the hon. gentleman could do to himself, the greatest barrier he could erect against his return here at a future day as a representative of the city of Quebec, is to obstruct this fast Atlantic service. I am open to correction; but I do not believe that we would see the hon. gentleman sitting in this House to-day if prior to his election he had put himself in antagonism to that project. It has never been a party question, I am happy to say. I have drawn the attention of the House to the unanimous support which this project received in its inception from this House; and last session I was personally indebted to the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government for having presented no hostility to the passage of the Bill which enabled us to call promptly for tenders, and to lay those tenders on the Table of this House. Under these circumstances, I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to an authority which I think all hon. gentlemen opposite will regard as a very high authority. I refer to the "Globe" newspaper. That paper is not published in the city of Quebec; it has not the direct and almost personal interest in this great question which every resident of the city of Quebec has. It is published in the city of Toronto, away in the heart of Ontario; and yet, Sir, you will search in vain for any argument more clear, more forcible, and more unanswerable, in my judgment, than that contained in an article of the Toronto "Globe" of August 6th on this very subject. It points out the difficulties that have been suggested. Then, referring to the distance from Quebec to Liverpool, it says:

> For a 20-knot steamer this distance represents only 133 hours steaming, giving a saving of 59 hours, or over 30 per cent. In winter the voyage from Liverpool to Halifax would be completed in 120 hours at this speed.

Again:

> The superiority of the Canadian route will thus amount to at least a whole day in summer and more than a day and a half in winter, from port to port. If in respect of accommodation for all classes of passengers the new steamers are fully equal to those of the New York lines, a very large passenger traffic will be attracted to the Canadian route.

I may say that the contractors are required to provide the very finest service to be found in any part of the world, with passenger accommodation equal to that provided on any of the New York lines.

> Not only Canadian passengers, but those going to and from Chicago and the western states, as well as all travellers to and from China, Japan and Australia, will find this route the fastest and most attractive.

Every word of this is not only perfectly sound and accurate, but it commends itself, I am sure, to the judgment of every intelligent Canadian; and when we have an opportunity of getting Her Majesty's Government to unite with us, and to contribute one-third of the amount necessary to obtain this vast boon for Canada, why should any hon. gentleman in this House place himself in a position of avowed antagonism to this great measure? I do not hesitate to say that our position with the Imperial Government will be weakened if it is found, after they have taken a great deal of trouble in connection with this project, and have committed themselves—and the hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is to get the members of the Government to commit themselves—to the great responsibility of providing £75,000 sterling per year for ten years for a service not in their own country, that Canada recedes from her position and says, "We have changed our minds, and we do not intend to go on with this service to which we have professed to attach so much importance as to induce you

to commit yourselves in this unreserved way. The "Globe" says further:

Attention will be drawn to Canada. The attractions which she offers to all classes of tourists and sportsmen will be more fully appreciated than hitherto, and European travellers in search of rest and sport will find in Canada fresh and inexhaustible opportunities far superior to those of Switzerland or Norway.

The hon. gentleman cannot underrate the importance of attracting wealthy and influential tourists from Great Britain or any part of the continent of Europe to Canada, as we all believe that all that is necessary to advance immeasurably the interests of this country is to bring its inexhaustible resources prominently before the capitalists of Europe. The "Globe" says further:

We think there is a great deal in the contention of the Patrons that improved freight facilities are of more importance than of improved service for passengers and mails. On this point the assurance is given that the fast steamers would be fitted with large refrigerators, which will enable shippers of Canadian butter and eggs, fruit, cheese and dressed meat, and possibly of other perishable articles, such as fresh salmon and other fish, to send their goods to the British market in the best possible condition. The Allans also proposed to establish in conjunction with the fast service a line of cargo steamers of great size and high power for the further development of their cargo and cattle carrying trade. The cargo steamers will be 8,000 to 9,000 tons, and will be fitted with the most modern appliances for carrying live stock, as well as with large chilled spaces for meat shipments and dairy products. We are told that such vessels, with their large cargo capacity, will supply the best accommodation for all kinds of freight, and will also be available for bringing to Canada large numbers of immigrants during the busy season, when the space on the fast steamers may be overcrowded.

I will not detain the House with more than one more quotation:

As to the amount of the subsidy, the cost of the mail steamers is estimated at $7,000,000 and the cost of maintenance at $3,000,000. It has been suggested to the Government that a service of 18-knot steamers might be substituted for the 20-knot service for which tenders have already been received. Against this it is argued that in comparison with the New York lines an 18-knot service would rank as second-class; that it would attach to such service; that it would attract no attention to the Canadian route, and would almost certainly fail to divert traffic, either passenger or freight, from the New York route; that it would be no advertisement for Canada.

I will not add anything beyond saying that it is not too late yet for the colleagues of the hon. member for Quebec West to overrule his determination to obstruct this important service, and that they will be able to convince even that hon. gentleman that he will be doing a great injustice to Canada if by his present attitude he should be able to obstruct and prejudice a project to which the minds of the whole people of Canada have long been turned, and in which they take the deepest interest.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am grateful to the hon. gentleman for having brought this important subject to the attention of the House, and, on the whole, I may say that I have not to complain of the remarks he has made, except in this respect, that he has been most unjust and unfair to my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). My hon. friend never stated, and could not have stated—the hon. gentleman certainly must have misapprehended him altogether—that the Government had come to a determination to substitute an 18-knot service for a 20-knot service. He could not have made such a statement, because it is in the knowledge of the House—there can be no dispute as to that—that the Government has come to no determination whatever upon the tenders which have been received. The whole question of the service is under consideration, and has to be considered very carefully, for the reasons I am about to state. The hon. gentleman, I was glad to see, remembered and recalled to the House that last session, in the position I then occupied, I thought it my duty to offer to the Government every facility for passing a Bill which enabled the Government to call for tenders for this trans-Atlantic service. And I did so during the last session, not only as a Canadian, but as specially interested in the matter, representing, as I do, the city of Quebec, which is most interested. The present arrangements which exist with regard to the St. Lawrence are satisfactory to nobody, and most unsatisfactory to the city of Quebec. That city, by the facilities it offers, having the finest harbour on the continent, certainly the finest harbour in the Dominion——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Except Halifax.

The PRIME MINISTER. I allow this local prejudice to my hon. friend, but still it will not modify my opinion. At all events, as far as the navigation of the St. Lawrence is concerned, the consensus of opinion was that Quebec ought to be the terminus of this line, and, of course, as a Quebecer, representing the city of Quebec, we were in hopes that such a line, when established, would develop, not only the passenger trade of Canada at the harbour of Quebec, but also the traffic trade. But, when we came to open the tenders which were received by the late Government, upon the notices published in the newspapers, we found that they provided for a passenger service, but not for a freight service. It is in the knowledge, I think, of everybody, that naval construction, as many other things in this day, is undergoing constant changes. We found that, while the boats provided would have furnished splendid passenger service, they would afford no facilities at all for freight. The space allotted for freight could not ac-

commodate more than from eleven to fifteen hundred tons. Now, I would ask the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) who put the question yesterday to my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), if he would be satisfied with boats which, though they gave facilities for the passenger traffic, gave no facilities at all for freight traffic, and would carry only from eleven to fifteen hundred tons of freight. I do not know but that we may be obliged, in the end, to take those boats; but, before we give our assent to a proposition of this character, it is our duty to exhaust every possible means of information as to whether or not, for the money we would have to pay, we could obtain a better service, not only as far as the passenger traffic is concerned, but so far as the freight service is concerned also. I take issue with the hon. gentleman, furthermore, in this. He said, a moment ago, that in the specifications which were published, it was specially provided that the boats subsidized would afford ample facilities for cold storage. It is true that the tenders which were published contained the special provision that the boats to be subsidized should have ample and the latest and best provision for cold storage. But, in all the tenders received, not a word is to be found about cold storage. Under the circumstances, I should like to know if the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that it was our duty to accept at once those tenders and get Parliament to vote the money, while no provision was made for cold storage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The draft contract provides for it; and, as the invitation for tenders contained that as an essential condition, of course, we would have made no contract unless it covered all the requirements set out in the invitation for tenders.

The PRIME MINISTER. The draft contract which was submitted, certainly provided for cold storage, but the tenders do not contain any provision, and I do not know how you could compel a tenderer to sign that contract. I will give my hon. friend a better answer. The Messrs. Allan have stated in the press, I believe, that they were prepared with their other boats to provide for cold storage. That may be, but the fact still remains that, when you have to deal with matters of this kind, when Canada is asked to pay no less a sum than $750.000 a year, we not only have the right, but it is our duty, to see that we make the best possible bargain we can. That is the reason why we have not moved hastily. Speaking, not only as a Canadian and a member of the Government, but as representative of the city of Quebec, I have no hesitation in saying that, if the boats had no provision for cold storage, they would not be at all what the people of the city of Quebec expect. They expect that this service will be one that will not only develop the passenger trade at the port of Quebec, but the freight trade as well. This is the reason why the Government have thought it advisable to make haste slowly. There is another reason why we have not proceeded more rapidly. The tenders were not specific and absolute. The Messrs. Allan themselves and Mr. Huddart did not tender absolutely, and we were not in a position to compel them, in the face of the tenders they put in, to enter into a contract at once, because they reserved to themselves a period of four months in which to ascertain whether they could make certain financial arrangements, and, if they failed, they were to be at liberty to withdraw. What is the answer of the hon. gentleman to this? It is that the character of the Messrs. Allan is well known, that they are a wealthy firm, and that they would have no difficulty in making the necessary financial arrangements. I do not dispute that. But my hon. friend has a greater faith in the ability in this respect of the Messrs. Allan than they have themselves, because they did not undertake to accept the contract absolutely, but made a condition, and at the end of four months it was in their power to admit, or not to admit, or refuse. Now, the hon. gentleman knows very well that it was impossible for the Government, under such circumstances, not to refer these tenders to the Colonial Office. When the correspondence is brought down—and I hope that it will be brought down before the session is over—the House will see more clearly the necessity for this step. The hon. gentleman perhaps may remember that on the face of the correspondence, as it exists to-day, it was impossible for the Government to deal with the matter unless with previous conference with the Colonial Office, because the Colonial Office intimated, if I remember aright—and I think I may say this without breaking any confidence—that the tenders being as they were, perhaps the Government would have to consider whether new tenders should or should not be called for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. My recollection is that there is an intimation to that effect. I am quite sure that it will be found in the correspondence when it is brought down. But, even if the intimation is not there, taking the question as a mere matter of business argument, when the tenders were not absolute, was it possible, would it have been right, for this Government to give the contract and ask Parliament to vote the money unless ratification had been obtained from the Colonial Office? These are the reasons why we found it wise to proceed slowly. But proceed we must. The Government has no intention of shirking the duty that rests upon it of providing the best possible service on the Atlantic, a service which must give us not only passenger traffic but must develop our freight service. The service

will be acceptable to the Canadian farmer only if our farmers are able to get by means of it that rapid and safe carrying of their produce to which the hon. gentleman alluded a moment ago. That is the main reason, I may say, why we thought we had to get more knowledge of this question before we gave the contract—because no provision was made in the tenders received, to give to the farmers of Canada those facilities for carrying their produce which they had reason to expect. And I hope that by next session we shall be in a position to ask Parliament to vote for a service which will not only be the best so far as the passenger service is concerned, but the best also so far as the freight trade of this country is concerned.

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope to confine myself to a very few words, so few that I find it necessary in advance to express the hope that the hon. leader of the Opposition will not think that it is from any lack of respect for him that I occupy so short a time in answering some of the remarks he has made with reference to myself. I think I can say that when, last evening, I reiterated the substance of the address that I had made to the Quebec Board of Trade a few weeks ago, an extract from which was read by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), I did not say anything either in contradiction of or at all inconsistent with the course which the Government had laid down for itself on this question. On the contrary, I claim that I was in perfect accord with that course. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) tried to make me out inconsistent and tried to exaggerate very much certain things that I had said last night, by stating that they involved open antagonism to the Government's course. Now, big words always appear to me to indicate a very weak cause; I never knew any one who thought it necessary to use strong language except to hide some weakness in his position. Mr. Speaker, I went upon the hustings advocating a fast, first-class steamship service, and I favour that to-day; we can be content with nothing less. But I do say that the Government have acted wisely in carefully guarding the contracts to be entered into for that fast service. And, Mr. Speaker, is it not worth while, before entering upon a contract involving this tremendous obligation, to see the result of the working of the 20-knot steamers that are now plying between Liverpool and New York? Why should we not profit by the experience of a large line like the Cunard line, and not put upon this country an obligation that we may be sorry for? I wish to speak moderately regarding hon. gentlemen opposite, because only yesterday, as it were, I was with them, and therefore it would ill-become me to say anything severe. But I would ask them if some of their contracts would not have been better if they had paused a little before entering upon them. The hon. leader of the Opposition did infer some things which jarred upon my better nature, I am not thin-skinned, but when the hon. gentleman referred to an invitation extended to him, like some others, he did not tell the whole truth. He did not tell us that at that time he occupied the very high and enviable position of High Commissioner of Canada. I had no idea that he had abandoned that position. We extended that invitation to him, not as leader of the Opposition, but as High Commissioner. We felt it due to him. No matter how poor we may be, at least we never forget the duties of hospitality. We extended an invitation to the High Commissioner, as we thought, but when he cast off the cloak of High Commissioner and showed himself as a politician, why, Sir, we could not invite him as a body, and we did not. I should not speak harshly, because the hon. gentleman has been generous in dealing with a certain subject that I would have felt delicacy in mentioning. I am no orator as Brutus is, but a plain, blunt man. Being probed on a certain question, I did rise and make a speech in the Colonial Department, in defence of a cause that I will always defend to the utmost of my power, no matter in what part of the world I may be. The attack was not upon me, but upon Canada and upon the alleged meanness of Canada, and the expression used, was that Canada had never contributed one brass farthing to the defence of the Empire. Mr. Speaker, would you need to be probed a second time before springing to your feet and telling the gentleman who made such a remark that he did not know what he was talking about? The gentleman in question was Sir John Colomb. I was satisfied that he knew nothing about Canada, but that he was one of those who sow discord and create ill-feeling between the mother country and her colonies; and I took occasion to tell him, that it was a body of exactly such men who lost us the United States over a hundred years ago. Now, another slightly incorrect statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition was that I worked with him on Imperial defence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I did not refer to that subject.

Mr. DOBELL. I understood the hon. leader of the Opposition to state that I had worked with him heartily on Imperial defence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I did not refer to it at all.

Mr. DOBELL. I only wished to say that I never belonged to that organization.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nor did I. I was always opposed to it. The hon. gentleman and I worked together.

Mr. DOBELL. I had great pleasure in working with the hon. leader of the Opposi-

tion on many occasions in London, and I shall be very glad, if he ever again takes the place of High Commissioner, to work with him again, and always for the benefit of Canada. Well, Sir, I do not think that I need to take up the time of the House much longer. There are other things that I would like to speak about, but there will be an opportunity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DOBELL. No, Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered sufficiently the charge brought against me; I think I have shown that there has been nothing inconsistent in my action with regard to the fast line service. I have always held the ground since I have been in this House that a twenty-knot steamer is too extravagant for this country; such a service can never be carried on to advantage. I think we can give finer accommodation, and more comfortable—I dwell largely on comfort, because we Canadians, I find, like a great deal of comfort for a very little money.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DOBELL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Canadians, and Western Americans, too, want to cross the Atlantic for $75 to $80, and if you ask them for more, they will see if there is not a cheaper line going, and they will take that. But there is one little matter I would like to clear up, and this is a good occasion for doing so. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made a statement a night or two ago, personal to myself, that I had came out as an Independent Conservative. Now, I want to put that matter straight. I came out strictly as an Independent, and told a member of the late Government that I would not accept the slightest favour from the Conservatives. I came out strictly as an Independent, and I set myself to run against their nominee.

An hon. MEMBER. What are you now?

Mr. DOBELL. I am a loyal Liberal, and very proud of it.

Mr. FOSTER. We are certainly very much indebted to the hon. gentleman for the outspoken confidence with which he has favoured us. It is a case of about as quick a conversion as has ever been put upon record in this House.

Mr. LISTER. Not as quick as yours was.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend who made that remark will please have the kindness to state to what he refers. As I hear no explanation, I understand it was one of those interruptions which proceed from nothing, and had no object. But the hon. gentleman stated that he came out on the hustings and in the contest as a strict and straight Independent. Well, we have no fault to find with that; but within a month of the time that he took his stand on the platform as a strict Independent and was elected upon that platform, we find him joining a Liberal Government, and forgetting entirely the platform upon which he had been elected, and the electors who had sent him from the city of Quebec as an Independent. He canvassed on that basis, he got his vote on that basis, and no sooner had he got his vote on that basis as one of the prime elements of the contract that he made with his electors, than he ceased to be an Independent, and joined the ranks of one of the parties and became a member of a party Government. My hon. friend has a perfect right to do that, I do not blame him for doing it, if he considers that was the best course.

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. But he will acknowledge with me that it was a pretty sharp turn, and amounts almost to a breach of his canvass contract. If my hon. friend has joined a Liberal Government from the basis of an Independent canvass, on the condition that he should go back to his constituents and say to them: Now, I have obtained new light, and I propose no longer to be an Independent, as I told you last week and the week before that I should be. I have joined a Liberal Government, and I want you to give me your opinion of my action. That would have been all right; but the hon. gentleman went straight from his canvass as an Independent, and the votes that he got upon that basis, to a portfolio which did not submit him to the criticisms of the electorate whom he had canvassed as an Independent.

Now, Sir, this question divides itself into two parts. There is, first, the attitude of the Government with reference to the fast line service, and there is, secondly, the attitude of a portion of the Government with reference to such service; and it is well for us to see whether this Government, and the portion of the Government, stand upon the same platform. All that brought this matter before Parliament occurred in the city of Quebec, in a meeting of the Board of Trade of which my hon. friend is, I believe, at the present time the president. A report of that meeting was published in a Quebec paper, "La Semaine Commerciale," and a portion of it was read here last night having reference to the remarks of my hon. friend. Now, that paper is published in the city of Quebec, a city where this matter is a prominent subject of conversation, and which is very much interested in this question, and the report which this commercial paper, not a partisan paper, made of that meeting, may be taken as representing pretty clearly the statements of my hon. friend, and the trend of those statements. Well, I call the attention of my hon. friend to this fact, that we cannot read the editorial in "La Semaine Commerciale" without seeing that every line bears upon it the impression that the hon. gentleman is not in favour of a fast line properly so called; and

that he put before the accomplishment of a fast line, if it ever is accomplished, certain other public works and improvements which he thinks ought to antedate the establishment of that line, certain works in the city of Quebec, such, for instance, as the paper puts it, as the completion of the Quebec bridge, which must be done before the fast line is put on. But the point I want to make now, and I call attention to it, is that the impression made by my hon. friend's speech was that he repudiated a fast line service, as it has been understood at any time during the last three years in this Parliament and in this country. The hon. gentleman shakes his head as intimating that he did not repudiate it; and yet the last sentence that he uttered with reference to this matter this afternoon, was that he was not in favour of a twenty-knot service. Now, Sir, such was the impression made upon that paper by the hon. gentleman's speech in the city of Quebec, at the Board of Trade. My hon. friend said last night that he spoke there as an individual, but he cannot disassociate himself from the Government which he joined from an independent basis, and with which he has linked his fortunes. I submit that the hon. gentleman, as a member of the Government, has no right to go to an important meeting in an important city, and, in his individual capacity, to declare his absolute opposition to a settled line of policy of a previous Government, a line of policy that has been discussed in the country for three years and practically taken as settled, a line of policy to which the present Government has on many occasions, through its individual members, given its adhesion so far as the principle is concerned, and which the leader of the Government to-night says it is the determination of the Government to push forward to completion as rapidly as they think they can. Now, Sir, a portion of the Government goes down to the city of Quebec, and before any statement of policy has been given by the leader of the Government in the House, takes the public and the Board of Trade in that city into its confidence, and actually repudiates the chief principle of the fast line service, namely, the question of speed. My hon. friend not only did that in the city of Quebec, and this assumption was fairly taken by the paper which commented upon it, but later he came to this House last night and stated the same thing. The leader of the Government would lead the House to infer that we had pushed the statements of the hon. member for Quebec West further than they were intended to go. But I ask the attention of the House to what he did say last night, and to what he stated here this afternoon. Let us see what he said last night, and I will ask my hon. friend to read it and come to the conclusion, if he can, that the member of the Government who sits for Quebec City is in favour of a fast line service with the element of speed in it which is necessary for the accomplishment of a fast line service. The hon. gentleman said:

> At the same time I have always claimed that a 20-knot steamer is too costly, and that the wants of this country are more in the direction of having extra good accommodation, larger steamers, but at the same time the passage money, not more costly, that Canadians desire to cross the Atlantic with all the comfort that it is possible to give them, but they do not want to pay more than $75 or $80 for the passage.

Take that sentence. In the first place, 20-knot steamers would be too costly. Then, the hon. gentleman, as a member of the Government, subscribed to the statement that he is not in favour of a 20-knot fast line, for it would be too costly. But he has another objection: Canadians want a good thing, but they want it cheap, and they will not be prepared to pay more than $75 or $80 for a passage. I tell the hon. gentleman and the leader of the Government that if they wait to obtain a fast line service consonant with the wishes of the country and at the same time to secure passage thereby at rates from $75 to $80, they will wait till doomsday. The hon. gentleman says that Canadians want a good thing, and want it cheap. He is opposed to a fast line because it is costly and it cannot be given to the country cheap, yet the hon. gentleman himself and thousands of Canadians, almost every year, go down to New York and take the best berths in the fastest steamers from that port to Liverpool, and they do not get them cheap. They know a good thing, they want it, and are prepared to pay for it. Would they not be willing to pay an equal price, if they sailed by a fast steamer from Quebec as from New York? But the hon. gentleman is opposed to a 20-knot service, chiefly because the people would not be able to get a $75 passage. He proceeded:

> We have not people in this country who are prepared to pay £100, which was often paid from New York, and if we had 20-knot steamers from Quebec, I believe the enterprise would end in disappointment.

The hon. gentleman does not want to build too costly steamers; he does not want any steamers on which the passage will be more than $75 or $80, and he says that a fast line would end in disappointment. He has taken a position as unalterably opposed to any fast line that does not fulfil those conditions. No fast line service, however, could be established which would fulfil those conditions. The hon. gentleman further said:

> It would involve an outlay of $750,000 a year. An 18-knot service—I have never said 17 or 18 knots, and I have always claimed that we should have 18 knots—could be performed from Quebec to Liverpool in the same time as a 20-knot service would perform the voyage from New York to Liverpool. The working of this line would cause a saving of about half the cost, we would have accommodation in the way of cold storage,

and more capacity for general cargo. Besides, I believe that before long power will be applied to steamers in a more economical way than is the case to-day. I am told that 20-knot steamers from New York cost a very large sum in repairs, and that an 18-knot service suffers from far less friction and is performed with more comfort and ease than a 20-knot service.

There is no use giving any more quotations from the hon. gentleman's speech. He has placed himself squarely on record as not being in favour of any service which is more rapid than 18 knots, and he has given the reasons why he is in favour of that kind of service. Does the hon. leader of the Government subscribe to that doctrine? The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is one of his prominent supporters, and is a member of the Government, and he has taken a position as being unalterably opposed to a 20-knot service. The hon. gentleman might in two weeks' time, come from an independent platform and join a Liberal Government, and justify that to himself; but I doubt if, after his speeches delivered last night and to-day, in the event of his leader, next week or next session, bringing down a proposition to Parliament for a 20-knot service, involving the expenditure necessary for that service, the hon. gentleman could swallow his words and remain in that Government and vote for a policy of that kind. It is not necessary to go further in order to show the position which the hon. member for Quebec West takes with respect to the fast line service. He is against it; he is against a 20-knot service; he considers 18 knots sufficient, and he holds that fast steamers would be too expensive and would not give the requisite freight accommodation, and that the result of such a service would end in disappointment, and, therefore, he is unalterably opposed to it. That is the position of the hon. member for Quebec West. I now come to the position of the leader of the Government, who is supposed to represent all the Government—or what portion of the Government does he represent?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Those who have not bolted.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has bolted for a good position, and, no doubt, he would be prepared to bolt again.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I bolted you.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt, the hon. gentleman would be prepared to bolt again for a good position.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I bolted into a good one, and you bolted out.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has said he is in favour of securing for this country a fast service as rapidly as it can be obtained. The hon. gentleman does not bind himself that the service will not be beyond 18 knots. By that very statement he intimates that it will in reality be a fast service, and consequently there is a position of antagonism between the hon. leader of the Government and those members of the Government he represents, and the member of the Government representing Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). The hon. leader of the Government, however, seeks to justify delay, and to justify delay on several grounds. One of his many grounds is this, that the vessels for which tenders were asked and for which tenders were received, were so deficient in freight accommodation that he thought it would be well for the Government to go slowly, in order that they might secure large freight accommodation, together with a fast service.

The PRIME MINISTER. To ascertain if it were possible.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite understand that. I think it is the saving clause in the hon. gentleman's declaration, and he knew exactly what he said, when he made that statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope so.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman, as a result of his investigations, will not be able to avoid the extreme difficulty of providing ample freight capacity and a rapid service in the same vessel. The more closely the hon. gentleman inquires into the matter, the more he will be satisfied that the Government have only a limited range of choice as to the quantity of freight that can be carried, if the main idea of having a fast service is maintained. If it is laid down that the speed shall be such as to entitle the service to be called a fast service—and 18 knots would not, in the opinion of this House, so entitle it—the hon. gentleman will find, and, no doubt, he knows to-day, that the capacity for freight must necessarily be limited. The hon. gentleman said that the capacity would only be 1,000 or 1,500 tons; I think that is about right, so far as my memory goes. It will be impossible, unless you very greatly increase the tonnage and size of the vessel, which will, of course, increase the cost very largely, to secure very much larger freight capacity than from 1,500 to 2,000 tons.

The question has got to be fought on these lines; as to whether you shall repudiate this fast line principle of passengers and mails and subordinate it to the freight, or whether you will subordinate the freight capacity to the principle of speed in the conveyance of passengers and mails. That, I think, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) will find out. Although it is perfectly right for him to make his investigation and see whether or not the freight can be extended, I think he will find out that unless he is prepared to very nearly double the tonnage of the vessels as compared with the tonnage of the tenders for which we called, he will not be able to accomplish any very much larger scope of freight combined with the

speed that is necessary for making it in reality a fast service. So much with reference to that. But 1,500 tons or 2,000 tons per vessel is still a very respectable quantity of freight of the kind that this will be.

The PRIME MINISTER. 2,000 tons is out of the question altogether. The extreme limit is 1,500 tons.

Mr. FOSTER. I am giving my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) the scope to make the tonnage larger and keep the speed and get up to as high as 2,000 tons. That he may do, but he has got to make his vessels of much larger tonnage than those for which we asked for in the tender.

The PRIME MINISTER. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. And if he does that, he has got to add materially to the cost of the whole service, and the amount of capital required to build them and to put in the machinery which will run them will have to be very much larger.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I call my hon. friend's attention to this. There is only one kind of freight which seeks these large vessels, and that is the finer quality of perishable freight, and it will be no small amount if the vessels which are at present called for would carry 1,500 tons per trip, which would be an aggregate of 78,000 or 80,000 tons in a year of that particular class of products which will alone pay for its carriage in fast vessels. And, if my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), by adding greatly to the tonnage and consequently to the cost of the vessels, is able to bring it up to 2,000 tons, he will not very much largely increase the amount of freight compared with that which offers, but he will very largely increase the cost of the service. But, I think what takes place is this, and what takes place under these peculiar conditions where these tenders are now, is that fast freight vessels follow in the wake of a fast line such as we are contemplating to put on. What I fear we may miss—and I hope my hon. friend will take it into account—is this : that if there ever has been a peculiarly favourable condition for joining these two as a sequence, that condition occurs now in the tenders which are put in for this very service. The Allans have tendered for the service. They are the principal tenderers, and are the ones whose tender will be chiefly looked at. The Allans are a Canadian company as well as a European company. They have a large freight interest over the world, and especially between Canada and Great Britain, and it would be peculiarly fortunate if they should get the fast line service carrying a minimum of freight where they are in a position to follow it up with a fleet of fast freight vessels in the line of operations which they have been carrying on for a series of years, and which they will continue to carry on and extend. No tenderer not having the plant and the experience and the vessels that the Allans have in this particular service would be able to supplement a fast line for mails and passengers with a fast freight line to at all the extent and with the ease that the Allan company can with reference to Canada. That is a strong point in this matter. My hon. friend will see that any delay, even for the saving of a small amount of money, would militate against placing the contract, if it can be done, under such favourable conditions for the extension of a fast freight service. So much with reference to that.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has tried to ground the reason for his delay on this : that what he wants is cold storage, and that although that entered into the correspondence, yet the tenders did not provide for cold storage.

The PRIME MINISTER. The tenders called for it.

Mr. FOSTER. The point my hon. friend made then was that the answers to the tenders did not reply to that point in the call for the tenders.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, now, my hon. friend knows perfectly well, and he will be the first one to acknowledge that that criticism fails very largely when he comes to look on what is the ordinary course of business. In a tender you call for certain things. The main point that the tenderer applies to in such case is the question of speed and the question of subsidy. All the rest is general. Once you have the points of speed and subsidy fixed, the other points are settled when you come to draw up and sign the contract between the Government and the steamship company. I recollect going through that same operation in the contract that was made with the Anderson company for this fast line some five or six years ago. Exactly the same course was pursued, but when we came to form the contract and to get it signed, every one of these points were carefully guarded and made provision for. In the contract, which my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) will find among the papers, he will see that that point was very carefully guarded. More than that, he will find that the Allan company were prepared to sign that draft contract. They approved of the draft contract after some correspondence had taken place and signified their approval and were ready to sign it, and in that contract the question of cold storage was amply provided for. There is therefore no ground for delay upon that point.

My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) made the point that the tenders were not absolute, and that that was a reason why the Gov-

ernment should—I cannot understand what—but at least should invite delay. How does my hon. friend propose to cure that by delay? Is he going to call for new tenders and so throw open again to a long period of uncertainty and doubt the whole question which is now so closely approaching conclusion, both with reference to Canada and the Allan company, and with reference to Great Britain and its aid in the matter?

The PRIME MINISTER. I can answer that. If the Canadian Government alone were interested in this contract that point might easily be waived and got over; but my hon. friend is aware that we must consult the Colonial authorities in order to have a subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER My hon. friend is perfectly right in saying, not only that it is right for us to consult the Home Government, but the Home Government, seeing that a change of Government had just taken place, have very properly said: We do not wish finally to go into this matter until we have the opinion of the incoming Government, and more especially as the contracts had to be laid upon the Table of the House before they could be ratified. But my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) must also be frank enough to state this: that there was arrived at an absolute agreement between the Colonial Office and this Government with reference to the matter of the subsidies, and that one of the essential elements of that was that the speed should be up to the proper extent, and that they would not get help out of the British treasury for a line which did not in reality make itself approved as a fast line. The only delay that was necessary in that, if my hon. friend will allow me, was for the present Government to signify its assent to the arrangement, and ask that the contract be signed, with the understanding that the British Government was favourable to it. All the preliminaries, even to the details of the contract, were finally agreed upon and settled as between the two Governments; and that was the position in which my hon. friend found the matter when he took up the reins of Government. The point that was kept in view was that it was courteous and right that the incoming Government, in order to implement this contract, should have the opportunity of signifying its assent to it, and of carrying the matter to a conclusion. I think there is no delay necessary on that account. It was simply to enable the Government to give its views on those matters to the Colonial Office. So much with reference to that. The position, I take it, is better than I feared it was last night. The hon. First Minister, leading the Government, and I hope leading the hon. member for Quebec West—and that is not a difficult matter, judging from past experience—has made a statement from which we can congratulate this House and the country that the situation is not so bad as it appeared to be last night. As it appeared last night, it looked as if the Government had repudiated the fast line entirely. So far as the hon. member for Quebec West is concerned, he does repudiate it. He ties himself down to a service not exceeding 18 knots; and he gives reasons which, if he holds them, are reasons which exist to-day, which will exist to-morrow, which will exist for all time. So that we have the position of the leader of the Government in the main satisfactory; and if he will only assure the House—and I am not sure that he did not do it—that no unnecessary delay will take place in the Government availing themselves of the present favourable condition of things to make this contract fast, and to get this service started, even though the drag-wheels be put on by his hon. colleague from Quebec West, I think the House will rest satisfied with the policy and the announcement of the hon. gentleman with respect to that. At all events, a great weight has been taken off our shoulders and off the shoulders of the people by the hon. gentleman's statement. He almost made the statement that another member of the Government and his opinions are repudiated, and that the Government as a body goes in for the fast line service, and hopes to have it accomplished as soon as possible.

I would venture to suggest to the hon. gentleman that it is very unsettling and inconvenient to have members of the Government in one place repudiating a policy, and the Government in another place stating that they hold by the policy. I am afraid my hon. friend will have several difficulties of that kind. I notice that my hon. friend, in a telegram sent to British Columbia during the time of the elections, made a promise to the gentlemen who at that time were striving very hard to become members of this Parliament, that whatever view they took on Chinese immigration would be the view that he would subscribe to, and that would prevail. My hon. friend knew then the view of the British Columbia candidates; he knows now the view of the British Columbia members; and yet another important and honoured member of his Cabinet has pledged himself to that great and venerable statesman, Li Hung Chang, that he will not abandon him, and he last night put himself, in the most philosophic and generous way, in the forefront of the battle, and, in opposition to the leader of the Government, declared that his lance was in rest, and would never be lowered so long as Li Hung Chang needed a champion. I honour my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue for his chivalry, and for holding firmly to the compact which he has made with Li Hung Chang. But I warn him that there will be a splintering of lances one way or the other when he meets his leader with the British Columbia delegation behind him—the British Columbia delegation declaring that the

Chinese must not be allowed to come into this country, the leader of the Government declaring that what they want shall be carried out in law, and my hon. friend, in his philosophic and chivalric devotion to Li Hung Chang, declaring that he shall not be abandoned, and that the Chinese shall be welcome to come to Canada.

I hope my hon. friend can make a statement with reference to another matter which would be equally reassuring. There is today in this city a large delegation from the city of St. John. They are here because the impression has gone abroad that the policy of the late Government in reference to the subsidizing of steamers running from Portland to the old country is to be repudiated, and that these steamers are to be again subsidized. That question has been discussed in this Parliament, and I think it has been very largely the opinion of Parliament that the time had come when we should cease giving subsidies to any freight service, and in fact to any service, from United States ports, the vessels simply calling at Canadian ports and going to Great Britain. The former Government, after full consideration of the matter, came to the conclusion to adopt that policy, and they have put their views on record, and my hon. friend will find them in the records of the Privy Council Office. Now, I find that the fear is entertained all too largely, that that policy is to be abandoned, and that subsidies are to be granted to vessels plying as of old from Portland to the ports of Great Britain, and calling at St. John and Halifax. I hope my hon. friend will be able to make just as satisfactory a statement with reference to that as he did with reference to the fast line service. I do believe my hon. friend will not abandon the policy which this Parliament, I think, has affirmed with reference to that matter, which the late Government at least carried out: and he will do a great deal towards clearing up what is unsettling public opinion in the maritime provinces, if he will be kind enough to make a statement with reference to that matter this afternoon.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Speaker, when I disagree with my hon. leader, I will certainly not follow the example set last session by the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Foster). I will not betray my leader as the hon. member betrayed his. When I differ from my leader I will tell him frankly. In the meantime, I may remind the members of this House that the position I took last night was perfectly clear. I stated that I had never consulted any of my colleagues on the Chinese question, that they had never consulted with me, that I had never heard them speak of the question; and if in the last election I did not know what took place in British Columbia it was because I was busy in my own corner of the Dominion with the work which the hon. members on the other side of the House had cut out for me when they tried to excite all the religious prejudices they could against me. When I heard the hon. member on the other side say that we had appealed to religious prejudices, I did not rise and speak; but since I am obliged to do it now, I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they excited religious prejudices against us in the most shameful manner in the last election. I tell them that we are not answerable for the raising of religious prejudices, but they are, because the leader of the Opposition said that he had been deceived in the bargain he had made in order to try to carry the province of Quebec.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has put words in my mouth which I did not utter. I deny, in the most emphatic terms, that I ever had any bargain with anybody.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. gentleman declared his disappointment, at all events.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I was somewhat surprised to see my hon. friend from York making an attack on myself when his object at bottom was the sowing of dissensions in New Brunswick, as was shown by the termination of his speech. I remember, and probably the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) remembers it too, that after a celebrated orator in this House had talked very volubly and at great length, my old friend, for whose memory I have the greatest respect, the late Sir John A. Macdonald, compared him to a windmill run by a water power. I would hardly apply that description to my hon. friend, because, I know, Mr. Speaker, if I did, you would call me to order. I might give another illustration which is perhaps more apt. A young man once made a speech in the presence of an uncle of whom he had great expectations. He asked his uncle what kind of a speech he had made? The uncle replied: "You have made an excellent speech." "How long did I talk," asked the youth? "Well," replied the uncle, "I do not know." "Did I take three-quarters of an hour, and what did you think of it?" "Well, it was not bad. If you had been very clever, you would have made that speech in about ten minutes, and if you had been extra smart, you would not have made it at all." My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) charged the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell) with having changed his opinions after the election. Well, supposing he had. He ran as an independent, and the hon. member for York himself once ran as an Independent Liberal. I would ask my hon. friend if he remembers how, when travelling through King's county, he used to say: "I am a Liberal," and would call

up recollections of the Ryans and other leading Liberals, and exclaim: "What great and good men they were?" Then he would go on to explain how he had always looked up to them as a boy and say: "If I could accomplish anything like the great good they have done, my work would be finished." "I would like," he used to say, "to have the little boys in the county of King's point to me, as I used to point to Ryan, and say there goes Foster who is pre-eminently above all his peers in his country." That, he exclaimed, would be a lasting memorial in King's county to his virtues. But where to-day is my hon. friend? He has left us and deprived all the little boys in that county of the opportunity of pointing to him as the great Liberal. The hon. member knows that I am speaking what is the truth, and it will be wiser for him to get up and say, as he did the other night, that when the papers are brought down it will be different. Let him deny what I say at his peril; "verba volant, scripta manent." Some of his speeches of those days are yet extant and can be produced if necessary. When he went to Waterford, he proclaimed himself a Liberal and claimed that he was a son of King's county, in which I think he made a mistake. I did not know it at the time, but I learned it afterwards. He called up the Liberals and Conservatives together and explained things in this way. He said: When we entered confederation the Liberals and Conservatives joined together and became Liberal-Conservatives and Conservative-Liberals, and all good men joined together for the good of this country. Why does he not apply the same example to my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Dobell), when my hon. friend was willing to come in with this party, which not only he believes, but the country believes, is the party which ought to govern Canada. The country has repudiated my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), and his own county repudiated him. The hon. gentleman is fond of playing upon words in this House and outside. When he gets into a Catholic district, he tells the voters that he is Catholic enough to do anything to serve their interests. He knows that the farmers who live in the back districts do not understand the literal meaning of the word "Catholic," unlike the hon. gentleman, who has had the benefit of a larger education. At least, we are told he has, and I presume he has. At any rate he is quite a good speaker, as we must all admit. But he is not so good that he is willing to show fair-play to an opponent, for when he went down to Queen's, after being driven out of his own county, to address an audience there, he refused me the privilege of a British subject and would not allow me to reply. Does the hon. member think that the country does not take his proper measure? Is it not on record that he ran as a Liberal and that he joined the Conservative Government shortly afterwards, just as soon as he got the chance. He said at that time: When I go to Ottawa, people will say that I am going to support the Tilley Government, that Tilley will literally take me into his arms, but I am not that kind of a man, I am independent. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was then a supporter of the Government, and am not afraid to say where I was and where I am to-day. I am not afraid to take a manly course, and my justification is that my county has every confidence in me and the integrity of my position. Now, let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in 1891 three or fours days after the nomination, tenders were advertised for to furnish a fast line service. On that occasion, I asked him how it came about that on the eve of an election the Government asked for tenders for a fast line, and that the contract was not to be determined until the election was over. He replied that I was taking a very unfair position. Why, he said, we have literally granted it, and you may look upon the fast line as an accomplished fact. Well, five years later, again on the eve of a general election, the late Government were promising many branches of railway in Prince Edward Island, they were promising a railway line through every parish, and they promised to have a fast line from Halifax. They promised other concessions in New Brunswick, and literally it was a case of throwing the blanket over running horses and holding them back from the race. The people, however, awoke at last and determined to get rid of these men and have a new party in power. My hon. friend attacks this Government for not carrying out at once the policy which he had laid out in 1891, which he was five years trying to mature, and which he had not carried out before the last election. And now this position taken by the hon. gentleman, I think, is an untenable position. If he talks about the hon. Premier holding back upon that question, then, Sir, I am in favour of his doing so. I speak now as a New Brunswicker, as coming from a province that expects a great deal from the leader of the Government That province has the highest appreciation of him and the strongest confidence that in him the people have a man who will do something for the maritime provinces. We have been going on with promises ever since confederation, and promises are not enough. Our hopes were roused, when we got confederation. But confederation brought us little or nothing. Then came the National Policy, which I voted for, and I am not here to repudiate it. I accepted it at the hands of my political friends, because I was in hopes that it might be to our interest and be a good thing for Canada. I did not agree with it, but I was willing to see it tried. And we found that my views were not at all wrong. The people accepted the National Policy, but found that it bore hardly on

New Brunswick. And I do not hesitate to say that our people now want as near free trade as the hon. Premier can give us, as near free trade as the circumstances of the country will allow. Of course, we cannot expect to get free trade with the mass of debt we have, with the immense taxation that is necessary. But we may so deal with the finances of the country, we may so arrange our affairs, cutting down unnecessary expenses and extravagances, that we may look for a change of policy, and the adoption of a policy, not to build up one or two men, but to build up the country at large. Now, when we find a party in power that is willing to do something for us, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) finds fault. He speaks of the Allan line. Why did not they build up St. John? Why did they not come and take away the freight of that port? We find to-day that a steamer comes, as it did last winter, and is able to take so much from our port, that other steamers are attracted; and, if the Government will kindly give us a little support in order to keep those steamers coming there until they have got their trade into shape, until they are able to develop the resources of the port, success will be assured, and New Brunswick will not come before this House asking for favours; she will not be asking for $750,000 for fast line steamers. When the delegation from New Brunswick hears what the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) has to propose, I am sure that they will go home perfectly satisfied, and that New Brunswick will be satisfied, as well. Mr. Speaker, I have one more word to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am glad to hear my hon. friends say "Hear, hear," because, no doubt, they think that, if I went on, I might say something unpleasant. But I do not propose to put it out all at once. I have no doubt in my own mind that, as the elections in New Brunswick take place one after another, we shall carry all the seats, every one of them. We will reduce immense majorities into large minorities, just as we did in Queen's county, which we carried, just as we did in King's county, just as we did in the city of St. John and the city and county of St. John, notwithstanding all the efforts and all the eloquent speeches of the hon. gentleman. Notwithstanding all his efforts, the practical people will declare that they do not want men who will beat around the bush; what they want is a Government of practical politicians. The country does not thank us for wasting time. I had hoped that we should have been here only a fortnight, that we might have gone home before the nineteenth of the month. I had hoped that the Opposition, led by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), would not have prolonged debate after debate. For my part, I have not taken up the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says "Hear, hear." Sir, he has wasted more time of this House than almost any other man in it; and I can assure him that, much as we admire what he says, we shall still more admire it, when it is more briefly expressed. Now, New Brunswick looks to the development of the port. I speak now to the party I am supporting. They are pleased to think that this will be done, and I have no doubt that it will be done. I have no doubt that the Government will give a practical demonstration to the people of St. John that they are going to build up that port, and not the port of St. John alone, but the whole port of New Brunswick—if I may so speak, seeing that it is at the mouth of a vast river, and is a province of vast resources. The real interest of the people will not be abandoned for some scheme at Hudson Bay, or some fast line, or some other distant field that looks green. When the people feel that there is a party in power that really means business and is really going to do something for them, their hearts will revive, business will improve, and New Brunswick will prove not ungrateful for the change, and will show the hon. Minister leading this Government that, when she gets a good man, she can appreciate him and stand by him.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say in one word that I was very much gratified to find that my hon. friend the Prime Minister had not said anything to endorse what I regarded as a very unfortunate statement made by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). I am glad that this subject has been discussed by the leaders on both sides altogether apart from party. This is a subject that I hope will always be kept above party. It is above party, and I sincerely hope that both sides of the House will unite in endeavouring to have this fast service carried out as it ought to be. Anything to check the progress that has been made in regard to this matter, would check the great progress that is being made toward the unity of the Empire; and I do sincerely hope that the hon. leader of the Government will do all that in him lies to further this great project.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to make a few remarks in the line of the discussion that has taken place this afternoon with regard to the matter of the fast steamship service. That discussion has been confined largely to members of the eastern provinces and of Quebec; and I shall detain the House for a few moments only to say a few words upon that subject from an Ontario standpoint;

and I presume it would be the desire of the Government to have the views of the representatives from all parts of the Dominion upon this most important question, freely expressed before they have definitely settled upon their policy with regard to the matter. Now, Sir, I repudiate the position taken by some members of the House that the country is committed to this project. I assert that the Government which has now assumed the reins of office is in no wise committed to the policy of their predecessors with regard to fast steamship lines, or with regard to any of the other leading features of the policy of the late Government which is now in Opposition. I wish to point out that the late Government dallied with this question, considered it for years, and failed at any time to take a straightforward, consistent and settled course with regard to the matter. At first they made slight advances, then receded, then advanced a little, and then receded; and at all times were evidently disposd to shrink from incurring the responsibility and the expenditure that the scheme would entail. Now, when these gentlemen are in Opposition they would fain force the Government of the day into a position which they themselves shrank from, they would fain force the Government of the day to incur an expenditure which is practically an addition of $20,000,000 to the public debt of this country. I do not think, Sir, that the policy of making this addition to our charges, the policy of incurring an annual expenditure of $750,000 for a fast steamship service, is one that will commend itself at least to the representatives of the province from which I come.

I must say in this connection that I was highly pleased with the remarks of my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) last night. His remarks were those of a solid, level-headed business man, who has not been carried away with all this clap-trap about a fast service, and the securing of western passenger traffic, &c., &c., who looks at the question from a business standpoint, and realizes that with steamers of large capacity and a speed of 18 knots an hour, we would secure a service at vastly less cost, and that would be actually more beneficial to the interests of Canada, than the service proposed. I place very great reliance upon the opinion of the hon. member for Quebec West, associated as he has been throughout all his business life, with forwarding enterprises, and with business in general. If the Government is to adopt a new policy with regard to steamship subventions and the establishment of steamship lines, the policy foreshadowed by the hon. member for Quebec West is, in my opinion, the policy that the Government should adopt. I felt, Sir, moreover, a great degree of sympathy for that hon. gentleman, and I felt like stigmatizing as most unfair the attack made upon him by certain speakers on the Opposition side of the House. Sir, this country was in a position at the time of the last general election, when good men of all parties were called upon, if they would discharge their duty to their country, to come to the rescue. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who had been managing the affairs of this country, had brought it to the verge of ruin. The condition of affairs in this country was most critical, and the continuance of the management on the lines they had pursued, for five or ten years longer, would have been in the highest degree disastrous to the interests of Canada. I often said in my own canvass in discussing public questions, that we called upon all good men, we did not care what their political antecedents had been, we called upon all men who desired to advance the interests of Canada, to come over and help us put these men out of office. The hon. member for Quebec West is one of that class whose patriotic impulses and regard for his duty as a citizen of Canada, overruled the party affiliations and party trammels that had previously, perhaps, bound him; and so I give him more credit for the position that he took, for the aid he has given in procuring for this country a good Government, than if he had been for years associated with the men his better judgment has told him it is proper for him to associate with politically at present.

Now, returning to this steamship service question, I am free to say that I would not dare to advocate the granting of $750,000 to a fast steamship line, that I would not dare to advocate a liberal grant for the Pacific Ocean cable, and ever face my constituents again. I would not think of it, and if I did do it, it would be an act of folly for which I would be punished by their rejection. There is scarcely a member from the province of Ontario who can either favour the granting of $750,000 to a fast steamship line, or favour the granting of one-half the cost of a Pacific Ocean cable, who will ever receive the approval of his constituents for that act. And so I stand here to-night, as a member from an Ontario constituency, and representing, as I believe I do in this matter, the opinions of the majority of the people of Ontario, and I warn this Government against being guilty of that act of folly which they would be guilty of if they granted a subvention of $750,000 per annum to a fast steamship line, or if they undertook to pay any considerable portion of the cost of a Pacific cable. The Pacific cable, of course, Mr. Speaker, is part of the scheme. We have the fast line, we have the Pacific cable, we have an Australian steamship line, and these are all parts of one scheme, an Imperial scheme, as it is called—a very good scheme if the cost of it is saddled upon the right shoulders, but a scheme of which it is not prudent or proper for us to assume the expense. It strikes me that one of the most objectionable features of granting a subvention of $750,000 per annum to a fast steamship line, is that the Government of Canada will be spending $750,000 a year for the

purpose of rendering bankrupt other Canadian steamship lines. We have the Allan line, we have the Dominion line, we have the Beaver line and we have the Donaldson line, and here is a proposal to expend $750,000 a year for the purpose of rendering the investments in all these lines unproductive, even worthless. Well, I do not think we are called upon to do it, in view of the facilities we have already given to steamship lines for transacting the business of this Dominion; and additions to these facilities will be provided by the enterprise of those who are engaged in the transportation business, and will be forthcoming as fast as the wants of the country demand.

Now, Sir, there is a great deal said about Imperial unity. It is a very nice thing, and a very good thing, too, and I believe in it to a certain extent. I believe in having all the portions of the British Empire acting together in concert, and I believe in having every portion discharge its due liability to the rest of the Empire, doing its full share—I believe in all that. I believe that Canada will never shrink from discharging the full share of the responsibility that rests upon it, resulting from the fact that it is a portion of the British Empire. But what have we done already? Have we done nothing? Have we done nothing to forward the interests of this Empire? Have we made any investments, have we made any expenditures that redound to the advantage of the Empire at large? I claim that we have. I claim that we have expended vast sums of money for the purpose of developing our own resources, and at the same time for the purpose of advancing the interests of the Empire. We have furnished to the British Empire a line of communication across this continent, the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have put into that railway over seventy million dollars of public money, we have granted to that railway a vast amount of public lands, we have exempted that railway from taxation, we have exempted its lands from taxation, we have given to it franchises and privileges of the most valuable character; and in doing all this, we have piled enormous burdens upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of this country. We have done our duty to the Empire in other respects, we have done more than our duty to the Empire; we have incurred a vast debt, we are staggering under that debt, and that debt is largely due to our desire to discharge our obligations to the Empire, as well as for the purpose of developing our own resources. And if we are called upon to expend money, simply upon the suggestion that we owe the Empire something, if we scrutinize the facts and arrive at a just conclusion we will see that we owe the Empire nothing, that we have done everything that can be reasonably required of us in the line of strengthening the Empire at large. England, of course, has vast resources; she has vast possessions. Her statesmen indulge in great schemes, schemes that are world-wide in their operations, and at the same time England is very thrifty in the management of her affairs. She takes care of herself very well; she sets to ourselves an excellent example in that respect. She is pushing an expedition up the Nile to the Soudan, and the cost is being paid by Egypt. She is sending regiments from India, landing them on the coast of the Red Sea, for the purpose of advancing her Imperial schemes in the Soudan, and the cost of those regiments is charged to the Indian exchequer. England so far as she can get assistance in this way, does it; and her statesmen of course would have no objection, they would be anxious in fact that we should pay the cost of a fast ocean service, also half the cost of laying a cable from Vancouver to Australia, which would be of no special service to us but would be of enormous advantage to England in the management of her own Imperial concerns. We wish well to England. Let her extend her Empire, and the faster the better; the more nations and the more millions that are brought under her sway, the better is it for the interests of humanity. Let her dominions expand, and so far as I am concerned I bid her God-speed in every step she takes. But we do not wish to be called upon under present circumstances to do more than our fair share in bearing the burdens. And so we respectfully say that if England wants a fast line across the Atlantic, let her establish it; if she wants an ocean cable from British Columbia to Australia, let her lay it down; if she wants the use of our Canadian Pacific Railway, which we have constructed, it is open to her use. We will give her all the assistance that it is proper for us to do, and we will aid her in every way that it is reasonable for us to do, but I, for one, as representing a western constituency, protest against putting the money of Canada into parts of a great Imperial scheme and to be used for the advancement of Imperial interests. Let the Imperial finances pay the cost of these undertakings.

I have said that Canada is overloaded. Canada is overloaded—Canada is poor. Our statesmen go to England, as the late High Commissioner did, and hobnob with dukes, lords and earls, and they are very desirous of standing well there. They are taken in tow by those noblemen and impressed with the idea that Canada had better expend $750,000 a year in establishing a fast steamship line, and that it would be very agreeable to England if Canada paid half the cost of laying down an ocean cable, a position very well illustrated by a case related by Artemus Ward, who in a burst of patriotic fervour, declared that the rebellion had to be put down if it took half his first wife's relations. So those men, who wish to stand well with their British friends, are prepared to oblige them even if half of the wealth

of the country has to be expended for the privilege. We do not feel just that way. We are not overshadowed by the blandishments that overcome some men. I feel bound to say that we must look after the interests of Canada, that we must discharge fairly and fully our duty to the Empire, but we should not go beyond the full and fair discharge of those obligations. The party now in office has come into power largely because of its pledges to introduce a better condition of things in this country. We have denounced as a party of extravagance hon. gentlemen now in Opposition. The verdict of the people has been that those men should go into Opposition; they failed to discharge the duties to the satisfaction of the country that devolved on them, and so the country withdrew its confidence from them. That confidence has been withdrawn from those gentlemen largely from the fact that the expenditure has been unduly increased, that the debt has been unnecessarily augmented, and there was a general belief that the management of the finances had been reckless, imprudent and extravagant. Now the Liberal party has come into power through the promise that those evils will be removed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the pledge which has been given, and yet at the very threshold we are confronted with this proposition of hon. gentlemen that we should practically increase the debt by $20,000,000 through giving a subsidy of $750,000 a year for a line of steamers we do not absolutely need. That is not the way to redeem our pledges to the country. The Opposition will be very glad to see it done. But the ex-Finance Minister himself shirked the responsibility, he avoided the issue, he backed and filled and did everything except come to the consideration of that question.

Mr. FOSTER. We did it and you stopped it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the Government had better refrain from carrying out this project. Too much anxiety is displayed by hon. gentlemen opposite to see it done; and it is a very good line of policy to pursue to refrain from doing what your enemies are very anxious you should do. I think we had better refrain from taking up the scheme that even a spendthrift and reckless government shrank from carrying into effect. We had better let the scheme alone. We have our duty to do to the Empire. We can do it, and it will not require this country to spend $750,000 to do it. We have to do our duty to the Empire, but its full discharge does not require an expenditure of four or five millions on a Pacific cable. We want a statesman-like, a moderate, a common-sense, business-like policy adopted, such as was foreshadowed by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). We must exercise care and economy in the expenditures of this country. If we are to meet with the approval of the people the annual charges must be reduced, the increase of the debt must stop; we must reach a point where the debt will gradually diminish, and to accomplish these results we must refrain from the kind of schemes of which this fast steamship line project is a specimen. I close by repeating that I have discussed the question at various points in Ontario, and I think I know the feeling of the people, and I would not dream of facing a constituency in any part of that province where the issue turned upon whether I had done my duty to the country in supporting a subsidy of $750,000 annually for a fast steamship line, or a grant of $4,000,000 more or less for a Pacific cable; and believing that the country will not look with favour upon this policy, I have taken the liberty of saying to-night what I have said with respect to it, thinking that possibly the Government might not consider it amiss that a member from the west should have given expression to the views which he believes prevails in the great province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman answer a question, if he deems it to be a proper one? Is the hon. gentleman in favour of a steamship line of eighteen-knot speed?

Mr. CHARLTON. If asked my opinion, I say I am in favour of allowing the steamship lines we have at present—four lines—that are serving the country well, to continue to do so. I am not particularly in favour of adding to our steamship subventions, but if matters can be readjusted so that we can secure a good eighteen-knot service without increasing the cost to the country, I should like it done.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to say a few words on this question, and to express my sense of bewilderment, because I found a distinguished member of the Government rising in his place and repudiating what seemed the accepted policy of the Government, and then again the leader of the Government repudiating the position taken by this colleague of his. But no sooner has the leader of the Government taken his seat after laying down in the most emphatic language what is the policy of the Government, than up rises the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) and repudiates the Prime Minister. We have a junior member of the Government repudiating the Prime Minister; we have Quebec West repudiating Quebec East. But what have we now? We have a distinguished member of the party in power which has charge of this scheme, taking out of his pigeon-hole a speech that he delivered a few years ago attacking the Conservative Government, and he pours the stale shot into the Treasury benches which he is supposed to support. It illustrates what my hon. friend the Finance Minister said at the conference held

here in 1893. When the Reform party laid down that interesting programme full of contradictions, he set forth this proposition, which was consonant with the programme. He said: In the Liberal party, where there are independent minds, there is sure to be a certain amount of divergence. To-day we have a united Cabinet here with an unlimited license for discordant utterance, and we have a Liberal party apparently quite consistent with a Government of that kind. I am not going to take a different position from that which was taken by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Charlton). We have two great parties in this House, and the vast number of both these parties favour a fast line.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Ah, there are other gentlemen opposite who do not, and so I find there are yet more divisions amongst them. I thought that the Government was like that blackbird pie into which an incongruous bird from a neighbouring rookery had strayed, but it seems to me now that there is more than one incongruous bird in the pie. I am not concerned with that, but I say that we are to-day face to face with what the hon. gentleman who leads the Government with such distinction, knows is a very serious matter. We have here in the green tree of the Reform party in power, a Government that is palpably not united among themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but that is the position. And it is a very remarkable and a very serious thing that we have these discords at a time when we have no programme from the Government. Why, Sir, if we have these discords when we have no programme, what shall we have when they bring forward a series of measures? Now, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) interested me very much to-night, and he never speaks without interesting me. It afforded him the most intense, I will not say grotesque amusement, to witness the difference that he exhibited as existing between himself and his leader. The astonishment of the House was reflected in his face by gleams of self-satisfied humorous delight, and I confess that when I heard the hon. gentleman's speech it was to me very interesting. The argument in regard to the swift line that was used by the leader of the Government did not strike me as one that was cogent or in any way conclusive. He argued that these swift steamers had only 1,500 tons capacity for freight, and he said: We shall have these swift steamers, that is our policy. But he indicated that we would have swift steamers with a greater freight capacity. Well, Sir, from the little attention that I have been able to give to it, and as a non-scientific man reading what I can on these subjects, my impression is that the scientific men who speak with authority on this matter, lay down the rule that you cannot have speed and at the same time have great capacity for freight. The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) made a very proper argument when he stated that those who contemplated the fast line were not thinking merely of passengers—in justice to them that should be said—they were thinking of facilities for the transport of perishable commodities in which our farmers in the west and the farmers in the constituency of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) are interested.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do not bother about them.

Mr. DAVIN. The 1,500 ton capacity would accommodate a large amount of freight of these perishable articles. I understand that the "Lucania," which is one of the ocean greyhounds, a 22-knot boat, is paying, and I understand that the Cunard company, in addition to their fast steamers, have lately built 14½-knot steamers for the purposes of general freight-carrying, showing that these experienced shipbuilders think that it is not possible to do what the leader of the Government thinks could be done, namely: combine greyhound speed with large capacity for freight-carrying. Therefore, that did not strike me as a very powerful argument of the First Minister.

One word with reference to what fell from the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) whom I always like to see and hear, and I like to see him better than I like to hear him even. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) has a tremendous capacity for pedal eloquence, and it always is a pleasure for me to observe him. But, Sir, there is one abounding pleasure he gives me, and I enjoy this pleasure the more because I believe I share it with other members of this House; there is not a time that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) speaks that I do not thank an infinitely kind Providence that he preserved me from the chance of having been a schoolmate of his.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is far-fetched.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) says it is very far-fetched. It is distinctly "ad rem" for the hon. member (Mr. Domville) speaks generally of infantile reminiscence, and the bulk of his speeches are taken up with accounts of what happened in his school-days.

Now, Sir, the part of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk that has called me to my feet is that in which, as it seemed to me, he uttered an attack upon all Imperial aspiration amongst Canadians. I could not help feeling that there was an element of cowardice—I dare not utter it—that there was a want of courage in that speech. I could not help feeling that it was an attack upon a position taken up by the

leader of this House on an occasion when I heard one of the most admirable speeches from that hon. gentleman that I ever heard from him since I have had the honour of hearing speeches from him—and I have heard a good many exceedingly good speeches from his lips. At a banquet which was given by the Government to Lord Russell—and I had the honour of being present at it—the Prime Minister presided, and he presided, as those of us who were present saw, with dignity, and spoke with eloquence and power; and the note in the speech he there delivered which most pleased us all, and which found an echo I believe throughout the whole of Canada, and which had, to some extent, a new ring in it, was the Imperial note. Taking in connection with that speech, that portion of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk which dealt with Canada's Imperial aspirations and her quenchless determination to be true to the Empire, and which attacked the proposal endorsed only a few hours ago in this very House by the leader of the Government, I say that the whole speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk was a covert attack upon his leader, the head of the Government to-day.

Mr. CHARLTON. I call the hon. gentleman to order. His language is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. What language?

Mr. CHARLTON. Cowardly.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say cowardly. I said covert. I was on the verge of being unparliamentary, but I trembled on the verge. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was not merely unjust to the Imperial patriotism of Canada; he was unjust to the commercial capacities and interests of Canada. I was amazed that a man of his business experience could speak as he spoke to-night about a Pacific cable in relation to Canada's interests. He seemed to think that a Pacific cable could only be useful to Imperial interests, and could only be useful to England from a military point of view. Why, Sir, that cable would never be laid by England, or by England in conjunction with her colonies, if it was merely for military ends. What England contemplates, you may be certain, is not simply military ends, but commercial ends also. Does any one imagine that England, with her commerce looking to the four winds of heaven, and touching the commercial interests of the world at every point, could have a Pacific cable without that cable being useful to us as a young commercial nation? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman failed to see—his standpoint was too contracted, his view too narrow, his horizon too bounded for him to see the Imperial and commercial relations of the questions we were discussing. And, Sir, whom is he striking at now, when he talks about persons who will go over to London and hob-nob with dukes? This is an echo—I remember it very well—which belongs to other days. I have heard those strident tones make parabolas across that Table when they were intended to work execution upon men who were sitting on that side, but who are now here. His attacks to-day fall amongst his friends on the Treasury benches. Whom was he striking at when he talked about hob-nobbing with dukes? I hope there is to be a discussion at no very distant day upon a very important subject to be proposed by an hon. friend of mine from the North-west. Is the hon. gentleman striking at the present High Commissioner, an appointee, and a distinguished appointee, of the present Government? Or whom is he striking at? There are no persons on this side now hob-nobbing with dukes. Is it my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville), who the other day deprecated such men as we have had as High Commissioners, and intimated that we should have something much rougher and more democratic? Should such a gentleman go to England as High Commissioner, and should a duke happen to be Colonial Minister, he would have to rub elbows and rub hips with him. I do not suppose it would demoralize him terribly. I do not suppose it would destroy his character to meet a business man who happens to have a title. However, all that thunder, so far as the Conservative party is concerned, is now as ineffective as burnt powder or the snow of last year. The hon. gentleman is not what Disraeli once said of one of his enemies: he is not an extinct volcano. I do not know that he was ever a volcano; but as an engine of war he still detonates, though whatever he throws out now strikes his own friends. I am afraid that my hon. friend was set a bad example by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. member for North Wellington took my breath away the other night; he made me tremble. Looking down at his leader and looking daggers but using none, instead of the tones of praise that we have been accustomed to hear from him, he talked in other tones. He said with Anthony that he had come to bury Caesar, not to praise him; and he warned the hon. leader of the House that if ever he did anything like this, that and the other, as had been done by others, then he would have but a short shrift, and would cease to be captain of the good ship "Reform." And now we have my hon. friend from North Norfolk, a Nestor of the Reform party, warning the hon. leader of the Government that he has got into power to redress terrible evils, dire iniquities which this party committed when in power, and to reduce expenditure. I want to say that I will suppport him in reducing the expenditure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. One more to join us.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, yes, I will support him in that; and if there are any Augean stables

to be cleansed, I will help him to cleanse them. I will help him to perform all these feats which he has to perform. But, Sir, I do not use the language of warning to him; I do not say he is not going to do it; I do not distrust him. The notes of distrust come from his own benches; and now we have the hon. member for North Norfolk saying that if such and such things happen, the Government need not expect the support of Ontario. Why, Sir, it is disconcerting and disheartening to me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, a new Government has been brought into power, and I have said that I admire the hon. gentleman who is leading the House for the courage with which he formed that Government, and I also must praise the abnegation of the party he leads, because they are correlative virtues. The virtue of courage in the leader would have been dangerous, if there were not the correlative virtue of self-abnegation in the party. I honour the party and the leader and the Government; what more can a party expect from an opponent than that? They are all honourable men.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You will get a subsidy soon.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that what they are going to do, Mr. Speaker? I never got a subsidy from the other Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, you tried very hard.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I did not. I hope my hon. friend will not interrupt me. I once told him that his face was red by nature, not unassisted by art, and I do not want him to add to its rubicund quality by excited interruptions. I want to show how unjust hon. gentlemen opposite are to themselves and the position of the Government and the difficulties of their leader in taking the tone that was taken by my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to-night, and my hon. friend the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other night. They say that this Government, which was turned out, was so bad and inefficient. They know well themselves——

An hon. MEMBER. Do not worry yourself about the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. There is another gentleman who is red by nature, not unassisted by art.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are certain expressions which may seem witty, but they are rather personal, and, I think, should be avoided.

Mr. DAVIN. I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker. I never could have allowed myself to be guilty of the little breach of decorum that I have been guilty of, but for the exuberant enthusiasm that hon. gentlemen opposite have put into the speeches we have listened to to-night. What I want to say is this. Those gentlemen on the other side, who spoke of the defeat of the Conservative party, know well that they are not speaking their innermost convictions. They know well that what occurred on the 23rd June was this: that by reason of a peculiar question, a victorious party—or, to take the figure of speech used the other night by the hon. member for Wellington—a ship without a weak plank in her, a strong ship, well beamed, and masted, and taut, and with a victorious policy at the masthead, was, by reason of a peculiar question, sent upon the rocks. That is just what happened, and to say that the party was beaten on its trade policy or because of its extravagance, or because the country had got tired of it, is not to give the real secret of the failure of the Conservative party on the 23rd of June. It was beaten solely and simply——

Mr. DEVLIN. Because there were not sufficient returning officers.

Mr. DAVIN. I really do not know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. DEVLIN. You knew it on the 23rd.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's wit consists in; in fact, I never know what it consists in, although I make desperate efforts sometimes to find out. When the hon. gentleman was on this side, I used often try to understand the wit of what he said, when it sounded like wit.

Mr. DEVLIN. There was too much art in you then.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, there never was too much art in my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. members must be good enough not to fling observations to one another across the floor of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that you called the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There were two gentlemen engaged in doing that. No hon. gentleman should do that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. DAVIN. No doubt, it would give some of my friends opposite much pleasure, if I would sit down, but I have risen to discuss an important matter, and, if I give these gentlemen any uneasiness, let them bear it as best they can. What I wish to say is that they know well, when they say that the Conservatives were beaten because of their trade policy, or extravagance, or because they had become a sink of corruption, that they are not speaking by the book. The only thing that defeated the Conservative party on the 23rd of June was the course taken with regard to the Remedial Bill in this House, and that question is not yet settled. I hope it will be settled in accord with the views I have again and again, inside and outside this House, expressed. But, after that question is settled,

from what we have seen here, we have reason to believe that the Government has all its difficulties before it. Its difficulties have commenced in the cradle. They have begun, as we have seen to-night, in the bosom of the Cabinet itself. We have seen in the green tree to-night those elements of disruption and the flaring up of that independence of which my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) spoke. They have dangers to meet, not merely from the strength of the Opposition—and I believe it is a strong Opposition—but from the very bosom of its own party, from the very heart of the Cabinet, and it is these dangerous forces, I believe, that will disrupt and destroy the Administration.

Mr. ELLIS. Perhaps the rather humourous observations which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House are as much as can be said in favour of the proposition with regard to a fast line. I rise merely for the purpose of expressing my own opinion, which, I believe, is that of the constituency I represent, with regard to this matter, and of giving such support as I can to the views expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). This question has been considerably discussed in the city of St. John, and the general opinion there is against it. The feeling there prevails that Canada, burdened as she is to-day, ought not to take up such a heavy responsibility as will be involved by the immense subsidy for this line. The Board of Trade of St. John, composed both of Conservatives and Liberals, and not dealing with this question from a political standpoint at all, has expressed its opinion against it. I will read one paragraph from a memorial which they sent to the Government:

> That the expenditure of so large a sum as $750,000 yearly to be guaranteed for such a service for an extended term of years must involve a most serious demand upon the resources of the country and hinder aid to the development of other enterprises tending more materially to advance the interests of the whole Dominion. While, as this board is led to believe, the proposed line is being advocated largely in Imperial interests, the giving of so large a subsidy would seem to cast upon Canada an undue proportion of the costs, and a responsibility far beyond any probable returns.

When I was in this House from 1887 to 1891 my colleague was Mr. Weldon, who is now dead. In the discussions which took place upon this question we were opposed to the granting of the first subsidy of, I think, $500,000. In 1894, the Government proposed an addition of $250,000 to this subsidy; and if gentlemen who are interested will refer to the speeches made by our representatives in the House, Mr. Chesley and Mr. Hazen, they will observe that these gentlemen were seduced into giving a certain kind of support to the scheme by the proposition made to them and expressed on the floor of this House that the contractor for these steamers would be allowed to select St. John as one of the ports on the Atlantic seaboard to which these steamers could go. Mr. Chesley's speech clearly points out the feeling of the city of St. John against the proposition, but he was induced to vote for it by reason of that offer. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hope held out on that occasion was a false hope. Even with the proposed addition, the scheme was not satisfactory to our people; but when the contract was called for it was found that there was no such proposition in it relating to the city of St. John. I have only risen to say that the opinion of our city is the same as it was then, the same as it has always been. We believe that the interests of Canada can be best advanced by other means. We do not believe that the spending of so large a sum of money for such an enterprise will yield the country a compensating benefit. The country, burdened as it is with a large debt, should not be called upon to bear this additional expenditure, considering what the interests are that demand it. I quite feel that as far as necessary, the Imperial idea expressed by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) should be maintained, but I do not think the burden of this Imperial idea should be thrown upon Canada, or that we should do more than our fair share—and certainly the payment of $750,000 a year is more than our fair share. I do not know the opinion of other gentlemen, but coming from the maritime provinces, where we have waited long for the development that has not come, I cannot support this scheme.

Mr. MACLEAN. As a member from Ontario, I rise to repudiate the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The people of Ontario are in favour of the fast Atlantic service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. No, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. The people of Ontario do believe that Britannia rules the seas, and they are willing to do their part to maintain the Empire's proud position. The hon. member (Mr. Charlton) to-night, as on many former occasions, states the case of the Bay of New York against the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The people of Ontario will every time favour the St. Lawrence route, and support any reasonable scheme that has for its object the building up of Canadian trade by that route. Gentlemen on the other side, and especially the hon. member for North Norfolk, have taken upon them to express the United States view, and promote the welfare of the United States ports. If the hon. member for North Norfolk would like to appeal on this question to the people of Ontario, I am willing to go with him and discuss it in any county in the province. The hon. gentleman would find, especially in the city of Toronto, that

the feeling is all in favour of the fast Atlantic service. The way to get the fast Atlantic service is to try to get it. We can talk about it and raise petty objections to it without accomplishing anything practical. There is only one way to get this service, and that is to start it. If this is done Canada will control the great inter-continental traffic that ought to and that would flow through our territory. Another point is that this fast Atlantic service is a part of our Canadian Pacific Railway scheme. They were men of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite who said that the Canadian Pacific Railway was a failure, that it went through a sea of mountains. We know to-day what that sea of mountains has turned out to be —that in it we have the richest mining country in the world. Similar results will follow when we build up this fast Atlantic service: it will bring travel and traffic across Canada, and will build up our country, as well as doing a great deal, as has been said, to realize the Imperial idea. The Conservative party believes in the Imperial idea, and will support this Government, and especially the leader of this Government, if he tries to realize the views which he expressed in this House to-day.

Mr. LANGELIER. This debate relates to a question that deeply interests my own constituency, and not only my own constituency, but the whole city of Quebec. This is not the first time that this question has come before the House. I believe that I was one of the first members to bring up the subject. Some eight or nine years ago, one of the then members for Halifax—I think it was Mr. Kenny—asked the Government what had been the duration of the trip of the various mail steamers of the Canadian line within two months: and from the information that was laid before the House in answer to that question we learned that the duration of the passage was all the way from eleven to fourteen days. That is the way the mails were being carried. I stated then and I state now that in my opinion it is pure waste of money to pay steamers to carry mails in such a manner as that. The question of the faster service was left aside for some time. Some years afterwards the question was taken up by the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald, and it was proposed at first to give a subsidy of $500,000 for an improved mail service between Canada and Europe. But that sum was found insufficient. I must say that the whole House favoured that. Later on, when it was proposed to grant $750,000, that also was unanimously voted. We may have been wrong or we may have been right in voting that sum, but it seems to me useless to renew the discussion that then took place. Some exception was taken to the proposal, but both parties joined in voting for it. The country is no poorer now than it was then, and I think it will be richer under the new Government. It is true that $750,000 is a large sum; but it is better to pay that amount to have the mails carried in an effective manner than to pay a smaller sum for such a service as we have had. As I stated when the question was before the House years ago, when the country was much poorer and much smaller in population than it is to-day, we paid £104,000 a year to the Allan line to carry the mails from this country to England. At that time £104,000 was equal to three times $750,000 at the present day. But nobody complained. In my opinion we had better not pay one cent of money for a mail service unless we have a complete service. I must say that in my city there are no two opinions about this question. If I were to allow this question to pass without raising my voice, I would be charged with lack of good faith to my electors and to the citizens of Quebec. During the last election this question was not discussed because the whole city of Quebec and surrounding constituencies were at one upon it, and there is not a dissenting voice. If any man were to go on the hustings and say that he was opposed to a fast line service between Canada and England he would be hooted off the hustings. I think some misunderstanding has taken place with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) yesterday. I am quite sure that he was misunderstood. Some hon. gentlemen understood him to say that the policy of the Government was opposed to a fast steamship service; and I was glad to hear the Prime Minister to-day say that the Government's policy is not yet quite made up. We do not know whether the sum of money previously voted will be enough. I do not say that we should spend any amount of money for this fast service; if we find it is going to cost more money than the country can afford, then let us dispense with it, as we have to dispense with many other things we would like to get. But if it is possible to have a service for the sum of money voted some years ago, then I say, by all means let us have that improved service between Canada and England.

Mr. ROGERS. As this is a very important question from a farmer's standpoint, I feel that I cannot allow the opportunity to pass without saying a few words upon it. I represent a constituency of farmers, and I also represent a body which is pretty well known in Ontario, the Patrons of Industry. Hon. gentlemen who were in the late Government will remember very well the deputation that met them on this subject from the Grand Board of Patrons of Industry that met in Toronto, composed of eighty to one hundred of the representative men of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba. For two years in succession they emphatically and unanimously condemned this scheme of

granting $750,000 a year for a fast steamship line ; and I think we were as representative a body of men as you can find anywhere—barring, of course, this one. I must say that that feeling has taken a strong hold upon the farmers, and it was manifested all through the late contest wherever this subject was mentioned, and the action of the Grand Board was endorsed on all occasions without a dissenting voice. A cheer always went up whenever a candidate spoke in condemnation of that proposition. I am sure the late Government are aware that they lost many seats through their proposal to give that vast amount of money to a fast steamship service, as well as $120,000 yearly towards communication with Australia. The farmers of this country feel that the burden of debt is getting too heavy for them to bear, and they want to shake it off. I am glad to see that the present Government intend to take some action along the line of establishing, if it can be done, a fast steamship service in connection with cold storage ; and I sincerely hope that the cold storage scheme will take precedence of the other, because the needs of the country at present demand that something should be done on that line. I feel sure that whatever action the Government may take in that direction will receive the hearty endorsation of the farmers of Canada. I must say that I was considerably surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) who pretended to speak for the whole body of the farmers ; and I could not help feeling that he was not quite in hearty sympathy with us. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that he would not dare to go back to his constituents if he stood up and endorsed that scheme, and I can say the same thing with regard to my constituency. Now, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) also spoke upon this question, but he did not dare to support it. He played around it with a great flow of oratory, but he never said that he would endorse that scheme. He knew well enough that he would not dare to go back to his constituents in a by-election, as he very likely may have to do, if he had supported a proposition to spend $750,000 a year for a fast steamship service. I am sorry to see so much of the time of this House taken up with mere oratory. In conclusion, let me say that the farmers of this country object to be burdened to any greater extent than they are now, unless they can get some direct benefit from the expenditure. They are not in a condition to stand it. Perhaps when our circumstances are improved, we can launch out in some such scheme ; but in the meantime the Government will do well to act very cautiously and with hesitation before they grant any more large bonuses.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), in addressing the House on this question, presumed to speak for the entire province of Ontario. He stated that the entire province of Ontario was in favour of this fast Atlantic service at the cost proposed. Now, I beg to say on behalf of my constituents, that while we are ready to do anything reasonable to obtain a creditable steamship service between the mother country and Canada, we are not prepared, and I do not believe the people of the country—particularly of the province of Ontario, are prepared to support a scheme such as outlined by hon. gentlemen opposite, to establish a twenty-knot service at a cost of $750,000 a year. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) attempted to prove that there was a difference of opinion between some members of the Government coming from Quebec. Now, I listened with attention to the address of my esteemed friend at my left (Mr. Dobell), and I listened also to the address of my esteemed leader, and I must say that I can see no difference between them. My honoured leader stated that the Government of which he is the head was determined to secure the best service they possibly could for Canada, at the very lowest price. That is what the people of this country want, and it is right and prudent on the part of representatives of rural constituencies to rise and state that a twenty-knot service at a cost of $750,000 a year, is one that the people of western Canada at least, are not prepared to support. I am confident, however, that the Government will consider this question with prudence, sagacity and care, and if a scheme should be finally set on foot, it will be creditable to Canada, and not beyond our resources. I am satisfied that it will be carried on in a manner that will redound to the credit of the present Government, and will prove that our friends opposite were in the air altogether, that they were far above the heads of the people, and were going in for schemes that this country would not endorse in its present financial condition. We claim that the Government should pursue a policy of care and economy, and I believe they are going to do so. Why, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, what is quite true, that this scheme would add to our debt $20,000,000. When we realize that fact, we must approve of the policy of the Government as outlined by the leader, when he says that they intend to proceed with the utmost care and economy. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) should be the last member to rise and seek to find differences of opinion among members of the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman has performed a feat in the House which has not been performed by any member during fifteen years, and that is the feat of repudiating himself, which he has done on several occasions. I have heard the hon. gentleman make a speech one way and almost immediately afterwards vote the other. Hon. members have seen him do that, and the hon. gentleman's course has afforded amusement. His eloquence also amuses

the House, but hon. members take as little stock in the opinions he expresses as his constituents take in the hon. gentleman, for he had the most narrow escape of any hon. member who holds a seat in the House. He is shortly going back to his constituents, and so to-night he would not advocate a fast Atlantic service with an annual grant of $750,000. The hon. gentleman occupied the time in beating about the bush and never came to the point, and yet when the hon. gentleman goes west no doubt he will say that he spoke in favour of the scheme or against it just as it suits him. I hope whatever may come out of this project, the Government will see that the annual expenditure is not increased to the enormous extent intended by hon. gentlemen opposite, but that prudence will be exercised, and exhaustive investigation made as regards the steamship lines running between this continent and the mother country, and thus ascertain how far it would be prudent for the country to attempt competition against the 65,000,000 of people to the south of us, especially in view of our financial difficulties, which have been brought about by the extravagant administration of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McMILLAN. As a farmer of Ontario, and one who has had opportunities of ascertaining the sentiments of my brother farmers, because during eight years I have travelled over the province and held meetings regarding agricultural questions, I desire to state that the statement made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that the people of Ontario are almost a unit in favour of a fast steamship line, is not correct. Whatever may be the opinions of a large number of the people of Toronto, the farmers do not consider that a fast line is specially in their interest. The feeling of the farmers is this: While they want as efficient a mail and passenger service and as cheap a service as possible, they are more interested in having a thorough system of cold storage, by which proper care can be taken of perishable goods during shipment. I paid particular attention to the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition, who stated that if the speed was reduced from 20 knots to 18 knots it would cause all the traffic going over the Canadian Pacific Railway from the west to take the route through the Suez Canal, even though it took eighty days instead of forty days. That was a piece of the most arrant nonsense I ever heard. In regard to the action of the late Government, the ex-Finance Minister, in defending himself and his colleagues stated that if the present Government waited to secure the opinion of Canada in favour of the service, they would wait till doomsday.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will perhaps permit me to interrupt him and say that he entirely misunderstood what I said.

Mr. McMULLEN.

I said nothing of that kind at all. What I did say was this, that if the Government waited until they got a 20-knot service which would give a passage across the Atlantic at $75 per head, they would wait till doomsday.

Mr. McMILLAN. I took down the language used by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman may have made a slip of the tongue, or made the statement in a moment of weakness. At all events, I took down his language, and I was much astonished to hear it. What our farmers want is a service that will give them as cheap rates as possible, for one or two days makes no difference in the condition of perishable goods when there are proper cold storage facilities provided. I was very much impressed by some remarks made by the Australasian intercolonial commissioners when in Ottawa. When members of this Government were advocating a rapid mail service between Canada and Great Britain, the commissioners from the Australian colonies stated that what the farmers of Australasia wanted was not so much a fast service as one that would carry freight in good condition, as with cold storage the question is one of two days was of very little importance. According to my experience, and the experience of others, a 20-knot service is impracticable from Quebec down the St. Lawrence until a point 200 miles outside of the Straits of Belle Isle is reached. During the last five years I have crossed the ocean twice. The last time the steamship—during 36 hours was running at about 8 knots, and there was danger of running into icebergs during that time. During the present summer a vessel left Montreal with 90 head of cattle belonging to me on board. In the Straits she was running at only about 8 knots, but in a dark night, although there was no fog, she struck an iceberg and had to return to Newfoundland. The opinion I have expressed in regard to a 20-knot service is expressed by men who have given attention to the navigation of the Gulf. Let me read the opinion of Mr. Clement, of Glasgow, who is a commission merchant who handles large quantities of Canadian produce. He was asked his opinion of the Huddart scheme with a 21-knot passenger service, with a Canadian subsidy of $750,000 a year. Mr. Clement replied:

> The fast line service excites the enthusiasm of Imperialists on both sides of the water, but I cannot see where the money is in it for Canada. A few tourists might be attracted this way by it for a while, but that would be of little benefit to this country, and it is doubtful that it could be maintained, owing to the difficulties of navigation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

This gentleman has establishments at Glasgow, Manchester and London and probably handles the largest amount of Canadian perishable goods sent to the old country. I believe that even 18 knots is impossible until the vessels get outside the Straits of Belle

Isle, in view of the weather which generally prevails in the Gulf. Let me say as a farmer that it is much more important to us that we should get reduced rates and ample accommodation with cold storage than secure a fast line on the payment of an enormous subsidy. In all subsidies granted in the past agricultural interests have been entirely ignored, and I hope the present Government in any subsidies granted will pay strict attention to the interest of the farming community, and see that any line of vessels subsidized shall possess ample cold storage arrangements and give cheap freights, because those are what the farmer want to-day. This provision will be one of great benefit to the farmers, and it is one which the Government can confer on them if the steamship scheme is properly carried out.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I expressed my opinion on this subject last session, and since then I have discussed it before the electors. I discussed this question upon public platforms, where there were representatives of the opposite party, and I did not find, during my whole campaign, which lasted five weeks, a single supporter of the Conservative Government who would advocate a fast line of Atlantic steamers. That only goes to show that the farmers and a large number of the business men in western Ontario are opposed to the expenditure of $750,000 a year to obtain what they have at the present time, good lines of steamers to carry the products of their toil across the Atlantic. I have listened to the speeches made in favour of the fast line, from the leader of the Opposition down to the last one who spoke on that side of the House, and I did not hear a single substantial argument in favour of it. It is true that we are told that a great number of travellers would come from the Western States, and from Vancouver, and probably from the far East to travel through our country. But, allowing that they did, what advantage would that be to us, when their time was so much occupied that a day was of such value to them that they came through Canada, instead of going by the Suez route? Again, you can understand that during the winter season a fast line of steamers on Canadian waters will not be patronized, as would the fast line from New York. I do not see any hon. gentlemen opposite who would take a long drive in the winter season, all the way to Halifax, the winter port, for the purpose of countenancing a Canadian steamer, when after twelve hours' travel he could take a fast steamer from New York. We must also bear in mind that we are so geographically situated that it is impossible for us to have our steamers travel at full speed, as they do from New York. There are difficulties in our navigation of the Atlantic, such as fogs and icebergs in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which would necessitate our fast steamers going slower. Such obstacles do not present themselves to the south, and, therefore, they will always have the advantage in crossing the ocean faster than we can.

We were told this afternoon by the leader of the Opposition that great advantage would accrue to the farmers of Canada, through having their perishable products carried on this fast line, and he mentioned eggs, and butter, and vegetables, and such like. Now, I appeal to the common sense of every individual in this House and in the country, what difference would it make to the farmers to have their eggs arrive in London, Liverpool or Manchester twenty-four hours sooner than they arrive at the present time. We have cold storage compartments on other steamers, and butter can be preserved in all its flavour for six weeks as well as for five days, and we are just as liable to strike a high market, if our products arrive in England a day or two days late, as we would by the fast steamer. I cannot see for one moment what advantage it would be for the farming community, and, therefore, I think, in the present financial condition of the country, when we are striving to economize on every side, it would be an error of policy on the part of this Government, or on the part of Parliament, to agree to spend $750,000 a year for a service which would not be largely to the advantage of Canada. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) stated that there appeared to be an agreement between the Government and the Allan Company that they would make other arrangements to carry our products across the ocean. And, if there are other arrangements made by slower vessels, do you not see that our products would be carried in about the same time as they are at present, and that there would not be much hurry about it, after all? What advantage is it to the farmers of Canada, who would have to contribute about one-half of the $750,000 a year, to sustain that line? I understand that $750,000 are to be given each year for ten years, which means $7,500,000, and then for the following ten years there would be given $500,000 a year, which would mean $5,000,000, or, in all, the people of this country would be called upon to contribute $12,500,000 out of their hard-earned money, to keep up a service which almost everybody acknowledges would be of little advantage to the community. We are also told that these steamers would carry all the Canadian mails. That is not so. These steamers are supposed to cross only once a week, and the mails that would arrive half an hour after the weekly steamer left, would have to be sent via the United States. Then again, it is said that this fast line would benefit the large commercial men of this country who do business with England. It is well known by everybody who is engaged in business in these latter days, that instructions are not carried on by mail, but rather by cable, and, if goods are neces-

sary to be here by a certain day, they can be shipped from England so as to arrive on the very day the Canadian merchant requires them. Looking the whole matter over from a common sense standpoint—and that is the standpoint from which we should view it—it would be impolitic and unwise, on the part of this country, to vote $750,000 a year for ten years and $500,000 for another ten years to establish a fast line of steamers.

RECENT ELECTION IN NORTH GREY.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to direct attention for a moment to an article which appears in one of the Quebec papers, called "L'Electeur," a Liberal paper published in Quebec, and which article is headed: "A Word to the Brethren." This is said to be a manifesto issued by the members of Parliament who are reputed, according to this paper, to be Orangemen, to the electors of North Grey in the late election. The article is introduced in the following language:—

An unpublished document submitted for the consideration of our compatriots. It is our duty in pursuit of a patriotic taste to keep our compatriots constantly on guard and to acquaint them with the perils of the political situation, in order that they may the better protect themselves.

We have just had placed in our hands an unpublished document of great significance. It is an Orange manifesto distributed by thousands of copies during the recent election in North Grey. It bears the signature of all the Orange members of the Commons and reads as follows:—

A WORD TO THE BRETHREN.

The time having arrived when all Orange brethren must unite to stem the agressions of Romanism, the following Orange brethren are devoting their full energies to defeat the Hon. Wm. Paterson, who voted against Orange incorporation:—

Right Worshipful Bro. N. Clarke Wallace, M.P., Grand Master of the Orange order of British North America, and President of the Triennial Council of the World.

Bro. Geo. Taylor, M.P., Past County Master for Leeds.

Past Master Bro. Dr. Sproule, M.P.

Bro. W. F. Maclean, M.P.

Past Worshipful Master Bro. Col. Tyrwhitt, M.P.

Bro. McNeill, M.P.

Bro. Sam. Hughes, M.P., ex-Worshipful Master, Victoria County.

Bro. Andrew Broder, M.P.

Worshipful Bro. W. Beattie Nesbitt.

These brethren having taken charge of the campaign in North Grey on behalf of Mr. McLauchlan, will, with other brethren address meetings throughout the riding in Mr. McLauchlan's interests. Meantime you are called upon by the Grand Master, N. Clarke Wallace, to render all brotherly assistance in advancing the cause, and you will please without delay distribute the inclosed Owen Sound "Star" supplements amongst the electors where it is judicious to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, in regard to this, that only some of the gentlemen named in this were in the county of Grey at that election. Some of these gentlemen, who are reputed to be prominent members of the Orange Order, never were members in their lives, and are not members to-day. In the next place, I wish to say that no manifesto of that nature was issued by that gentleman, or by any one in his behalf, and distributed among the people of North Grey. I emphatically deny and repudiate this article. The only information I had about the manifesto was this. About twelve o'clock on the night before the election, a friend of ours came to me, and stated that he had been shown it by a Roman Catholic friend, who had said that it had been given him by an active canvasser of Mr. Paterson, but under the promise that he would not give it up; but he allowed a copy of it to be taken. He said it had been distributed the previous night, which was Sunday night, to every Roman Catholic of the district. I am not aware of its having been seen by any Protestant of the district. It was distributed by a prominent supporter of Mr. Paterson, a gentleman whom I know very well. But I am authorized to say, on behalf of these gentlemen, that they never got out that manifesto, or any other manifesto. What we had to say we said fairly and openly on the platform: and at every meeting, so far as my knowledge goes, we had both Protestants and Catholics present.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What did you say about French domination?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is saying; but I am speaking with reference to what is calculated to mislead, and what I honestly fear is intended to mislead. It is published down in the province of Quebec, among people who cannot know the facts, and who, if they believe it, will undoubtedly be misled by it; and, in justice to the hon. gentleman and to those associated with him in that campaign, I wish to deny that they distributed this manifesto, or saw or knew anything about it, except as to the copy which I speak of having heard about on the night before the election. Instead of that, it is reported to have been distributed in thousands.

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

(In the Committee.)

Dredging $188,000

Mr. BRITTON. I want to ask if, included in this item, there is any appropriation for dredging on the Rideau Canal between Westport and Kingston?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). That does not belong to my department. It belongs to the Department of Railways and Canals. It will come up later.

Roads and Bridges..... $81,800

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the item for a swing bridge over the Burlington Channel increased from $15,000 to $19,800 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money we had last year has lapsed, and this is to pay for the balance of the work done, the bridge now being completed.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has no revote marked.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It should have been marked "revote."

Mr. FOSTER. Does this pay the whole of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Telegraph line ..... $ 1,000

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before this item is carried, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) whether he has looked into the correspondence carried on between his predecessors in office and myself in connection with the building of a telegraph line between Grosse Isle and Crane Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) A report was made on the matter, but I have not yet had time to look into it, which I intend to do later on.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) This being a matter of importance, I hope the hon. Minister will, at the earliest opportunity, carefully consider that report, as it involves the building of a telegraph line, the necessity for which is being keenly felt, especially in the winter season, by the people of Crane Island.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I shall give the matter my best consideration.

To provide for salaries of engineers, draughtsmen and clerks, Chief Engineer's Office $46,000

To provide for salaries of architects, draughtsmen and clerks, Chief Architect's Office 22,500

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the hon. Minister of Public Works has discharged a number of these officers, yet he is asking for an amount of $46,600. How many has he in the department and how many has he discharged ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the Estimates there was an amount of $54,000 asked, and I am only asking $46,000, which makes a saving of $8,000. I did not discharge all the draughtsmen, and certainly could not do so.

Mr. SPROULE. How many did you discharge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the chief engineer's branch I discharged the following draughtsmen :—

Chabot	$2 00 per day.
Moffette	2 75 "
E. Smith	3 00 "
J. H. Roy	2 75 "
H. Friel	3 00 "
J. Aube	3 00 "
F. E. Perley, late engineer.	$200 per month.
Tremblay	$4 00 per day.
Leduc	$1,200 per year.
John Connell	900 "
L. T. Dorais	1,200 "

In the secretary's branch, the following gentlemen were discharged :—

J. Marsan	$1 00 per day.
E. Aube	2 00 "
A. Girard	1 50 "

In the accountant's office, the following were discharged :—

H. Lyons	1 50
G. Wolsely	2 50

In the architect's branch :

D. A. Mara	$2 50 per day.
T. B. Morin	1 75 "
G. Bray	$40 per month.
E. Pelletier	$1 50 per day.

There are a lot of other men, labouring men, whose names I have not here.

Mr. SPROULE. If I kept a correct account, I think the hon. gentleman named some 13 temporary clerks who were discharged, and the aggregate of whose salaries would be from $15,000 to $16,000, besides others he has not mentioned. Take $15,000 from $54,000, and you will have $39,000, yet the hon. gentleman asks for $46,000. Does he intend replacing any of these men he has discharged ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that I will have to dispense with the services of some more employees, as I have not yet been able to complete the work of reorganization. There will certainly be some other dismissals. In the opinion of my officers, we can do the work with less men than we now have.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Why then do you ask for so much money ? The reduction in the Estimates should be proportionate to the reductions in the number of men employed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already saved in wages on that account alone $21,000, but I have not had time to go into the full details of the reform I am trying to make. That reform is surely not a party question. My hon. friends tell me that I am asking for more money than perhaps may be wanted to pay the actual number in my employ. They may be sure that I will not spend a dollar more than will be necessary. If my hon. friends will look at the figures, they will find that in the main estimates I am saving this year $78,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman not going to bring down any Supplementary Estimates? What is the use of his trying to take credit for a reduction of $78,000 in the main estimates when all his estimates are not down yet. It will be time enough for him to plume himself on his saving, and no one will be quicker to give him credit than I, when his whole estimates are down, and we can see what saving he has made. I think I understood him to say that he has saved on these dismissals $21,000. That is what those clerks would require for one year's wages.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He is then in this position. He turned round to his hon. friends behind him and said: I have made a saving of $21,000. The better way for my hon. friend to do is to prove that by striking $21,000 from this estimate. But I call his attention to the fact that he is cutting off only $8,000. Now if the hon. gentleman is going to make the saving indicated by the number of clerks he has dismissed, he must not ask the House to give him $13,000 more than he intends to spend merely because he promises that he will not spend any money that is not necessary. He must take one of two courses. He must either say: I wanted to get rid of a large number of men, and I am going to employ a certain number, but not quite so many; or, if he does not want the men he must make the estimate in accord with the saving he is going to make. Does he intend to put on more men than there are there now? Does he intend to replace any of these twenty-one men whom he has dismissed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) of the facts of the case. If he looks at page 50 of his own estimates, he will find that my predecessor asked in these main estimates for a total appropriation of $1,566,000. I am now asking only $1,487,000, a saving of $78,000. The hon. gentleman tells me: You may ask a little more on certain items than you will be obliged to spend. That may be the case. I have frankly stated to the House that I have not had the time thus far to go into every detail of the work that is before me. I will not spend one dollar more than is necessary. And I say this, that I hope, I earnestly hope, to be able to save in wages this year between $60,000 and $75,000. I may be mistaken, but that is what I hope for. Every day, Sir, it is easy for me to save a certain amount of money. I do not wish to indulge in recriminations about that; this department has been placed, I quite admit it, in special circumstances. Every day I am doing some reform work, and doing it, it is only fair for me to say, with the full concurrence and help of my employees to whom just as much credit is due as to myself.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must not attempt to-night what he tried so effectively to do the other evening in the discussion of the Dominion Reformatory. We have passed all the items for his department with the exception of these items for salaries, which are entirely different from the others. You may refuse to build public works and save in that way; but this is a matter that is of vital importance at this time—what saving can be made by dispensing with what my hon. friend is pleased to call useless and unnecessary clerks. The hon. gentleman has stated here—and he stated it in the newspapers before he stated it here—that he found a great many people in the department who were not needed. Presumably those whom he dismissed were of that class.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman came to the virtuous conclusion that he would not pay with public money anybody whose services were not necessary. That is perfectly right, and if he will continue to act upon that principle, he will have the support of gentlemen on this side. On coming into office and on consultation with his chief officers, the hon. gentleman came to the conclusion, that, amongst the 120 men or so, he could dispense with the services of a number thus affecting a saving of $21,000. Why, then, does he ask $13,000 more than is necessary?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that I am asking $13,000 more than is necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not need to say it; the figures show it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are saving——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to hear what the hon. gentleman is saving on the whole public works. Let us take one item at a time. My hon. friend jumps about like a spry little animal that we all know of. Will he answer the one question that I put?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have read the list of dismissals in the whole department, not only in the branch for which I am now asking the credit.

Mr. FOSTER. From the whole department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The whole department including these four votes. I think that I have dismissed, if I am not mistaken over 200 men.

Mr. FOSTER. Men whose salaries were paid out of this item?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; but in my department.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us stick to this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am prepared to stick to the whole thing; it is better, I think.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure we are glad to know that the Minister of Public Works is practising economy; and, for my own part, I am satisfied there is great room for economy in the Public Works Department. But I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to this committee how it is that after he has stated to the House that he has dispensed with the services of a number of men whose salaries he estimates amounts to $22,500 or a little more, how is it that he still asks—taking these two items together, as these figures apply to the chief engineer's office and the chief architect's office—that he still asks for an increase on the permanent staff of $3,265. At any rate, there was $79,000 last year, and $68,500 this year, or $10,500 less than last year. But there should be $22,500 taken off instead of $10,500, and we can ask them to take off $12,000 more, especially in view of the fact that he has only commenced the economies he is going to practice, and he can dispense with the services of a number of other employees, such as architects, draughtsmen, clerks and so on, in the engineer's and chief architect's office. In view of the further fact that he has increased the expenditure on the permanent staff——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not increased it.

Mr. WALLACE. The expenditure on the permanent staff in 1895-96 was $48,985; his estimate for 1896-97 is $52,090, or an increase of $3,265.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These estimates are those of your own friends, they are not mine.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have been frequently reminded that these Estimates are not those of the present Government. I can say that 90 per cent of the members of Parliament on this side of the House are not in the slightest degree responsible for these Estimates. They never passed the criticism of Parliament. There are only eight or ten members of the Government who submitted these Estimates in the House, who are now sitting here. I say that 90 per cent of the members of Parliament on this side of the House are in no sense responsible for these Estimates, and I think it is time the Minister of Public Works should cease making that excuse. We hold the hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for these Estimates, and we are going to call them to account for the expenditure they make under them. Now, we find an increase on the permanent staff of $3,265, and the Minister has told us that he has only commenced his retrenchment with these twenty-five men whose salaries aggregate $22,500: so we can safely ask that that $22,500 be deducted from last year's Estimates. If the Minister means, as no doubt he does, that he has reduced the expenditure to that amount, and that he is going to reduce it still further, he has no right to-day to ask for a single dollar more than the difference between $69,000 and $47,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry that my efforts to practise economy are not better appreciated by hon. gentlemen opposite. I come before this committee with a clear saving on one item only of $21,000, and hon. gentlemen are not satisfied. The hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) says he is not responsible for these Estimates. I quite understand that he is not responsible for the whole thing, because he had then bolted from the ranks of the late Government. But the late Government brought these Estimates before the House, and although I have made this large reduction, my hon. friends are not pleased. They are not pleased because I have found ways and means to make a saving. Well, they want me to make more saving. Let hon. gentlemen give me a little more time, and I will try and satisfy them. Now, they take me to task because, with their pencils in hand, they take down the names of all the men I have dismissed. My hon. friend should understand me better. I read the names of the men that I dismissed in every branch, and they represent a certain amount of money that is not to be entirely applied to the item before us.

Mr. WALLACE. I mentioned that fact that the names the hon. member read out were not to be applied to the chief engineer's office, but were to be applied to other offices as well; and I have deducted the amount that he saved from the sum total.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is wrong, that is all. He said I had increased the permanent staff; I deny it. It is not fair to say that I have increased the number of permanent employees.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say that he had increased the number of permanent employees. I said he had increased the expenditure from $48,985 to $52,090, as will be found on page 18.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I say that my hon. friend is wrong. I found in my predecessor's Estimate, page 18, three second-class clerks, one $1,400, one at $1,350, one at $1,325. There were then three new second-class clerks that had been created by my predecessor. I have already explained why I left them there, because I have in my department a great many temporary employees, who I think should be made permanent. I think that my predecessor was wise in creating these three second-class clerks. We have a number of good

employees who are not permanent, and from whom we should select a certain number and make them permanent.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman wants money to provide for the salaries of engineers, draughtsmen, clerks, and the chief engineer's office. If he would be good enough to tell us how many men he employs in that office, and the salaries he intends to give them, then we could find out whether he is asking more money than he should.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not asking for more money than I want. Perhaps I will be able to make still more saving. I have not had time to go through all the branches of my department. I have an army of outside employees, amongst whom I hope to make a good deal of saving.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the question is areasonable one. If the hon. gentleman cannot give the names, then it would be fair to leave this item until he can give them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down the names to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not speaking of the outside men, but of those who are in that office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the names to-morrow.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is this difference between the position of the Minister of Public Works and that assumed by any other Minister who has explained his estimates, that other Ministers when spoken to about dismissals have stated—and they showed a degree of wisdom in their action—that they did not know what changes would be necessary. But the Minister of Public Works so soon as he was sworn in commenced cutting off heads, making dismissals on a large scale, and at the same time taking the credit of having effected large savings. We find, however, that under the head of Civil Government, that hon. gentleman has asked for an increased amount. Again, if the Minister has made those dismissals, which undoubtedly is a fact, why should he come to this committee and ask absolutely for as much money as was required before those dismissals took place? It is nonsense to state that there has been a decrease of $78,000 in the entire estimate before the members of the committee have seen the Supplementaries. An apparent reduction could be effected by the Government resolving not to go on with certain public works, and yet in reality there might not be one cent saved in wages.

Mr. QUINN. I do not think I can be held responsible for the Estimates before the committee on the ground that they are the Estimates of the late Government, but as a member of the committee I should like to have some explanation as to why the amount has not been reduced to a greater degree. I probably misunderstood the explanation given by the Minister, but I took a note of what he said when asked by an hon. gentleman as to the amount by which employees wages would be reduced, and what officers had been dismissed. Under the first item, to provide salaries for engineers, draughtsmen and clerks in the chief engineer's office, $51,000 were appropriated for 1895-96, and $46,000 are asked at the moment. An hon. gentleman asked what men were discharged, a number having been discharged in that particular branch, and what their salaries were. The Minister answered, giving the names of certain individuals, begining with one who had a salary of $4,000 and ending with one at $400. The amount in the aggregate is about $16,000. I desire to inquire if there is a reduction of $16,000 in this item under consideration made by dismissals from office by the hon. Minister?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They aggregate $18,000.

Mr. QUINN. The next item was the chief architect's office. In reply to a question, the Minister read a number of names, beginning with one who received $1 a day and ending with one who received $1,200 a year, the total number being ten or twelve with salaries aggregating $9,000. Yet we find as regards the first item a reduction of only $5,000, namely, the difference between $46,000 and $51,000, and on the second item a reduction of only $5,700. If there has been a reduction from dismissals in these two offices, aggregating $25,000, how is it that the reductions made by the Minister in the Estimates for these departments only represent $10,700?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman is making a fatal mistake, for he is comparing the Estimates which the Minister of Public Works has submitted with the Estimates of the previous year in the column adjacent. If the hon. gentleman will take the first series of Estimates before the House he will discover that the appropriations made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), as Finance Minister, were considerably in excess of those figures, and therefore a proper comparison is not between our Estimates and the Estimates of last year, but our Estimates and the Estimates which hon. gentlemen opposite prepared for the service for the current year. The point has been taken by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that whereas the Minister claimed a reduction of about $21,000 under the head of salaries of officials, there was in reality no such difference, the difference being as between $46,000 and $54,000, or a difference of $8,000. But if the hon. gentleman will examine the other items he will find that in most of them there is a difference. Under the item to provide for the

salaries of engineers, draughtsmen and clerks there is an appropriation asked of $46,000, whereas the appropriation asked by the hon. gentleman opposite was $54,000. There is a saving of $8,000 on that one item. If the hon. gentleman will take the architect's office, he will find we propose an appropriation of $22,500 against an appropriation of $28,500, or a saving of $6,000. If he takes the item for telegraphic service, he will find an appropriation of $2,900 asked as against $3,500 in the previous Estimates, or a saving of $600. If he will take the last item, to provide for temporary clerks and other assistance, he will find an appropriation of $23,000 as compared with $30,000 in the Estimates of my predecessor. If the hon. gentleman will add these several sums together, he will find they amount to $21,600, the sum which the Minister stated he would be prepared to save in those branches.

Mr. WALLACE. In regard to the statement of the Finance Minister, that we have to compare the Estimates submitted last session with the Estimates now submitted, I deny that. Hon. members of this House, with few exceptions, are not responsible in any degree for those Estimates, and we refuse to be bound by them. Last year $126,640 was asked; this year the amount is $110,000, or a decrease of $16,240. To that decrease add an increase made in the permanent staff, of $3,280, and it leaves a balance of $13,000. But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has told the Committee to-night that he has dispensed with the services of the clerical staff, architects, draughtsmen, and others, amounting to $22,500. We ask him, instead of taking $13,000 from the expenditure, that he should fairly deduct $22,500. That we can fairly demand from him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After the very interesting lecture which my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) from West Assiniboia gave us to-night on the necessity of unity and harmony on this side of the House, and after his reference to a speech of mine made in Ottawa some years ago—which I am glad he has remembered—as to the liberty which should exist in any political party in matters of detail, I am astonished, and indeed pained, to discover that there is such an absence of unity on the other side of the House. It grieves me to find now that this blue-book containing the Estimates, which is a part of the record of the Conservative party, is to be repudiated by all of them, except six or seven gentlemen who sit on the front Opposition benches. I had the impression that this great united Conservative party were prepared to stand by their leaders, at all events on the eve of the last election, and, when these Estimates were brought down to the House, I thought they committed, not only the Government who presented them, but also the party supporting them. If my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) for special reasons was in a position to repudiate these Estimates, I venture to say that such is not the case with regard to the great body of hon. gentlemen who sit near him. We have a right, in all seriousness, to hold, not only a few gentlemen, who have the privilege of sitting in the front Opposition ranks, but the whole Conservative party, responsible for the presentation of these Estimates. We have assumed the responsibility for them, in accepting them so far as we do, and more especially shall we be responsible for them, when the expenditure comes to be considered at the close of the year. We have a right to say that as these Estimates were submitted to the House by our predecessors in office, they should assume a share of the responsibility for them. I, therefore, trust we shall have no more of that lack of harmony which has been exhibited on the other side of the House this evening. The Minister of Public Works did not undertake to make savings, as compared with the appropriations which hon. gentlemen made a year ago. He undertook to make savings as compared with the staff which he found in his office when he came in. And, if the hon. gentlemen opposite spent less money, or appropriated less money, in their Estimates in a former year, and if they found it necessary to appropriate a larger sum in their Estimates for the current year, is it fair and reasonable that they should take the Estimates of 1895-96 as the true basis of the expenditure, when, in reality, they had more people in their employ than they had provided for in those Estimates? My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has a perfect right to say that, inasmuch as —not last year, but in your Estimates for the present year—the late Government asked for a certain amount, and inasmuch as he proposes to spend a much less sum for the current year—he has a perfect right to make that a comparison and to claim credit for his department for the difference, which is the saving he makes.

Mr. FOSTER. After this somewhat excited speech, I just want to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) one question. He has tried to make this House believe that he gets the Minister of Public Works out of his great difficulty by going to the Estimates that the preceding Government had placed before the House; for what year? For the year 1896-97. These Estimates were not passed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the matter now? I am very sorry if any words of mine should cause bodily trouble to my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen). These Estimates did not pass. There was not a single man in the employment of the Minister of Public Works, when he took office, who was employed under Estimates that were not passed. Am I right or wrong?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. That shows about the calibre of hon. gentlemen opposite. I asked the Minister of Public Works, because I do not think that his friend helped him a bit. When he read out that list of men he dismissed, amounting in their salaries to $21,000, it was a list of men who were employed and paid under the vote that passed Parliament for 1895-96. According to his own figures, my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) saved $21,000 out of that vote. Now, the question that he has got to answer is this: As he only shows $14,000 of a saving as regards the expenditure of the preceding year, what is he going to do with that difference between the $14,000 and the $21,000? Why, what folly it is to say that, suppose we had brought down $500,000 for this current year, did not pass the Estimates, did not employ a single man under them, that, therefore, if my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) came in and reduced down to $100,000, he should make his claim for a saving with reference to what was proposed but never had been carried out. The point I want to make to my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is this: it was the men employed under the vote of 1895-96 that you dismissed; you dismissed $21,000 worth of them; you, therefore, have more money by about $7,000 than you want, and you are not showing what you are going to do with that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My friend is a very difficult man to please, but I will try to show him that he is wrong again. There is no possible doubt but that I have made a saving, because the men are not there. That is a plain fact. There is one thing that my hon. friend knows, or should know, and that is that there were men under the old regime employed and charged to dredging, and surveys, and all that kind of thing. Amongst the men that I have dismissed there were for instance, Tremblay, Dorois, Connell and others, who were charged to surveys or dredging. These men are no more with me, and they will not be paid again. No nice talking will change that fact. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is an artist in mixing up matters.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to unmix them for you.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case he has mixed himself altogether. Is there any clearer case under the sun? The men have been dismissed, and they will be paid no more, and, if he is not pleased, I am sorry.

Mr. GIBSON. I know very well that there is no more competent gentleman in this House in dealing with figures than the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and I would like to add a word or two in relation to what he said. He said that these men were paid under an appropriation made by his Government. Granting that to be true, his appropriation on the four items now in dispute amounted to $113,400. The hon. Minister says he has dispensed with a number of employees. If you take the difference between what he asks and the difference that was to be paid, $113,400, you will find that the Minister of Public Works asks for $94,400, or a difference of about $19,000.

Mr. WALLACE. What four items?

Mr. GIBSON. $51,000, $28,200, $3,500, $30,700——

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman why he omitted the first item, "Services and inspections," for which the amount asked by the Minister is $3,000 of an increase?

Mr. GIBSON. I am not here to defend the Minister of Public Works in regard to his items, or any other Minister; but I wish to put myself right before this committee, by entering my protest against the unfair remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I say the Minister has asked for a certain sum of money, and the hon. gentlemen opposite is criticising the whole of his reductions on four items. The Minister says he has caused a saving of $21,000 on these four items; and if they are added together, they will make $19,000, which is pretty close to the mark. The ex-Minister of Finance as I understand him, said that these men were paid under his own appropriations. Well, those appropriations amounted to $113,400; and according to the statement of the Minister of Public Works, for these various items he now asks for the sum of $94,400, or a saving of exactly $19,000; and that is all he said regarding these items. The saving of $78,000, I understood him to say, referred to the whole service in his department, not to these four items.

Mr. WALLACE. I asked the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson) to explain that item; but in a cloud of words he tried to obscure it and did not answer the question. I suppose the reason he did not was that this item shows an increase of $3,000, which, if included, would not give as favourable a showing as he wanted to make. The Minister of Public Works says he has decreased the expenditure by $22,500. Then we say drop $22,500 out of the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have saved more than that. I have saved $78,000.

Mr. WALLACE. So far, he says, he has only begun to economize, and he is going to reduce expenditures still more, and discharge further employees. He says now that he has reduced the expenditure by $78,000. Well, I hope he is not deceiving the committee or the country. I would not charge him with that. But what does the saving of $78,000 mean? It means not a smaller staff here, but less public works in the country; that is all. I find that the

appropriation for 1895-96 was $1,492,000, while the appropriation for 1896-97 is $1,487,000, which is a decrease of only $5,000, not $78,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the Supplementary Estimates to come yet.

Mr. WALLACE. And the Supplementaries not down yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not the first time that the hon. gentleman has been found to be unfair in this House. He is once more unfair to-night. He may or may not be responsible for the past estimates; the country will not care a great deal about that. But what are the facts? Estimates were brought down last session, which are in our hands, and they show that $1,566,000 was asked for by my predecessor, while I am asking to-night for $1,487,000, or $78,000 less. These are the plain facts and figures. But my hon. friend says, "But you are going to reduce public works." When I dismiss about 200 men, does that mean a reduction of public works? I have read to the House the names of some of the men whom I have dismissed. On the 1st of August I dispensed with the services of 75 men, if I remember the number exactly, at Ottawa. Since that time I have dispensed with the services of a number of other men at different places. For instance, I have dismissed a watchman named Hurley at the graving dock at Kingston, a man named LaMontagne at Lévis, a man named Lajoie at St. Maurice, a man at the custom-house at Three Rivers, and so on. I am not in a position to-night to give to the House the names of all the men whom I have been obliged to dismiss from the service because they were not wanted. It is unfair to say that I am reducing public works in the country. My hon. friends also speak of Supplementary Estimates. I hold in my hand Supplementary Estimates that were prepared by my predecessor, and, Sir, if you believe me, they reached the respectable figure of $2,941,000. I will not bring down estimates like those. I shall be obliged perhaps to bring down pretty large Supplementary Estimates, and I will tell my hon. friends why, and the ex-Minister of Finance knows why. Our public works today are in a dilapidated condition. A great many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have come to me this session and have told me that public works have been neglected to the utmost extent; and it is a fact. In nearly every part of Canada our great works have been neglected—works which, if they had been repaired in time, would have cost $3,000 or $4,000, but which will now cost very much larger amounts. What am I going to do? I am in the hands of both sides of the House. I say it again, and the ex-Finance Minister knows it. He has often gone to my predecessor and told him: you will not spend any more because we have no more cash in hand, and my predecessor was obliged, on many occasions, to let important public works run into the sea because he had no money to take care of them. There are great wharfs, which have cost millions of dollars in a dilapidated condition, and if not repaired, they will be altogether destroyed. It is not a pleasure to ask Parliament for large sums, but I shall certainly not bring down to the House Estimates of the magnitude of those which were prepared by my predecessor, and which reached the respectable amount of $2,941,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend takes a document, which he has under his hand, containing a large number of items that foot up to $2,900,000, and he shakes that document at me and says it is the Supplementary Estimates that I prepared last year. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. He is still young and fresh in his department, and my hon. friend sitting beside him (Mr. Fielding) is also young and fresh, so far as the financial work of the Dominion is concerned. They will both find that there will be no year in which it will not be impossible for them to meet all the demands made on them for public works. Let the Finance Minister eke out, as best he can, what money Parliament will give him, there will still be a large number of men from all parts of the country who will insist that there are works which require to be undertaken or repaired and which are going to pieces. In no one year will the department have an amount sufficient to do everything, which it would be well to do, if we could afford it. My hon. friend will not be long Minister of Public Works before he will find out that the demands put before him, and which he will have to check off and reduce before submitting them to Council, even after he has sifted them, will be twice as large as they will be when passed upon by the Council, and the document my hon. friend has shaken at me is simply a portion of the items which were pressed on the attention of my predecessor, the Minister of Public Works, and which would have been taken up in Council and sifted thoroughly. That is all there is in that. It is a mare's nest and the eggs were not hatched.

Time is the great vindicator, and time will put this matter right when the Minister of Finance brings down his next Public Accounts. When the Minister of Finance brings down the public reports for 1896-97 and lays them on the Table of this House, there will be no column of comparison that my hon. friend can find between what we might have expended, if we had remained in office, and what he has expended. The table of comparison will be between the expenditure for 1895-96 and the expenditure of 1896-97, so that although my hon. friend may show his economy to-night, as between what he proposes to expend and what we might have expended, if we had continued in office, he cannot do that in the public

records. The record will simply show the comparison between the expenditure of the two years, and what will that amount to? Here are the figures, before the hon. gentleman's own eyes, of the saving he has made in the whole Estimates which he has brought down, and that saving amounts to $4,000. Here are the items we are discussing, the items of salaries. Subtract the two amounts, $126,000 and $110,000, and there is only $16,000 left out, but he has given us a number of dismissals whose salaries aggregate $22,000, and he ought at least to have reduced his Estimates by the amount of the salaries of those he dismissed. If the hon. gentleman does not want to do that, he can probably say to the House that some of those he dismissed were useless and must be replaced by others, and if he does that, the House cannot refuse him the money. But in any case, he should have dropped about $5,000 more than he did. In the list of those mentioned as dismissed are there men who are not paid out of these votes at all?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. That would reduce the apparent surplus by a certain amount. Is it not possible, after all, that if those were deducted, the hon. gentleman would not have a very large amount of surplus over his reductions in the staff of men who were dismissed, and who were paid out of these votes. I do not propose to quarrel with him any longer, but my hon. friend brought it on himself. He went to the newspapers and made a tremendous flurry about his economy, and how things were very bad, and he was going to make them very good, and naturally we are curious to know how he is to succeed, and certainly we do not wish to place the temptation of a surplus before him.

Mr. RATZ. I am at a loss to know how these Estimates are made up. I am a new member and desire some information. On taking up the Auditor General's Report, I see that heretofore in the Public Works Department, there have been accounts paid that, in my opinion, should not have been paid. In order to explain more thoroughly what I mean, it will perhaps be necessary for me to read some of the items. I find in the Auditor General's Reports, under the Public Works Department, Ottawa officials, certain items. For instance, here is an item of hire of cabs to the amount of $304. Looking over the details, I find that they include: from office to house, $13.50; to Ottawa station, $34.25; station to hotel, $72; hotel to station, $66.75; sundry cab hire, $87.75; from Ottawa station, $30.25. This expenditure for cab hire was incurred in the city of Ottawa alone. Now, if this was the private business of any member of this House, there is not one on either side that would entertain for a single moment such bills as this. The constituency that I represent sent me here to look after their interests as I would after my own business, and I believe that every other member was sent here for the same purpose. But I find that this gentleman, whose accounts I have read, paid out for barbers, waiters, shining boots, items not given, $80.55. I do not know whether it is supposed that the country is to pay for shining boots and for the attendance of waiters and barbers for civil servants. I believe that members of this House pay for shining boots if they get it done; I know I am willing to pay for mine. This gentleman went out and was caught in a cold-snap, for he paid for the hire of an overcoat for twenty-six days at 50 cents per day. The same gentleman was caught out in a rainstorm and borrowed an umbrella, for the loan of which he paid $2.50. He could have bought two umbrellas for the price he paid for the loan of one. What troubles me is this—if the weather was so cold that he required an overcoat, how in the name of common-sense did he require so much shining of boots? We find in another man's account an item of barber twenty-seven times, $4.15, and nine baths, $3.15. Now, I do not know whether he got those baths, but at any rate the country had to pay for them. We find that another gentleman went away, and apparently he got to the city of Chicago. He has charged the country railway fare to the fair grounds, $1.50; entrance to the World's Fair, $3. We find the same gentleman charges for waiters, barbers, bell-boys, car-boys, $9.50. Another gentleman here charges for the wear and tear of a coat and suit for two months $6 odd. We find another charges railways to the World's Fair, entrance tickets to the fair grounds, elevated railroad, intramural railway, and so on. I would like to know, for my information, whether it is the intention of the Minister of Public Works to entertain such bills as these. I do not wish to detain the House any longer as it is getting late.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. RATZ. These gentlemen want me to go on. I will. I will read something else that may interest them. I hope I am not to be ruled out of order, though I may not have the right to mention these items, as they do not relate to this department. I find under the head of medicine and medical comforts for the North-west Mounted Police, lime juice, 65 gallons; whisky and brandy, &c., paid to the Western Milling Co., of Regina, alcohol, two gallons; Dublin Stout, 13 dozen pints. In another item we find lime juice by the barrel, whisky, brandy, and so on. I would be glad if some one of the medical men of the House would state for what disease this lime juice is actually used. But I am really in earnest about my first question. I would like to know whe-

ther it is the intention of the Minister of Public Works to entertain such accounts as I have mentioned to-night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My colleagues and myself have fully made up our minds to be economical. If we drink lime juice we will pay for it out of our own pockets. If we forget ourselves to the extent of having a glass of wine or brandy, we will try to pay for it, and if we break umbrellas, we will buy new ones with our own money. To be serious, Sir, there is no doubt that there has been a large expenditure which should not have occurred, but with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Finance, at the helm, such cases will not be repeated.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure there have been very many members of this House on both sides who have regretted the departure into Opposition of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). But we find now that we have a gentleman in the House who can discount the finest efforts of that hon. gentleman. The remark is made beside me here that the hon. member for North Wellington, as he looks across at this side is green with envy. He may regain his composure, but he can never regain the laurels that he has lost to-night. As to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works, there is a familiar tone about it. He says that the public works all over the Dominion are in a dilapidated condition; that the breakwaters have been neglected in every direction, and that works that might have been improved and repaired for $1,000 will cost from $3,000 to $6,000, or more, because of this neglect. And he says in pathetic tones: Gentlemen, what am I to do? To me it seems that there is an air as of the spirit of the late lamented Mr. Mercier hovering over these things.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentleman go on and speak of the dead.

Mr. WALLACE. We will speak of the living. The hon. Minister says that he has dismissed 200 men, that he has dismissed seventy-four men in the city of Ottawa alone, and that the expenditures have been reduced in every direction. Well, Sir, the expenditure that was authorized by Parliament up to 1st July, 1896—and I think these gentlemen came into power about ten days later, so that the expenditure could not have been very seriously added to after that date—was $1,492,000. The estimated expenditure, up to the first of July, was $1,492,000, and that amount Parliament voted. This year, they say they have made these enormous reductions, owing to dismissals, the salaries of twenty-five men alone amounting to $22,500, but, notwithstanding this and the saving on the salaries of the 175 other men dismissed, there is an estimated saving of only $4,500. But even that saving is a illusory one, because, if you take the permanent staff on page 38, whose names are not included in this million and a half dollars, there is an increase of $3,200 and a decrease of $4,500, which makes a net decrease of $1,300. Now, after all the boasting of this hon. gentleman for the last two months, and in view of the necessity—which I admit—of retrenchment, and for which there is large room, still all the decrease he has been able to make is $1,300, and the supplementaries not down yet. Now, Sir, we are voting a very large amount of money that, according to their own statement, is entirely unnecessary, and I think we can fairly ask the Minister of Public Works to revise the account he has submitted here, and ask for a much less sum.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before that item is carried, I wish to say a word or two in connection with a matter about which I now ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to give me the necessary information. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he contemplates taking action on the petition of the ratepayers of the parish of Ste. Geneviève who have brought to his notice, through their petition, certain grievances which I think are well founded. Within the last few days the House has voted considerable sums of money for public works and repairs to public works already built, but I believe it to be our duty not to overlook the grievances of those people who are being injured through public works built by the Government. There are land owners who find themselves placed in a very hurtful position and are suffering considerable damages from the building of public works. Now, what I have just stated applies with particular force to the case of the land owners of Ste. Geneviève, to which I now call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), as that parish is situated in the county that I have the honour to represent in this House. What I would like to ask the Minister, is that he should appropriate, out of the considerable sums of money voted for repairs, a sufficient amount —although necessarily a small one—to obviate the serious damages which those landowners are suffering from the public works built, a few years ago, by the Dominion Government.

There have been two wharfs built by the Dominion Government opposite Ste. Geneviève and Isle Bizard. Certain repairs and improvements have also been made to the Ste. Anne locks, and it is claimed that the damages and inconveniences complained of result from those public works, and further from certain works built by the Government at Carillon. For a certain number of years, works under special statutes have been carried on at Ste. Anne and Vaudreuil, and

I understand that there has resulted from those works a gradual rise in the level of the waters on the lake of Two Mountains and on the Ottawa River, at the outlet of the latter from that lake. Now, owing to that, the landowners of Ste. Geneviève, to whom I refer, run the risk of seeing their lands flooded. And I may say that, for a certain number of years past, flooding has been a regular occurrence, which did not take place prior to those works having been built. Now, in the view of experts, fully competent in such matters, although not engineers, the flooding of these lands results from those works having been built, as I have just stated; and they, therefore, hold to the view that it is incumbent upon the Government to see to it that the cause of those damages be removed. Now, with a view to that latter result being reached, what is to be done? What they suggest is this, that a dam should be built at the mouth of the creek opposite the flooded lands, and further that another dam be built lower down, so as to obstruct the passage of the water remaining on those lands. Through that expenditure the landowners would be protected from the flooding of their lands and, on the other hand, the Government would enjoy a better position than the one they now occupy, as they would no longer have to settle any lawful claims for damages arising from the construction of those works. I believe that, under the circumstances, the petition sent, a little while ago by those landowners should be looked into by the Minister of Public Works. If, as I readily believe, the hon. Minister is bent upon practising economy, no better opportunity of carrying out his policy could offer itself then by preventing the recurrence of damages caused by public works built by the Government. I hope that the hon. Minister will send out an engineer who will make it his duty to inquire into and report upon the causes of the regular recurrence of those inundations which result in such heavy damages to the land owners in question.

Now, I might further call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to this fact, that mostly all the landowners who suffer from the flooding of their lands are men who have always supported the party which the hon. gentleman now belongs to. They have always forestalled the advent into power of the hon. gentlemen opposite as the new era when their petitions would be speedily acted upon and all such claims settled. As it is my privilege to represent those landowners in this House, I take it to be my duty to press their claims upon the hon. Minister. I do not wish, however, my remarks to be construed into a statement that all the landowners who suffer from those inundations share in the political views of the hon. gentlemen opposite. There are some among them who do not share the same views as the hon. gentlemen opposite, but I venture to give expression to the hope that the hon. Minister will give fair-play to all, irrespective of political opinions, when he sees his way to obviate the recurrence of the damages I have just alluded to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) I have, of late, looked into the matter which the hon. gentleman has just called my attention to. I may say that the state of things referred to has prevailed for a good many years, and it is to be regretted that more attention was not bestowed upon the matter by the former Administrations. I just received, a few days ago, the petition containing the statement of facts which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has just brought to the notice of the House. That petition will receive my most serious consideration. I may further tell the hon. gentleman that I have directed the competent officials of my department to inquire into and report upon the matter, and should that report, as I believe, be to the effect that the evils complained of by the hon. gentleman can be remedied, I will be most happy to afford relief to those good people who have already too long suffered from those inundations. The hon. gentleman, in his closing remarks, made a statement which I cannot pass over in silence. He stated that the majority of the landowners who have suffered from the flooding of their lands and who now pray for Government interference, are supporters of the Liberal party, and the hon. gentleman further said that I would not hesitate, he trusted, to act upon their petition. Let the hon. gentleman allow me to remind him that I will not allow my mind to be swayed by the political views held by voters in the different localities in which public needs may be felt. I am public-spirited enough, I trust, not to refuse public works to certain counties, because they happen to be represented in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite. And in so doing, I hope that my policy will be endorsed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House and by the country at large. As I just said, a large number of our public works are in a most deplorable and dilapidated condition, owing to the fact that, under the late Administration, the policy pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite was to refuse carrying on any works in the constituencies represented by members of the Opposition. Under the late Government, too often were the hon. gentlemen heard to say: Such and such a constituency is represented here by a Liberal, and we do not wish to build any work there, not even to make any repairs. I trust that so long as I am at the head of the Department of Public Works, as I said, I will commit no such blunder.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we have not got sufficient information in regard to this item. I do not wish to be unduly severe on the hon. gentleman, because he is new at the business; but it does seem to me that the

members of the House will naturally expect when a Minister asks for an appropriation of money, that he should say what he requires the money for, whom he is going to pay, how he is going to expend it. It is the most reasonable thing in the world to expect that the House should have that information. Then we would be able to tell whether the appropriation was required or not. Now, the hon. gentleman has informed us that he has made a great many dismissals in different branches; he has mentioned several branches, but, although we have gone over these branches, he has told us nothing about the deductions in each branch owing to the dismissals. He speaks of the dismissals he has made in several lines, but we ask him to confine himself to information belonging to this one branch, and tell us how many men he is going to employ there, what he intends to pay them, and then we will know whether the amount he asks for is too large or too small.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will simply repeat what I have said. I said I would be delighted to bring down to the House the names of all the men that are now in the employ of my department, and for which I am asking this money. I will do this to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman furnishes that information, I would like him to make a distinction between the branches, that is, to tell us the branches to which these men belong, and the amount of money he proposes to pay them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will do so with pleasure.

Collection of Revenue—Public Works... $172,800

Mr. SPROULE. On the item for the collection of slide and boom dues, $4,000, can the hon. gentleman tell us what the total collections were during last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $70,686.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman spoke about having dismissed some 200 men. Were any of the dismissed men employed upon the staffs which are paid under this item?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No man paid out of that vote was dismissed.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to inquire what is the vote under which 200 men were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vote for public buildings at Ottawa, $25,000. Under that heading I dismissed 74 men.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is a satisfactory answer.

Exchequer Court .....$ 10,402

Mr. GILLIES. I desire to refer to the Exchequer Court in regard to admiralty cases. When the Colonial Courts Admiralty Act was passed in 1891, I asked a question on this subject from the then Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson. I brought to his notice the fact that it was very inconvenient to have the Admiralty Courts as then constituted. I brought to his notice the fact, and many of my learned friends agreed with me, that the practice was extremely inconvenient, inasmuch as all processes in admiralty cases had to be issued from the metropolitan cities of the different provinces, and I pointed out that it would be a great convenience to the profession and to the public if admiralty jurisdiction was conferred on county court judges in the different districts. With this suggestion the Minister of Justice agreed, and he stated that inasmuch as the Act gave power to the Governor General in Council to fix the number of judges at any time, this suggestion would be attended to in due course. This has not been done, and the practice remains now as it was then. If a collison occurs on any part of our coast application for a remedy has to be made to the Admiralty Court at Halifax. This is extremely inconvenient. If the county court judge had power to issue an attachment against a ship, application could be made to those judges and a remedy applied. I desire to ask if it is contemplated by the department to give county court judges admiralty jurisdiction?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Formerly the admiralty courts were imperial courts, and were supposed to be under the control of the Imperial Parliament. A change took place by which the admiralty courts became branches of the Exchequer Court. Now, the judge of the Exchequer Court has the right to appoint in different districts judges to act as his deputies in Admiralty matters. When that change took place and admiralty courts were brought within the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, the old judges of those courts—those appointed by the Imperial authorities on the representation of the Federal authorities—continued to act. At all events that was the practice in my own province. The judge of the Exchequer Court has the right to appoint deputies.

An hon. MEMBER. I do not think so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am speaking from memory and cannot of course carry all these Acts in my recollection, but I think you will find that all the judges in admiralty are acting as deputy judges of the Exchequer Court, and are presumably appointed by the judge of the Exchequer Court. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned we have only the one judge in admiralty there, and he resides in the city of Quebec. I think you will find that there

are but two judges of Admiralty so-called, that is the judge at Halifax and the judge at Quebec. I understand the question is this: That the jurisdiction which is now exercised by these two judges should be extended so that the judges in the county courts in the maritime provinces, and the judges of the Superior Court in our province should be vested with admiralty jurisdiction. That is a question which so far as I am concerned I have never heard discussed before. I do not know how it might operate, but so far as Quebec is concerned I do not think it would be advantageous. I shall undertake to submit the matter to the head of the department, and to get the views of Sir Oliver Mowat on the subject. I cannot do more to-night, because I have not considered the matter myself.

Mr. LISTER. The question which my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has brought up is one of some importance to the profession in Ontario. Some years ago an Admiralty Act was passed by this Parliament and the county court judges in counties bordering on the lakes were appointed surrogates having admiralty jurisdiction. They had power to issue warrants for the arrest of ships and to try causes. For some reason or another that Act was repealed a few years ago, and as a matter of fact we now have only one judge in Admiralty in the province of Ontario. He is in the city of Toronto, so that if any cause in admiralty takes place it is necessary to have the affidavits sent to Toronto, get the warrant for the arrest, and then return it by the marshall to the sheriff of the county in which the cause of action arose. From actual experience, the Admiralty Court is of very little use in the province of Ontario, because by the time the process is issued and returned, the vessel is out of the jurisdiction, and the person who has issued the action has lost his remedy against the vessel and must look to the owners. I would call the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact, that on the great lakes nine-tenths of the shipping is registered in the United States, and I know from actual experience that many just claims have been lost in the last few years by reason of the extreme difficulty of getting a warrant for the arrest of the boat. I would urge upon the Solicitor General to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this condition of affairs. There is only one judge now to try admiralty causes in Ontario, and they must be tried in Toronto, entailing very heavy expenses; whereas formerly they were tried before the judge of the County Court in Lambton, Essex, Lincoln and other counties bordering on the great lakes. They were then tried inexpensively, and the procedure was convenient to the parties, to the profession, and to the witnesses. At the present time an action in admiralty is an expensive proceeding, even if you succeed in getting the boat seized. I think we ought to return to the law as it was prior to the last Act. It would be more convenient for every one concerned, it would be less costly, and I think it would give justice more generally than it does now.

Mr. BRITTON. Having heard the discussion I must ask the indulgence of the committee to say a word or two, because having heard it, if I remain silent it would imply that I did not know anything about it. I want to mention that one of the last acts of the late Government was to take action in that direction. I do not exactly know the modus operandi, but whether under the Act as it exists or by Order in Council the judge of the County Court of Frontenac was appointed Judge in Admiralty, and since the session commenced I have asked to have a registrar appointed so that the machinery may be put in motion. There is now another judge presiding over admiralty matters in Ontario besides the judge in Toronto. The judge of the county of Frontenac is an Admiralty Judge, and a registrar is about to be appointed, if he has not already been appointed. There will in future be a vice-Admiralty Court in Kingston.

Mr. LISTER. We have none in the west.

Kingston Penitentiary $211,300

Mr. RICHARDSON. In connection with this item I beg to call the attention of the committee to the binding twine "industry" which is run in connection with the Kingston Penitentiary. Hon. members will recollect that I put a question yesterday to the Solicitor General with reference to the matter, and he was then unable to give me the information. Since that, I have looked into the question, and I would like to supply members of the House with some information that I have been able to collect with regard to it. The manufacture of binder twine was begun at Kingston Penitentiary in the year 1894, and the cost of the plant was some $40,000. The Government made up its mind that it would be better that it should not dispose of this binder twine itself, and so it gave a contract to a man named John Connor of the city of St. John, N.B., to handle this twine. Mr. Connor had some connection with cordage manufacture in the past. The contract that was made with Mr. Connor, was as follows:—

This memorandum and agreement made the fifteenth day of April, A.D. 1895.
Between

The Warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, hereinafter called "the Warden," of the first part,

and

John Connor, of the city of St. John, in the province of New Brunswick, hereinafter called the "Agent," of the second part.

The said parties contract and agree with each other as follows:—

1. The warden agrees to sell through the agency of the agent, and in the manner and upon terms and conditions hereinafter provided, the whole of the binder twine now on hand at the Kingston Penitentiary, and all binder twine which shall be there manufactured between the date of this agreement and the fifteenth day of August next; and the agent undertakes to sell such output in manner aforesaid and upon such terms and conditions.

2. The warden is to fix, from time to time, the price at which the binder twine is to be sold by the agent, such price not to exceed that of the same grade of twine manufactured elsewhere in Canada; and sales by the agent are, as regards credit, to be upon the usual terms in the trade.

3. Cartage and freight at car-load rates are to be allowed by the warden in accordance with the usages of the trade, upon twine shipped or delivered on the agent's orders.

4. The warden is to expend two hundred and fifty ($250) dollars in advertising the binder twine, in such manner as the agent may suggest.

5. The agent guarantees the sale of the whole of twine, and is to be personally responsible to the warden for the aggregate value thereof at the prices so fixed, or to be fixed as aforesaid, less ten per cent.

6. The agent agrees to clear the penitentiary of all twine remaining on hand on the said fifteenth day of August, paying therefor as therein provided.

7. The warden is to deliver and the agent is to take delivery of such quantities of twine and at such times as the agent may desire; provided that the warden is not to be under any obligation to deliver at any time more twine than is on hand at the penitentiary. The agent is then to furnish the warden with satisfactory collateral security to cover the value at the selling price of each shipment of twine delivered to him or to his order.

For the proper performance of this contract and to ensure the Government against any loss, the agent of Mr. Connor was to furnish the Government with satisfactory security; and what does this House suppose was the nature of the security that Mr. Connor furnished? His security to the Government consisted of certain bonds of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I may inform the House that these bonds were perfectly worthless. They were not worth the paper on which they were printed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that that was the only security?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Evidence on this subject was given in the Public Accounts Committee, last session.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is with the view of calling the attention of the Solicitor General to these matters that I have risen at this time. My information is that the only security Mr. Connor gave was these bonds. If they are not perfectly worthless, I am sure the House will be glad to know it, although I fancy that there is little doubt in the mind of any hon. member that they are worthless. After this contract was executed and this worthless security given, the warden, acting for the Government, handed over to Mr. John Connor 1,063,757 pounds of binder-twine, the value of which was $56,783.36. Mr. Connor was a member of a firm known as the Continental Binder Twine Company when this contract was made. Other members of the firm were the notorious Michael Connolly and N. K. Connolly, those men whose names stink in the nostrils of Canada at the present time, those men who have been a grim spectre in Canadian political history for several years past. As I say, the value of the twine delivered to these men was $56,783.36; they accounted to the Government for some $27,000; and the amount still owing to the Government by them is $27,372.71. About this time this Continental Binder Twine Company got into difficulties, and were unable to pay the Government this amount, and up to the present time they have not paid it; but Mr. Connor offered to hand over to the Government the debts that were owing to the company, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, to himself, as he was the agent. Large quantities of this twine, I may inform the House, were advanced to gentlemen all over the Dominion of Canada; and I am credibly informed, and it is my belief, that the men, or the greater portion of the men, who got this twine were political partisans, Conservatives; and the amounts owing by them on the twine have not yet been paid. I want to read to this House a list of the gentlemen who have secured this twine, and who still owe for it, first to Mr. Connor, but now to the Government, to whom Mr. Connor has handed over these debts. A. W. Cranston, of Clearwater, Man.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where does the hon. gentleman get this information?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It does not make any difference to the ex-Minister of Justice where I get the information; he and other hon. gentlemen ought to be quite satisfied so long as the information given is correct. Mr. Cranston owes for the twine he got, $1,425. Mr. Robert Rogers, also of Clearwater, Man., owes $850 on account of binder twine.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For what year?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Secured from Mr. Connor in 1895.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The answer given in the House last session was that the amount had been claimed from Rogers under a judgment of the court.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to inform the House that this Mr. Robert Rogers, of Clearwater, Man., was the president of the Conservative Association of Manitoba, and devoted almost his entire time, for the last three or four years, to the interests of the

Conservative party, travelling over the province. The hon. gentleman is able to say that it was reported that his account for the binder twine had been settled, because Mr. Rogers gave his note for $800; but that note has not been paid.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not wish to mislead this House. I stated that it had been officially reported to this House by the late Minister of Justice that Mr. Robert Rogers was sued for the amount of his account, that judgment was recovered against him, and that the amount of the judgment had been realized. The hon. gentleman evidently is not aware of that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The information I have got—and I certainly would not for an instant think of misleading the House in the matter—is that Rogers owes $850, that he has given a note for $800, and that that note has not been paid. That is the information I have received from a department of the Government, and I believe it to be true. This Mr. Cranston, who owes $1,425, is Mr. Rogers' factotum at Clearwater, formerly, if indeed he is not at present, his clerk. So that hon. gentlemen will see that Mr. Rogers and his friend have secured from this Government over $2,200 worth of twine; and it is a fair inference to draw that he has been allowed to exploit the Government out of this very large amount because of the services he has rendered to the Conservative party in Manitoba. The chief services which he has rendered in Manitoba have been to organize the Conservative party in that province. He has been for years, and is to-day, the president of the Conservative Association of Manitoba. Now, let me read to hon. gentlemen some of the other amounts that are owing by various gentlemen throughout the Dominion: and, although I may not know the political complexion of all these gentlemen, perhaps hon. members who are listening to me will know it.

Robt. I. Crisp, Souris	$1,090 00
R. McKenzie, Manitou	1,710 00
Branbury & Thomson, Grenfell, N.W.T.	524 34
Risdon & Livesey, St. Thomas, Ont. (accepted drafts)	750 00
Bank of Commerce, Brantford, notes or proceeds of notes as follows:—	
Risdon & Livesey (accepted drafts)	1,052 10
Jas. Eadie, Portage la Prairie, and the proceeds of any other notes, drafts and acceptances, endorsed by John Connor whether paid or unpaid.	
Geo. Powell, Blyth (note)	500 00
Jas. Eadie, Portage la Prairie	300 00
" " accepted draft	101 50
" " "	472 62
" " "	103 00
A. D. Ellis, Simcoe	75 00
R. Rogers, Clearwater, Man.	50 00
" " (note	800 00
E. C. Jones, Deloraine, Man.	1,140 00
W. B. Crawford, Shawville, Que. (note)	209 00
" " "	455 80
Robinson Co., Presque Isle, Maine (note)	700 00
Shirah Milling Co., Caledonia, Ont.	345 00
W. E. & C. Stanley, Lucan, Ont.	175 00
" " " (note).	250 00
W. Wigmore, Neepawa, Man. See John Connor's letter, March 14th, 1896	900 00
Union Bank, Neepawa, Man., and Howden & Howden, solicitors, notes varying from $5 to $80, amounting to	796 50
J. F. Boyd, Minnedosa, Man.	150 00
B. Van Blaricon, Arden	275 00
Wm. Stewart, Cookstown, Ont.	415 52
Wood, Vallance & Co., Hamilton, Ont., say	1,200 00
Geo. Lawrence, Killarney, Man.	1,050 00
H. W. Steep, Winnipeg, Man. (claim, $2,300)	600 00
C. Cummings, Wolfe Island	1,000 00
Mowatt & Co., Trenton	252 61
Geo. Thompson, Cobourg	240 00
James & Reid, Perth	201 70
Geo. Sears, Kingston	81 38
A. G. McGrady & Son	9 25
Mundell & Percival	17 50
P. S. Stewart, Renfrew	115 00
W. A. Mitchell, Kingston	23 00
F. S. Green, Waterford, Ont.	30 00
W. H. Anderson, Kemptville	120 00
McGuigan & Saunders	51 00
W. Wilkinson, Brampton	117 20
W. W. McFarlane	336 60
N. Turner & Son., Cornwall	40 88
H. Fowall, Belleville	16 83
J. H. Ashdown, Winnipeg, Man.	39 90

One would think that after the experience in connection with this twine business in 1895, the Government would surely protect itself for the next year, but they did not. The contract for the twine of 1896 was let to one Patrick Kelly, a gentleman who figured as a witness in the notorious McGreevy-Connolly scandal, and who, I have no doubt, is known to every student of the political events of Canada for the last few years. Mr. Patrick Kelly was to secure the contract on the same conditions as Mr. Connor had it the previous year. What was the result? After the lapse of a considerable time it was discovered that Mr. Kelly was unable to put up satisfactory security. The Government did not want to make quite the same mistake as it did the year before, and seems to have insisted upon security, which Kelly was unable to give. The result was that almost the whole manufacture of this year, amounting to 500 tons of twine or between $50,000 and $60,000 worth, is now lying unsold, to the great loss of the Dominion. I noticed the other day an advertisement in the newspapers under the name of the Solicitor General, calling for tenders for this 500 tons of twine. Hon. gentlemen will easily see what a great loss this must be to the Government, for the time has passed this year when this twine should be sold, and it must of necessity be carried over to another year, so that the country will lose the interest on this large amount. Had this industry been conducted on an honest, economical and decent basis, the country would have

made 50 cents per day on the convict labour employed in manufacturing this twine. It seems to me that this would be a good subject for investigation by a commission. It seems to me that in this matter there are worse phases than even in the notorious McGreevy-Connolly scandal. It is high time, Mr. Chairman, that we had decent, honest methods adopted in conducting the public affairs of the country. In the province from which I come, I believe that the cry which was raised against the Government, that it had pursued dishonest and corrupt methods, was the most potent cry against it. The people had come to the conclusion that it was high time that honest and decent methods should prevail in the conduct of public affairs, and it was because of that conviction that I believe the late Government was defeated and the new Government brought into power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has been very badly advised, I am afraid, by some who were perhaps afraid to discuss this matter as boldly as the hon. gentleman has done, though they might have understood it a little better. For instance, he has mixed up several accounts and has got tangled up considerably on this question of twine. He has given us the contract for 1895 and the contract for 1896, and did not make the slightest attempt to keep the accounts in proper order. I would call his attention to an answer given in this House on the subject of Mr. Rogers, who, the hon. gentleman said, is a very prominent Conservative. There was another debtor in that list, a member of a firm of Hamilton, whose rating is very high, and one of whom is a member of this House. I do not know how far that is correct. I am told, I do not know how correctly, that the gentleman is a member of this House, but I am told at any rate that the firm is one of very high standing. But take the case of Mr. Rogers who is, as the hon. member says, connected with the Conservative party in Manitoba. The late Minister of Justice was asked as to this account on the 29th January, 1896. The following is the question and answer :—

Has Robert Rogers, of the province of Manitoba, paid the account due from him to the Government for binding twine and reported unpaid last session ? If so, when paid ?

Mr. DICKEY. The amount of the invoice has been paid. There is an amount of about $65 still due for freight prepaid by the penitentiary, which the agent of the department has been instructed to collect.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman assert that the amount owing by Mr. Rogers, this $50,000 or $60,000 has been paid, that it is paid to-day ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely the hon. gentleman understands English. I will read what the late Minister of Justice stated. I take it that he was correctly informed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It may have meant that it was paid by a note, but that is not paying the account.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not say that this was paid by a note. I say the ex-Minister of Justice would have stated what was incorrect and misleading, if he was referring in this case to the giving of a note. What he stated as a matter of fact was that the amount had been paid and not that a note had been given ; and any one who knows Mr. Dickey, who was Minister of Justice at the time, would know that he had no intention of misleading the House and must have spoken as he was advised by the officers of his department. I think the statement made was so extraordinary that the Solicitor General should enlighten the committee. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) disdained to say how he obtained his information. He seemed to think that in regard to Connor's contract he had given information to the committee of a novel character. But it is within the recollection of members of the Public Accounts Committee that last session the question of Connor's contract was taken up and that officers of the department explained the whole transaction. Connor was not only the contractor for the Department of Justice, but also, I believe, for the Central Prison Binding Twine factory. At any rate he was a man, enjoying the confidence of the department before I went into it, and one of the few men the department could lay their hands upon, at all conversant with the business. He had been exceedingly successful in the business in St. John, but was then out of it having sold out to the Cordage Company. He was considered in every way reliable and able. The contract which the hon. gentleman has referred to was made with him, and the securities were given. I cannot state from memory what those securities were ; but, while they were not of the highest class or satisfactory in every respect, they were far beyond the bonds of the Baie des Chaleurs Company, according to Mr. Newcombe's statement before the Public Accounts Committee last session. How much has been paid since I am not aware. But, if my memory serves me aright, we were advised that full security had been given. We were also told by Mr. Newcombe in that examination the particulars in regard to the class of security taken and of those securities not having been so satisfactory as the department desired. The department called for security to be given to the satisfaction of the warden ; and that officer had not reported on this subject as soon as he should have done, or before the contract was in course of being carried out by Mr. Connor. No doubt there was in connection with the contract an unfortunate circumstance in the manner in which it was done. It was not satisfactory. Nevertheless the committee were led to the conclusion, apparently last session, that there

would be no loss to the country in the end. How far that has been realized, is more than I can say. I hope that the statement that has just been made, from what source I cannot in any way gather—it cannot be official, because it is in so many respects obviously incorrect—will be explained by the Solicitor General and that gentleman will give the debtor and creditor side of the account with Mr. Connor.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). As to the source of the information used by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), I may explain briefly. Yesterday that hon. gentleman put a question in the House referring to this contract. The answer would have been long, and I asked the hon. gentleman if he would be good enough either to move for the papers or to come to my office and I would be glad to give him any information in my possession. He called and I stated very frankly and as fully as I could in the time at my disposal what I had to say about this matter. I have no intention of hiding what I said to Mr. Richardson, and I will repeat to the House what I said. The position of this contract was represented by me to be about this: In 1894 we sold about $16,000 of twine through the agency of Mr. John Connor and every dollar of the account was paid. In 1895 our troubles began. In that year a contract was entered into with Mr. Connor, under which contract he should have furnished security that he would pay for the twine that was to be delivered to him, the security to be satisfactory to the warden. Mr. Connor received twine to the value of about $50,000, which he disposed of, and on account of which there is still due the sum of $21,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman goes on, I would ask him what security he has?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Originally we had the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company's bonds.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Only?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is what I understand. Of coure I am giving this information as I gathered it from the documents placed in my hands by the officials of the department. In addition we have certificates of the trustees of the Tobique Valley Railway first mortgage bonds.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. $13,500. We have an order on the trustees of the Tobique Valley Railway Company for first mortgage bonds that we have not got, $7,200. We have a claim against one James Stratton, $12,000, which appears to represent goods sold to him and for which he was indebted to Mr. Connor.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is James Stratton?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have his name, and that is all I know about him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I understand he is a St. John gentleman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In addition to that we have a seven-twelfths interest in a gypsum deposit somewhere in Victoria county, N.B. We have also a one-sixth interest in another gypsum deposit. We have also stock certificate of the John Good Cordage Company of $7,500. We have a note of Mr. Akers for $1,113. I am not sure that it is fair to say that we are going to lose this balance of $29,000. I do not think we are, because we shall sue N. K. and M. Connolly for that balance. The suit has already entered. Our contention is that they were partners with Mr. Connor in this transaction, and we believe, from information we have in the department that we shall be able to collect that $29,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Have you a mortgage on any property?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not that I remember; we have an assignment of different claims to which the hon. member for Pictou referred a moment ago, which I will more fully explain. Now, if we are wrong in law, we stand to lose the $29,000; that is if we do not make out that the Connollys are partners. But if we succeed, we have a chance to make them pay the account. That is exactly the position so far as the department is concerned. But in addition to the legal claims that we have against Connor, we have an assignment from him to the department of different accounts that were due to him for twine furnished under his contract. Among these accounts were one or two that were referred to: one by Mr. Rogers—I do not know anything about Mr. Rogers, I never heard of him before; and the other by Mr. Wood. Since the question was put by the hon. member for Pictou as to the position of the Rogers account, I have made inquiry, and it appears that the Rogers account, stated to have been paid by the Minister of Justice in January, 1896, was the account for goods furnished under the contract of 1894, and that the amount transferred to us still remaining due according to the schedule we have prepared, is the amount due for the contract of 1895 from Connor. I am giving that information as it has been furnished to me. But I think it must be right, because you will notice that the answer of the Minister of Justice was given in January, 1896, and I see this note I speak of was endorsed over to the department in March. Therefore, the matter could not have been in the hands of the Minister of Justice at that time, and he could not have answered that

the matter was settled. Now, about Mr. Wood, I am directed to say that so far as he is concerned, he dealt with Connor to the extent of $32,000. He became suspicious of Connor's dealings and wrote to the department to ascertain whether he should pay this money to Connor or to the department. I have got the letter here somewhere, and I find he was informed that he might deal with Connor, and he did deal with him, and the $1,200 the hon. member for Lisgar referred to as being due by Wood, Vallance & Co. has been paid. That is the information I have from the officers of the department, but the amount is entered in the schedule as still due.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Lest the House might get an impression that I had sought to mislead it in any way in regard to the security, I would ask the Solicitor General to state whether he told me that there was additional security other than the Baie des Chaleur bonds.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, that was the security given in connection with the original transaction.

Mr. BERGERON. If I understood the hon. gentleman, he thinks in law he cannot collect the money from Connolly & Co.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say the contrary.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the hon. gentleman afterwards to say that if we are correct in law, we will get our money back from the firm; if not, he says, we will run the risk of losing it. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he means to say that these securities that are supposed to be in his hands, are good or bad.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My information is that they are substantially valueless. As to the claim against the Connollys, I have been consulting with the Deputy Minister on the subject, and he is of the opinion that they are liable, and from the experience I have had of him to the present time, I think his opinion is of considerable weight and of great value.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What do you think of the Connor liability as regards solvency?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say much about that, but I am told this difficulty was brought about because the Messrs. Connolly, who ought to know all about him, proceeded against him, and that would give the impression that he is not very solvent.

Mr. BERGERON. It is to be regretted that the hon. member for Lisgar did not put his question at first, instead of reading to us a lot of names, because what the Solicitor General tells us is not quite as bad as what the hon. gentleman said.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like the hon. gentleman to point out in what respect we differ.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. First, in regard to the colour which the hon. gentleman from Lisgar gave to his statement, and the colour of the statement of the Solicitor General. I think a business man reading them would be more satisfied with the statement of the Solicitor General than with that of the hon. member for Lisgar. I think the hon. member for Lisgar did not carry the committee with him in withholding information so valuable to the committee at the outset. Had he told us that he had gathered his information after being allowed to examine these papers in the Department of Justice, no one would have quarrelled with that, and we would have been able to follow the information he was giving us. But for some reason he seemed ashamed to let us know where he had found out these facts.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think we must be fair about this. I cannot allow the hon. member for Lisgar to be attacked without defending him on the facts. He had a short conversation with me this morning, and his information on this point, though accurate, was not complete, because I did not give him that information as extensively as I ought to have done, because I was not possessed of it at the time. Since he called upon me about these papers, I went through the whole of them myself, and I had the advantage in addition of having the assistance of the gentleman in the department who is more conversant with this matter. When the hon. gentleman for Lisgar spoke to me about it this morning, I told him that these were matters I did not want him to say much about.

Mr. BERGERON. But he has not followed that advice.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If he manifested any hesitation about expressing the source whence he got his information, it is probably my fault; therefore, if there is any blame in connection with it, I am to blame. Now, to complete the statement of this matter, I may say that for 1896 there were 500 tons, or thereabouts, of binder twine manufactured. Of that quantity, ten tons were sold and 490 tons are still on hand. Kelly, the man with whom the contract was made, not having fulfilled the conditions as to security, the twine was not delivered, and the department is proceeding now to dispose of 490 tons, and we have called for tenders.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is another difference between the statement made by the Solicitor General and the statement of the hon. gentleman for Lisgar. From the statement made by the Solicitor General, it is

apparent that probably the Government will lose nothing at all, because they have taken action against the man whom they hold liable on this claim, and on the advice of the Minister of Justice, no such action would have been taken against the Messrs. Connolly, unless good ground had been found against them by the department. This, of course, changes the condition of the case completely. But this statement of the condition of affairs was withheld from the committee by the hon. member for Lisgar.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think the hon. member for Lisgar withheld that statement, although he did not make it. So far as the Connollys are concerned, I believe myself that we can collect the amount, that is to say, we can get judgment against them, and I believe we can collect the amount too. But my hon. friend knows that we have already a judgment against them of $40,000 which is not paid.

Mr. BERGERON. What I take exception to is the fact that the hon. member for Lisgar got up a few moments ago to ask a question from the Solicitor General, and took advantage of the occasion to make a speech. If he had put his question and waited for the statement made by the Solicitor General, the whole story would not have looked as bad as he presented it to us.

Mr. LISTER. The whole thing is disgraceful to the late Government. It cannot be disgraceful to this Government, because they have nothing to do with it as yet. If the Solicitor General and the Government in power to-day have as much success in collecting this money from Mr. Connor as the late Government had in collecting nearly $900,000, it will be little indeed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That amount was never owing.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman need not try and raise a false issue. There was no want of candour on the part of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), in the statement he made to the committee, which was substantially correct, as the facts were subsequently stated by the Solicitor General. These goods were sold to political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. They were sold on credit, no security, in fact, having been taken, although apparently security was given. The security was of no value. The bonds of such railways as were mentioned were absolutely valueless; and we have this fact before the committee, that the Government sold the products to their friends. The late Government stands accused of using the binding twine factory at Kingston for the purpose of compensating friends through Manitoba and the North-west for political services rendered and to be rendered. Hon. gentlemen opposite may try to excuse themselves, but the fact stands out prominently, that this has been, from first to last, a disgraceful piece of jobbery on the part of the late Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has formed an extravagant opinion on the whole transaction, and it will relieve his mind somewhat in regard to the question of jobbery, when I state that the Government did not sell those products, and, as the Solicitor General has explained, the Government had nothing to do with the sale of those products to Conservatives or to Grits. The only bargain made was with Mr. Connor.

Mr. LISTER. Their agent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And he sold to whomsoever he pleased.

Mr. LISTER. Connor was the agent of the Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was at one time agent of the provincial government of Ontario.

Mr. LISTER. He was the agent of this Government, and he is so described in the contract. Mr. Connor was a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he took care, apparently, to sell throughout Manitoba and the rest of the country, as regards his credit sales, at all events, to people who, apparently, were worth nothing. As regards the firm of Wood & Co., their credit stands pre-eminent in the country. They did not need credit, and, as a matter of fact, their purchases, amounting to upwards of $30,000, have been paid in full. It would be well if the others to whom sales had been made had paid in the same way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With respect to Mr. Connor: he is a warm friend, a personal political friend of an hon. gentleman whom the hon. member follows, the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. ELLIS. With respect to Mr. Connor, I may say that he was at one time a manufacturer of twine and rope of various kinds in St. John, and had quite a number of people in his employ. He joined one of the "combines," closed up his factory—he is a great protectionist—and received an allowance from some association for not working his rope-making factory, so that it was no longer necessary for him to carry on his establishment. I should like to inquire whether he did not sell a large quantity of raw material to the penitentiary? However, that is not a very important matter. This must, however, be said, that Mr. Connor was a most extreme partisan. He seemed to be in the secrets of the then Ministers, and he knew all their movements. I never knew a Minister to pass through St. John without Mr. Connor knowing it, and, if a Minister was prepared to take him to Moncton in his private car, he accepted the invitation. It is certainly a

surprise that these facts have come out, but it has always been a surprise to the people of St. John, Liberals as well as Conservatives, that Mr. Connor was so much in the confidence of the Government, and that he was given those privileges, which he appears to have worked so well to his own advantage. With respect to Tobique Valley Railway, or gypsum bonds, no one would like to be burdened with them. I understand, however, that Mr. Connor has lately stated that all his matters have been very satisfactorily arranged, and that there will be no further trouble in regard to them.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to draw attention to one feature of the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), namely, that the statement made by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was substantially the same as that given by the Solicitor General. The statement of the hon. member for Lisgar was that there was only one kind of security, that of the bonds of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway; but the Solicitor General mentioned two or three kinds. One security was the bonds of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, another was bonds of the Tobique Valley Railway, and there were gypsum bonds and others. When the hon. member for Lisgar read over the names and commented on them, the impression he left on the committee was that those accounts were perfectly valueless; yet among them he read the name of Wood & Co., a partner in that firm being a member of this House.

Mr. LISTER. That firm paid long ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, that firm must have been of good standing. The hon. gentleman said that from the information he could gather, all the accounts were perfectly worthless. This was leaving a false impression on the House. The most charitable conclusion at which we can arrive with reference to the hon. gentleman's conduct is that the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to give information on a subject of which he knew little. He gave the committee only a portion of the information required, but withheld a larger portion of which he should have given to enable the committee to judge this case fairly, and, besides, it was not the same information as was subsequently given by the Solicitor General. No doubt, if we went over the accounts, we would find that many of the parties were all right, and the amounts would be realized at a later date. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am neither defending transactions that should not be defended, or justifying transactions that could have been better done in some other way; but, in all fairness, when the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) attempts to give the House information, he ought to seek to satisfy himself that it is correct before giving it,

Mr. RICHARDSON. With respect to the statement that I displayed a lack of candour, I wish to say this, that I have no excuse to offer, that I obtained my information from the Solicitor General. When the hon. gentleman asked me where I got the information, I did not know whether it would be quite proper for me to state that I obtained it from the Solicitor General, and for that reason I kept silence, and simply said the information was no doubt correct. The Solicitor General has risen in his place and told the House that the information I have given was correct.

Mr. SPROULE. It was not correct. Was the reference to the security correct?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The information was probably not as ample as that supplied by the Solicitor General, but in so far as the information went it was correct. Now with regard to the security question. I said that according to my information the only security that the Government had when the contract was given to Mr. Connor, was these worthless Baie des Chaleurs bonds. The Solicitor General has just informed me that that is true, and that there was subsequent security furnished. I am quite sure that hon. gentlemen know that if there was any additional security and if I knew it, I would be very glad to tell it. Do hon. gentlemen suppose that a young man would enter this House and deliberately try to mislead it. Why, it would be against my own interests to state anything that was not absolutely true, and what information I gave to the House this evening was the information obtained from the Solicitor General, and the Solicitor General has told the committee that the information I gave was correct. It was not as ample as was given by the Solicitor General, but it was accurate as far as it went. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) charged that there was a discrepancy between the statement I made, and the statement the Solicitor General made. He said that I stated that the country might lose this $27,000, but that the Solicitor General said that this money might be recovered from the Connollys. With regard to that point all I have to say is, that if that money can be recovered from N. K. Connolly and Michael Connolly, there is no thanks to the late Government for it. It was merely an accident, and perhaps a fortunate accident in one sense, that these men may have made enough money out of this country in boodling, so that we may collect this sum from them. Now with regard to the account of Mr. Rogers. I stated that according to my information Mr. Rogers owed $850 for binder twine, and the hon. member for Picton (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will see that according to the statement of the Solicitor General I was perfectly correct in that. Mr. Rogers seems to have owed an amount in 1894, and that seems to have been paid, but then he owes $850 for 1895, and that amount is not paid. The fact that Mr.

Rogers is President of the Conservative Association probably accounts for the fact that it was not paid.

Mr. CLANCY. I have listened with some interest to the statement made here to-night, and it is rather a serious charge to say that any hon. gentleman would mislead the House. I am in the judgment of this committee when I ask, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) when he got up and made a fair statement was it without any colour or any animus in it from first to last? The hon. gentleman will hardly contend that himself. In every stage of his remarks he endeavoured to blacken the character of the men connected with the transaction. He could not mention the name of the Connolly Bros. without telling the House that they had been boodlers in the past. I would like to ask at this stage, if the Solicitor General told the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) in any part of the conversation with him, that the Government did hope to recover that sum from the Connolly Bros.? If the Solicitor General did not make that statement he surely should not have sat quietly in his seat, and allowed the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) to give the impression to the House that this money would be a loss to the country. Sir, if that fact was not disclosed in the conversation between the two hon. gentlemen, then I believe that the Solicitor General should have stopped the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and said: "Don't go on with that because we do hope to collect that sum of money and there may be no loss." There is no doubt that the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Lisgar would lead a man without political bias in this House to come to the conclusion that the Government of the day had personally caused these sales to be made to men of a certain political stripe, that in consequence of their political leanings they were permitted to go without paying these debts, and that therefore, to use the classic language of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), the whole thing was used for the purpose of boodling, and the money lost to the country. Sir, if the Solicitor General had made his statement to the House at the outset, everyone would have been perfectly satisfied, and no wrong impression would have been given to the country as to any financial loss accruing. There was another point that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) laid great stress upon. He went so far as not only to make it appear that the country was going to sustain a very great loss from the sale of binder twine, but that it would also sustain a loss because of the non-sale of the twine. He tried to show that a large quantity of twine was being held over, interest being paid upon it presumably, and that in consequence of it not being sold a great loss would accrue. If that hon. gentleman had inquired he would have known that a year ago there was such a fall in the price of fibre for the purpose of manufacturing binder twine, that it was quite possible the twine may be worth 2 cents a pound more next year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CLANCY. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but if they read the evidence of Mr. Noxon one of the Inspectors of Prisons of the province of Ontario, which evidence was given before the Public Accounts Committee of the legislature, they would have a more intelligent appreciation of this subject.

Mr. FLINT. The course of discussion from the other side of the House must prove conclusively that hon. gentlemen opposite have been placed in a very embarrassing position when they are obliged to attack the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). The whole effort of these hon. gentlemen seems to be to try to intimate that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has in some particular failed in his duty to the committee. Let us glance over the statement of the case as made before the committee by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) and let us see if there is anything in it on which hon. gentlemen opposite should congratulate themselves. Let us look on the whole thing as a business transaction, and I ask any business man in this country, if there was ever so ridiculous a business transaction as this which was entered into by a department of a Government. It is supposed that when a department of Government is dealing with a matter of this kind, they will be more careful in looking after the interests of the public even than a private concern would be in looking after its interests. Here we find a new enterprise undertaken by the Government, and one in which great care ought to have been exercised. It ought to have been shown conclusively in the first place, that instead of dealing with first-class business concerns in this country and inducing them to handle the products of the Kingston Penitentiary factory, they dealt with a well-known and leading politician, one who in consequence of his connection with the combine was enabled to close up his factory, receiving from the combines a subsidy, and thus set free to engage in transactions of this kind. The Government, through its agents, with its eyes wide open, with the Department of Justice at the head of it, has entered into a contract with this man, giving him full and absolute control of the product of the Kingston Penitentiary in binder twine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just what the Ontario government is doing.

Mr. FLINT. What the Ontario government is doing is no excuse. The gentleman then proceeds to give the Government security, which I think no business house in

Canada would have accepted for one moment as security for any financial obligation whatever. It is enough to make one smile to have it intimated that bonds of the Tobique Valley Railway Company, or an interest in gypsum mines in the province of New Brunswick would be taken as security for large sums of money due on a business transaction. Yet this was the security taken by the Government, and upon the same $50,000 or $60,000 worth of product belonging to the people of this country was handed over to this man Connor. Following that transaction, when he has closed his connection with the Government, we find that he has handed over to them, as the wreck and refuse of his transactions, claims against an enormous number of leading Conservatives in the province of Manitoba, and some in the province of Ontario, as assets to meet this liability of some $27,000 or $28,000. Taking into consideration the character and political standing of the man who has been given this contract, and taking into consideration the political stripe of the gentlemen to whom he handed over various quantities of this product without pay and without security, I ask if it is not a fair conclusion that through the grossest negligence on the part of the Government directly, or through direct connivance between members of the Government and these men, the property of the public was handed over to political favourites to be used for political purposes. I believe the conclusion is almost irresistible to any impartial mind that the Government must have known the purpose and the object with which this large fund was being made use of by this man Connor; and when we are called upon by hon. gentlemen opposite to congratulate ourselves that we have these ducks and drakes, from which in the course of a few years, after the settlement of disputed and doubtful points of law, we may recover something, I think they are trying to satisfy their minds with something which the country will not be satisfied with. It is possible that we may have a big pile of costs to pay by and by; but I think that any impartial student of these accounts must conclude that it is very doubtful if we shall ever see a cent of the money.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In connection with the security, I wish to make one point clear, which perhaps I did not make sufficiently clear. When the contract was entered into for the sale of the product of 1895, the security taken at the time was exclusively Baie des Chaleurs bonds. After the twine was disposed of, and after the deficiency was established, then it became necessary for the Department of Justice to ascertain how the account stood, and to get a settlement. Then, in March, 1896, a contract was made, under which an assignment was taken by the Department of Justice of the accounts remaining due, to represent the $29,000, and other securities, among which were the Tobique Valley Railway securities. In order to put the House in possession of all the facts, I think I ought to place at the disposal of the House a list of all the securities, because there were a lot of others in addition to those mentioned.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that all, besides the Connolly affair?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is all, besides the Connolly affair. I will put the House in possession of all the securities, and the House may come to the conclusion as to what they are worth.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say to the hon. Solicitor General and to the hon. member for Lisgar that this matter was before the Public Accounts Committee last session. I was a member of that committee, and the officers of the department came there and declared that the security was ample. That is on record in the report of the proceedings of the committee, which I sent for to the distribution office a few minutes ago, but the office was closed. I think, therefore, that the item ought to stand until these hon. gentlemen read that report.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If that is the case, I want to know it, and am willing to let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think, considering the hour, that the item may stand; and I think, too, that it is desirable that this matter should be more fully investigated.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are other members of the Public Accounts Committee present, and they will know that what I state is correct. I wish to say, further, that the output of the penitentiary this year was to be disposed of, but it was not given to Mr. Connor. But the Ontario government, knowing that Mr. Connor was the best man in the Dominion to handle the output of binder twine, have entered into an arrangement with him to handle their output this year on the same terms.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Does the hon. gentleman state that the terms on which the Ontario government dealt with Mr. Connor were the same terms as those made by this Government?

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is not the same man.

Mr. TAYLOR. I made this statement: that the Ontario government believed that this Mr. Connor, who handled binder twine for the Dominion Government, was the best man for that purpose, and they arranged with him to sell their output for this year, and he has done so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman said that the Ontario government had made a bargain on the same terms.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the same terms.

Mr. LANGELIER. On the same security?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say on the same security.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman know the security taken by the Ontario government?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not in the confidence of the Ontario government, as the hon. gentleman is, and he can get the facts.

Mr. McHUGH. I think this House is indebted to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) for having brought this matter to their attention this evening. I think he has exposed a transaction which reflects no credit on the late Government. Some hon. gentlemen, supporters of the late Government, have said that the securities were good. I would like to ask those hon. gentlemen why they have made no attempt before now to collect on these securities if they were good. They have said that the accounts are good. If so, it is high time they were paid or an attempt made to collect them. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), I think it was, found fault with the late Government because they did not sell this year's output and made another loss on that. It is quite possible for the country to have suffered two losses from the way this transaction was managed. In the first place, there was the sale of the output to men who were not responsible; and in the second place, there was the failure to sell this year's output to men who were responsible, and in that way there were two losses. The hon. member for Pictou said it would be an advantage for the Government not to put this year's output on the market. Does he expect this Government to go into the business of speculating in binder twine and holding over from one year to another what they should put on the market. Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the Ontario government. Well, if the Ontario government managed their affairs in this way, they would not be where they are to-day, and would not have the confidence of the people of the province. No charge of corruption has ever been brought home to their doors. An hon. gentleman has said that the people expected us to transact the business of this country by following the same business methods that we would in conducting our own private affairs. Well, is there any one who would transact his own private affairs on the security these hon. gentlemen have accepted in these transactions, and I consider this whole business demands more investigation than it has had this night.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We will let this item stand and go on with others.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... $107,800

Mr. BERGERON. There was a rumour that a very prominent prisoner of the penitentiary stood a chance of being pardoned, and I might say that the people of the constituency which I have the honour to represent are very much exercised over this rumour. I refer to the prisoner Shortis. The newspaper mentioned that his mother was here, and that steps were being taken to obtain his release. Is that true or not?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I never heard of the rumour before to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an increase of $8,508. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the result of the working of the new system. Under that system, which has been adopted by the Department of Justice in the last year or two, the working of the quarry is under the penitentiary branch of the Department of Justice.

Dorchester Penitentiary $51,650

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an increase in this of $3,074. What is the information?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The first increase is in salaries, $1,130. That includes the salary of the matron, $500, and the difference in salary of two guards, $200, and one teamster, $200, estimated under the new schedule and appointed under the old schedule. Then, there is the difference arising out of the statutory increases.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought the salaries of the guards were regulated by scale.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These are according to scale.

Mr. GILLIES. What are the names of the instructors in the different departments of the penitentiary at Dorchester?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The report of the Minister of Justice for 1895, page 170, gives the names of the instructors. Charles Miller is carpenter instructor, and John Downey, blacksmith instructor.

Mr. GILLIES. When was he appointed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On the 1st May, 1868.

Manitoba Penitentiary $44,150

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is a saving here of $3,643. What is the explanation of that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are increases in the salary list but there are certain decreases also. One of these is in the expenses of the uniforms. The House will understand that there are some years when the suits required are more numerous than others. There is also the fact that a better class of cloth has been used in making the suits. Then as to the maintenance,

there is a considerable saving, resulting from the better supervision over the officer's mess and also the increase of the farm products.

British Columbia Penitentiary..... $46,200

Mr. SPROULE. In this there is an increase.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is an increase on account of repairs in re-roofing the main prison. Another increase is in supplying plant for brick-making. It appears that the penitentiary is built where they can get but little stone, but there is material that can be used to make brick, and they utilize the labour of the convicts in this manufacture. Of course plant had to be supplied.

Mr. PRIOR. That is a new industry.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, September 18th, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to make a personal explanation. After I left the House last night, an hon. gentleman read a list of debtors to the Government for binder twine, and in that list was the name of the firm of which I have the honour to be the head. We were put down in it as owing the Government $1,200. I wish to say most emphatically that we do not owe the Government one cent. When an hon. gentleman asked a question in the House, the other day, with reference to the binder twine business, I telegraphed to my friends to send me down a statement of our twine account with the Government. It came down by the next mail, and I handed it to the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It showed that we paid every sixpence the Government had against us. This morning I received a letter from my partner, in which he says :

Your telegram of yesterday afternoon reached me at 5.25, which left only a few minutes to send the information asked for. However, I mailed you last night copies of the statements which we sent to the Warden of the Kingston Penitentiary on the 31st March last. I now inclose a copy of our letter to the warden which accompanied the statements, and which more fully explains the difference arising between the amount claimed in their statement and the amount which we remitted them in settlement. I trust that the statements which I sent you last night gave you all the desired information.

The following is a copy of the statement sent by our firm and addressed to the warden of the Kingston Penitentiary :—

March 31, 1896.

To the Warden, Kingston Penitentiary,
Kingston, Ont.

Dear sir,—Herewith we beg to hand you our cheque for $1,074.55 in favour of Dominion Government binder twine, being balance due on twine as per statement attached. We also inclose memo. showing where the difference arises between your statement and ours.

Amounts entered in your statement as $4,200. (June 18th, $1,050 ; June 24th, $2,100 ; July 23rd, $1,050.) $5.48 May 6th.

We have no trace or record of these whatever, nor are they included in Mr. Connor's memo. to us of July 31st.

$632.28. Difference in freights. We were to be allowed 25 cents on all North-west shipments and carload rate between Kingston and point of delivery on all others.

$731.25. Returns not credited. We have marked "x" on our statement returns you have not given us credit for.

$54.21. This is for freight we had to allow on twine reshipped on account of balls being too large and also late shipments not accepted.

$2.31. Telegrams to North-west re twine.

$3.00. Difference in price of Maple Leaf twine. Mr. Connor agreed to put this in at 5½ cents.

$193.66. Difference in cash account. As we repeatedly wrote Mr. Connor for statement, without effect, we feel that we are entitled to full cash discount. We deduct full amount, $1,003.66, while in your statement you allow only 3 per cent on $27,000, equals $810.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) WOOD, VALLANCE & CO.

We received an acknowledgment of this statement from the penitentiary, accepting it as correct. Now, when we were making our contract with the gentleman named here, we knew quite well the character of the man with whom we were dealing, and we refused to make a contract until we had the authority from the Government that he was authorized to make a contract for the sale of binder twine. When he asked for payment, we refused until we had the authority of the Deputy Minister of Justice for whatever payments we might make. We gave him one cheque, I believe, for $7,000 and a cheque for $18,500, and we sold him three cars of twine for $3,000. These figures make up the amount of our transactions with the Government, and I was quite surprised to see that our name was on the list of debtors. To whose fault this is due, I

do not know, but it is certainly an error and I wish to place myself right before the House. I wish to say that we do not owe the Government one cent. If we did owe the Government anything, we would be prepared to pay it, but we do not owe them a farthing. I would like to thank the gentleman upon the other side of the House who gave my firm rather a high character in this House last night. I am very much obliged for that.

MAJOR GENERAL CAMERON'S RESIGNATION.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I desire to lay upon the Table of the House the letter asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition addressed by Gen. Gascoigne to Gen. Cameron. I will make the necessary motion that an order of the House do issue for the production of this letter.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is covered by an order of the House already issued, and this letter should be regarded as a supplementary return.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if he will be good enough to lay on the Table also the letter addressed to him by Gen. Cameron a day or two ago which has relation to this matter—a letter of the 15th or 16th of September.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to a letter addressed by Major General Cameron to the Minister of Militia? Did that letter refer to travelling allowance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It referred to this whole question. Will the hon. Minister lay on the Table of the House any correspondence on this subject not already brought down.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have here a copy of a letter from Major General Cameron dated the 5th September.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The letter I refer to was dated the 16th September.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will look that letter up.

SUPPLY—SCHOONERS SEIZED BY THE RUSSIANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Government what progress has been made toward the settlement of the claims made by the owners of the schooners "Willie McGowan" and "Ariel," seized by the Russians.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would like to point out that on calling of the Orders of the Day no questions are permitted of which notice can be given. It is altogether irregular to ask questions at this stage without proper notice. Of course, if the subject is one of great public interest and of immediate urgency, a question may be asked, but the Government may answer it or not as they see fit. I do not wish hon. members to get into the habit of asking ordinary questions at this stage.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This is a matter that I consider of extreme importance.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) will realize that it would be impossible, without notice given, to furnish the information he asks for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman's question. He did not give me any notice of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish by any suggestion to limit the right of any member to bring up any subject for discussion, but only to refer to the asking of questions of which notice might be given. Of course, an hon. member can ask questions, but it is at the option of the Government to answer.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I hope this will serve as if it were a notice for a future day, as there might not be time to put it on the Notice paper and then reach it in the regular way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There will be plenty of time. Let the hon. gentleman put the notice on the paper now; it will appear on Monday, and I can answer it then.

THE DISMISSAL OF WEBSTER AUGUSTUS.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to a matter of supreme importance as affecting an individual. I spoke to the hon. Minister yesterday and gave him the name of the individual in question, and he told me he would be prepared to answer the question to-day. The gentleman I refer to is Captain Augustus, of Kingston, a gentleman who has been engaged for some years in the Militia Stores Department. On the 28th August he received this letter:

Kingston, 28th August, 1896.

Mr. Webster Augustus,
Kingston.

Sir,—I am directed by the Director of Stores to inform you that by direction of the Honourable the Minister, your services will be dispensed with from the 1st September next.

Your obedient servant,
F. STRANGE,
Captain, S. of S., M.D. 3.

This was the only intimation he received that his services would be dispensed with after faithful service. Captain Augustus writes :

Sir,—I was notified of my discharge (as sail-maker) from the militia stores on the 28th August, for what reason I do not know. If it was for interfering in politics, I defy any person, either Liberal or Conservative, to prove that I took any part in the last Dominion election. All I ask is a hearing, then I will have an opportunity to make a statement to show where an error has been made in my dismissal. Inclosed are a few statements that I have received from gentlemen who say that they will make affidavit if it is necessary. Mr. Britton——

I suppose this refers to the hon. member for Kingston.

—is personally acquainted with these gentlemen, I think. I will thank you if you can procure me a hearing.

I am, yours respectfully,
WEBSTER AUGUSTUS.

The testimonials he incloses are signed, one by E. W. Sullivan, one by S. Anglin, one by H. H. Taylor and one by Hugh Doney. They are all in substance the same. I will read only one of them :

Kingston, August 26th, 1896.

To whom it may concern,—

As secretary of Rideau ward of the Conservative Association of this city, I asked Captain Webster Augustus to turn out election day and work for D. M. McIntyre, Conservative candidate. He refused point-blank to do anything of the kind. I am in a position to swear to the above if necessary.

E. W. SULLIVAN,
Secretary, Rideau Ward.

So, Captain Augustus says he does not know why he has been dismissed and states that if it is for interference in the elections he is not guilty, and all he asks is a hearing before the hon. Minister who dismissed him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I do not understand the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to charge that this man was removed for political reasons. I can assure the hon. gentleman that, so far as I am aware of the facts, such is not the case. I was advised by my deputy that this man was an employee by the day, that his services were no longer required and he was given notice accordingly. That is all I know about the case.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is to be taken up first ?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Militia, beginning with item 106.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought you were going on with the Justice Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I thought that might be debatable, and I wanted to take this up, believing it would be unopposed.

Pay of staff, permanent corps and active militia, including allowances..... $347,650

Mr. SPROULE. I notice by the papers lately that some difficulty has occurred in connection with the Queen's Own in Toronto. Will the hon. gentleman inform me whether the rumour is correct which appears in the press that Lt.-Col. Hamilton is to be reinstated in that regiment, and what is the nature of the trouble ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Nothing whatever has been done with reference to the matter of the Queen's Own regiment since I came into the department. I have had no opportunity of taking up the case. Col. Hamilton has not been reinstated, nothing whatever has been done. I hope when the session is over, to get an opportunity of taking up the case and settling it one way or the other.

Salaries and wages of civil employees... $62,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend, in continuation of the question I put to him some time ago, whether he has yet dismissed Capt. Mackenzie from the caretaker's office on the Sussex property.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He still remains.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend made up his mind whether to retain him permanently ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I find that Capt. Mackenzie seems to be employed at present as caretaker on the rifle range at Sussex, at a salary of $1.25 per day, with an allowance of 30 cents a day. I have had no opportunity of enquiring whether it is necessary to keep an officer there ; but nothing whatever has been done in the direction of removing Capt. Mackenzie.

Warlike and other stores..... $35,350

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would like to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence that, now he has charge of the department, we shall find our regiments getting proper equipment. At the present moment they are in a position that is hardly creditable. We have a large force on paper, and if they were called out to-morrow they would have little or nothing to go with. I only call his attention to the matter now. I propose to take up the details on an occasion when he will permit me.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps this would be as good an opportunity as any to ask how far the delivery of the artillery and rifles ordered last year, has proceeded ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say to the hon. gentleman that 9,000 of the 40,000 rifles ordered last year, have been delivered. I am not aware that any of the artillery has been delivered yet.

Mr. TISDALE. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to a matter that I brought up on some statements in the newspapers, and concerning which I had the honour to submit an Order in Council to the late Government, and which was passed, in regard to the purchase of the Oliver equipment. I had not an opportunity at that time, under the orders, to make the statement in regard to it which I wished to make. It is true, as stated in the newspapers, that the late Government passed an Order in Council authorizing the acquisition of the right to the Oliver equipment for the militia of Canada, both permanent and active, for $5,000. I understood from the Minister of Militia and Defence at that time that that order had been repealed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It has not.

Mr. TISDALE. Then if it has not been repealed, I wish to call his attention to my view and to the view of the late Government, that it would be much to be regretted if it were repealed. At that time not only had it been recommended by the Major General in command of the forces, and had received strong recommendations from the militia force, but I also understood that it had been strongly recommended by General Wolseley and by Sir Redvers Buller, as being the most efficient equipment that had hitherto been discovered. We were given to understand that it could be acquired for $5,000. I thought it desirable, from the representations made to me by the officers of the department, that some equipment should be adopted, because it is very difficult to get a proper equipment unless one of that sort is adopted. In view of the strong representations of the gentlemen I have mentioned, who are so well qualified to judge, I think it would not be desirable to repeal that order. If we ever expect to acquire it for so low a sum as that, immediate advantage would have to be taken of the offer, for the reason that the gentleman who had invented this equipment, in consideration of getting immediate payment, was willing to take a very much less sum than he would be willing to take at a later time. I understood from the Minister of Militia and Defence that the Major General had subsequently, not exactly changed his mind, but had recommended, because of experiments going on in Great Britain, that it might be desirable to delay the acquisition of that equipment. Now, I think if the delay took place there would be danger of its costing this country a good deal more ; and in view of the recommendations of these distinguished men who were so well able to judge, I think it would be to a certain extent not exactly as a breach of faith, because the Order in Council could not of course bind the incoming Government or the House to take it, as the vote had not been given, but something which should not be done. I still hope that the Minister will again confer with these gentlemen and consider the importance of acquiring this equipment, which I believe the force generally who have taken the trouble to examine it, approve as being the best and cheapest equipment obtainable.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would ask the Minister to ascertain whether there is not a new equipment that would be worth looking into before he purchases the Oliver equipment. I do not speak from actual knowledge, but I am told that something has either come out, or is about to come out, which, perhaps, is an improvement. Now, I would like to see the Militia Department moving in an effective manner. I might point, perhaps, to one regiment in which I am interested, where we find a corps going about with bits of worn out ropes or leather round their waist, called a sword belt, year in and year out, and whenever you make application for a supply you get the answer, None on hand, or, none to issue. Now, I am not finding fault about our getting an equipment, but I say it would be well for the Minister to ascertain whether there is not a new equipment which would be an improvement on the Oliver. I have no doubt that the Oliver equipment would be very good and very serviceable if we had to go to the front. With the present equipment it is just like sending soldiers to the front with no boots. How can men march without boots ? Now, I am not merely speaking for myself ; I know that the militia have ideas and views of their own regarding their requirements. I can point to my own regiment. We have rifles issued to us, the strap of which is disgraceful. We never took them out of the packing case, yet we are held responsible, for they are charged against us. We either have to abandon them or use them, and by

and by we find the leather all stretched with the rain, and when we complain we are told, Oh, it was ordered. Now, I suggest to the Minister that before he commits his department and the taxpayers of Canada, to any vast expenditure, it would be well for him to look into what is going on in the world generally, and make up his mind, perhaps with the assistance of some of the corps, as to what would be in their judgment most beneficial and useful.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may be permitted to say a few words in addition to what has been said by the late Minister of Militia (Mr. Tisdale), and the reason why I rise is that the Oliver equipment came under the notice of the Department of Militia when I happened to be the head of that department. As to the excellence of that equipment there can be no possible question, either in this House or outside of it, because that point has been settled by the highest authority known to the Imperial service, and, in fact, all over the world, so far as practical experience is concerned. Field Marshal General Wolseley has, on more than one occasion, recommended it, for, if my memory serves me, when the equipment was first submitted to the Department of Militia and Defence, of which I was then the head, the samples sent to the department were accompanied by a letter highly recommending its adoption, from Lord Wolseley, who at that time was not Field Marshal. I fully agree with the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville), that, in matters of this kind, it is very desirable we should be practical, but I hardly see that the hon. gentleman is practical, when he states that we should not adopt for the service of Canada this new equipment, even although experience shows it to be the best possible equipment at the present time, because experiments are being made. Experiments are carried out every day, and the trouble in regard to the adoption of the Oliver equipment in Canada is the strong opposition of contractors abroad. I do not object to that competition, but I am giving it as a reason why the Oliver equipment—although I admit, it is the best known at the present time—has not been adopted, and that opposition arises from those who are experimenting in equipments in England and here. Let me ask hon. members who are familiar with the requirements of the force, to look into the Oliver equipment, and determine whether or not it is desirable to introduce it into the force. The weight being distributed by means of straps, renders it the very best equipment known. When it was proposed to introduce into Canada a system of manufacturing tunics and uniforms for the Canadian force, similar opposition was raised. Where did the opposition come from? It came from the contractors in England, who, at that time, were receiving $200,000 a year from this Dominion, and who opposed the system by which we succeeded in keeping in Canada that money and using the labour of Canada to produce the goods. That was the reason why that change was made. The same opposition will be met with by the present Minister of Militia, so far as the Oliver equipment is concerned. Dr. Oliver, who is a surgeon, has built his equipment on scientific principles and from his experience as a surgeon; otherwise it would not be the perfect equipment now furnished. The fact that at the present time he occupies an important position in the Imperial service, that of Surgeon General to the garrison at Halifax, indicates his high qualifications. When hon. members look into the question, as regards the requirements of the Canadian force, as I have done, they will, no doubt, be convinced that this equipment should be adopted. I will now state to the House why it was not adopted when I was Minister of Militia, and this may be necessary, in order that hon. members may understand why I am now advocating its adoption. The only conditions under which Dr. Oliver would hand over his patent to the Canadian Government, involved greater expenditure than the department felt justified in making at that time; but it must be remembered that the amount demanded at that time was very much greater than the small sum of $5,000 now asked, which appears to remove any possible objection to the purchase of the patent. When I was Minister, $12,000 or $14,000 were asked, and, after discussion, the amount was reduced to $10,000. At that time the General in command considered this equipment better than any in the Imperial service, and I am told by the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that the Major General in command has recommended it. I look upon it as the very best equipment that could be adopted. A very good equipment is that invented by Mr. Lewis, which is known to the Militia Department here. I hope, when the matter is considered—and I must admit that the Oliver equipment seems to me to meet all the requirements of the force—that the Lewis equipment will be given a trial, in order that we may be able to judge of the respective merits of both systems.

Mr. DOMVILLE. If the Oliver equipment commended itself to the Minister of Militia, why did he not buy it when he was in office? What was his object in waiting? If there was a pressing necessity, why did not the Minister of Militia purchase it then, instead of asking the present Government to do so? Now the hon. gentleman is asking the department to adopt an equipment which may be superseded by some better system.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The fact that I did not commit myself as Minister of Militia is possibly the reason why it was not tried at that time. The fact of the hon. gentleman waiting until the last experiment

has been tried, means that we will never adopt anything, because experiments are going on every day and they are improving every day. We know what it has been so far as rifles are concerned, and it would simply be absurd to expect us to wait until the last experiment before we select an equipment.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) pretty effectually answered himself. First, he told us that the Oliver equipment was offered to him some years ago for $14,000, but as it has come down to $5,000 now, it is a pretty good argument in favour of waiting. If we wait a little longer perhaps it might come down further.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You might get it for nothing.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman weakened his case in favour of the Oliver equipment by stating, that while he hoped we should adopt it, he trusted also we would look as favourably as possible upon the Lewis equipment. The hon. gentleman admits, therefore, that there are some other equipments beside the Oliver which deserve the attention of the Government. Now the position is exactly this: the late Government, after having had the Oliver equipment before them for a very long time, very shortly before they went out of office decided to pay Dr. Oliver $5,000, simply for the right of being allowed to use his patent. Since I came into the department I have discussed this question with the officers, more particularly with the general officer commanding, and I have been advised by him that important experiments in reference to equipment are being made in England at the present moment, which are sure to be decided within two or three weeks of this time. I was advised by him strongly to suspend judgment until we learn the result of these important investigations in England. The Order in Council has not been rescinded. The hon. gentleman from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) seemed to think that we were under some obligation to Dr. Oliver because of that Order in Council. I scarcely think so. The hon. gentleman answered himself in that argument, when he said that the Government could not possibly bind Parliament. I, for one, as Minister of Militia do not propose to ask Parliament to vote $5,000 to pay Dr. Oliver for his patent, if it is not the very best equipment that can be found in the world. When the country goes to the expense of supplying its citizen soldiers with this very necessary article, we should take very great care that we provide them with the very best thing of the kind extant. That is the course which the Government proposes to pursue in this matter.

Mr. CASEY. It is very natural that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) should try to justify his line of conduct when he was Minister of Militia. As my hon. friend the Minister (Mr. Borden) has pointed out, the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) when Minister of Militia had not the courage to implement what he states now were his opinions of the Oliver equipment, by buying it, but he now urges his successor in office to do so. Sir, the Dutch auction that has been going on, on the part of Surgeon General Oliver, offering his equipment a little lower every year, certainly does not seem to indicate that it is increasing in value. Another point which the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) has has never been accepted as the equipment has been before the British army authorities for 20 years at least, has been experimented on by them to a large extent, and has never been accepted as the equipment for British soldiers. If Lord Wolseley, Commander-in-Chief, were now as strongly in favour of the Oliver equipment as he was when he gave the letter referred to, it would undoubtedly by this time be the equipment of the British army. The whole thing has the air, to me, of being an attempt to sell damaged goods in the colonies. This thing, after long inquiry and experiment, has been found not good enough for the Imperial service and it has been tried to shove it off on one of the colonies.

As a practical measure I would suggest to the Minister of Militia that before he decides on any equipment for the Canadian militia, numerous samples of any equipment under consideration should be sent out to the different corps to be tried during a few weeks' actual service in camp, so that the men who have to wear the equipment will be able to judge as to its convenience in actual use. Canadians, Sir, are an inventive people. There are a good many in Canada specially versed in the carrying of weights through rough countries, men who have had experience in lumber camps, &c., and I would urge therefore that some inducement be offered, a prize or something of that sort, for inventions in this line. I believe that we are just as likely to get as good an invention in the way of equipments from a Canadian source, as from a British or from any other source. If attempts were made, say, during the coming winter, to get samples of equipments, we would have some of Canadian origin to try next summer, and in all probability, from the circumstances of the case, they would be much better than those invented elsewhere.

My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) says there can be no possible question as to the superiority of this Oliver equipment. I have pointed out already that there is such a very serious question about it, that it has never been adopted in the army in which it has been invented, and in which it has been tried. He laid great stress on Dr. Oliver being a surgeon general. Perhaps he is not aware—for there are a

great many military things he is not aware of—that this distinction is simply the result of being a certain number of years in the service as an army surgeon, and it does not indicate any very distinguished standing or ability on the part of the man who holds it.

Mr. PRIOR. Does not that apply to a general just as well ?

Mr. CASEY. He is not surgeon general of the British army ; he is "a surgeon general," which is a very different thing. The opinions of the hon. member for Three Rivers in regard to equipments are not probably of any more value than his opinions as a Minister were on a notable occasion when our men were using ammunition in the field in the North-west. When, in 1885, I asked the hon. gentleman if it were true as reported, that the cartridges served out to our soldiers in actual service were not as good as they ought to be, he calmly told me across the floor of the House : that they were certainly not quite good enough to use at practice at the targets, but they were quite good enough for use in the field. I submit that the opinions of the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) on matters of equipment, ammunition, &c., are not deserving of any very great weight in this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to prolong this discussion, but I think there must be some mistake in connection with the statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia to the House. This question is one of a good deal of importance. It is well known that the late Government made provision for a very much increased means of equipping and arming the militia. Parliament was asked for a very large expenditure for the purpose of putting the militia of Canada in the most efficient state possible. We found that this question of the Oliver equipment was one which it was very important should be promptly decided. If it were true that this was the best invention that had ever been presented for the service of soldiers in the field, it was of great importance to Canada, at a time when we were about to undertake a very extensive improvement in the equipment of the militia force of Canada, that we should have the very best means available for that purpose. My hon. friend the former Minister of Militia (Mr. Tisdale) has stated, and stated correctly, that the question of having an equipment of the very best character, one that can be borne with the least fatigue by a soldier marching, is of vital importance to the force. Under these circumstances, the matter was naturally brought to the attention of the late Government, and my hon. friend the late Minister of Militia has stated to the House, what is the fact, that he brought down to Council the recommendation of the general officer commanding, Major General Gascoigne, recommending the adoption of the Oliver equipment ; and the Order in Council passed by the Government adopting that equipment, was based upon the advice of Major General Gascoigne. Now, I can hardly understand how that can coincide with the Major General's opinions being of such a flexible character that he could recommend the next day the very reverse. The Governor General in Council acted upon the recommendation of the Minister of Militia, supported by the recommendation of Major General Gascoigne ; and, having offered one-half of the sum that was asked by Surgeon General Oliver for the patent of his equipment, the Government felt that they would be warranted in purchasing that patent at the small sum of $5,000, or one-half of what had previously been asked for it. An Order in Council was therefore submitted, passed, and signed by the Governor General, and Surgeon General Oliver having been informed that his equipment had received the approval of the Governor General in Council, and an Order in Council having been passed and signed by the Governor General to complete the transaction. I think it is a little late in the day for an officer of high standing, who ought to know his own mind, to find that his views are so flexible that he can change them and recommend a postponement. The hon. Minister of Militia says that in three weeks we shall have this question determined in England. Why, he has just heard from the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that this question has been before the authorities in England for twenty years, and that they have not decided it yet. I do not know that the hon. gentleman was exactly correct in that statement : but I do not think it at all unlikely ; and I have myself knowledge enough of the extremely conservative character of all arrangements made by the Imperial Government, to know that it is next to an impossibility to get anything changed, however important and necessary a change may be. The fact remains that one of the most distinguished officials in Her Majesty's service, a gentleman known not only throughout the British Empire, but throughout the world, Lord Wolseley, has borne again and again the most unqualified testimony to this equipment, as being superior to anything that is now in use, or that has ever been devised for the purpose. That opinion from so high an authority as Lord Wolseley, a gentleman who has had experience again and again of commanding a force in the field, and is, therefore, in a position to recognize the vital importance of this question, is backed up and sustained by another gentleman of the highest standing in the British army, General Redvers Buller, who has also testified, after careful examination, that this equipment has never been equalled by any other invention submitted for the purpose. Under these circumstances, I think the late Government will hardly be found blameworthy in having consented, at a time when they had proposed to make a very great improvement in preparing the militia force of this

country for the discharge of their duty, to adopt a patent so highly recommended, on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia, supported by the recommendation of the general officer commanding the militia force. I may say that Lord Wolseley has not only had wide experience elsewhere, but he has had experience, and very valuable experience, of the Canadian militia as well. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman's statement that this Order in Council has not been rescinded, and I hope it will never be rescinded. After the Government having entered into a contract with this gentleman, who has spent a great deal of time and money in preparing the invention, declared by the highest military authorities to be the best that has ever been produced for the purpose, I can hardly believe, even though this Order in Council had the misfortune to be passed by the late Government, that party feeling, or any other feeling, in this House will be carried to the length of destroying or changing an agreement which has been entered into with such deliberation by the late Government, and supported by such high authority. We all recognize the opinion of the hon. member for King's on these military questions ; but I think he will at once himself see that this decision was arrived at with the utmost care and deliberation, and that it would be impossible ever to arrive at a conclusion on any question, if one waited until there was no person in the world to come forward and claim to have invented something better than that already produced. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Militia and the Government will carefully consider this matter ; and, if they do, I am quite sure that this arrangement will be carried to a satisfactory conclusion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend may disabuse his mind of any idea that there is the slightest party feeling in this matter. In fact, I do not know to what political party Dr. Oliver belongs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Neither do I, but I can inform the hon. gentleman that, as an officer in the Imperial service he refused to have anything to do with our party politics.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman seemed to run away with the idea that I was acting from some party motives.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not on account of the inventor, but on account of the fact that this arrangement was made by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I admit that, on general principles, it might be pretty safe to go in the opposite direction of the late Government, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that I was not governed by any such idea in this matter. It is only fair to the general officer commanding, who, I think, has been handled rather unfairly by the hon. gentleman, to say that he has not intimated any change of mind whatever. He has simply said that having ascertained, after this Order in Council was passed, that a crucial investigation into this whole question was going on in England, where certainly such investigation can be best carried on by the War authorities, he advised this department, and he would have failed in his duty had he not done so, to wait before carrying out the Order in Council we are discussing, until we know we are getting the best article for our money.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would like to correct the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper). The hon. member for Three Rivers said that Major General Oliver was stationed at Halifax. He is not stationed here. The hon. member for Cape Breton said that he was an officer of the Imperial army and a surgeon general. He is not now on the active list in the army. Like many others who have acquired age, he has had to retire. Major General or Surgeon General Oliver, or whatever his title may be, is not an officer today in the British service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. It is in my knowledge that, at this moment, Surgeon General Oliver is in the employ of Her Majesty's service in that capacity at Halifax.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I hold in my hand the Army List and his name is not there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot help that. He is, at this moment, in the pay of the Imperial Government.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Here is the Imperial Army List, the one last issued, and Major General Oliver is not in the army in any capacity whatever.

Mr. TISDALE. When was that list published ?

Mr. DOMVILLE. The 1st July, 1896.

Mr. CASEY. It may possibly be that Surgeon General Oliver may have been temporarily employed in some capacity by the Imperial Government, but it is clear, from their own official statement, that Surgeon General Oliver is not an officer of the British army in active service at present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I undertake to assert that Surgeon General Oliver is at this moment in the service of the Imperial Government.

Mr. CASEY. I call the hon. gentleman to order. I insist that the Army List be

taken in preference to any personal statement of the hon. member for Cape Breton. He cannot know as well as the authorities who issued the Army List. It is absurd to put his statement of personal knowledge against that. It is also absurd for the hon. gentleman to keep harping on the support of General Wolseley to this particular pet equipment of the hon. gentleman, for he has certainly taken it under his special charge, not realizing that in so doing he is taking the best way of making it unpopular with those who have to decide the question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear. That is just what they repudiate.

Mr. CASEY. The majority of this House will have the settling of that question, and they are distinctly not prepared to accept the ground that what the hon. gentleman takes under his pet charge is just the thing we ought to get. The hon. gentleman has had pet schemes here before, and they did not materialize. He is not doing Surgeon General Oliver any good with this side of the House, or with either side of the House for that matter, for there are many on both sides who have very small confidence in the hon. gentleman's pet schemes. It is absurd for him to bring up, again and again, the pretension that Lord Wolseley, the Commander-in-chief, is in favour of this equipment. Why, before he made that statement, he was informed by the Minister of Militia and Defence, on the authority of the Major General commanding, that at this moment Lord Wolseley is trying this very equipment, not for the first time, but giving it another chance. It has been tried for years back and failed, and it is being tried again in competition with other equipments. If Lord Wolseley were in favour of that equipment to the extent that the hon. member for Cape Breton would have us believe he is, he would have adopted it and not tried it over again. It is many years since Lord Wolseley wrote the letter quoted by the hon. member for Three Rivers, and at that time it was no doubt the best he had seen. It has been condemned, however, in the British service, and is now being peddled in the colonies, under the patronage of the hon. member for Cape Breton. So much for that little matter, which is a very petty affair in itself. I must, however, join my voice to that of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) in urging upon the Government the necessity of securing some good equipment at a very early date.

I want to ask a question as to the distribution of the 9,000 rifles which the hon. Minister says he has received. By what method does he propose to distribute these rifles—are they to be given, so many to each corps, or according to efficiency in shooting, or what other considerations are to prevail in the distribution?

Mr. TISDALE. I hope the House will permit me a few words before this matter is dropped. I have no intention of prolonging the debate upon it. I regret very much the tone of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I was in office for a very short time, occupying the position now held by the hon. Minister of Militia. While in that position, I endeavoured to eliminate politics from the administration of militia affairs. It is not possible always to do that, but, as far as possible, the Minister of Militia, I believe, ought to keep that as one of the principal rules to be followed. I believe and hope that the present hon. Minister will do so, as he is an old volunteer officer. In getting this equipment adopted, I had one sole object in view—to lighten as much as possible the burden our soldiers have to bear in active service. I took the responsibility, as I would take it again, of recommending this change. Before doing so, I got such recommendations and information as I could, from the Major General commanding, who, in every way—and I wish to bear this testimony to him—took the deepest interest in all these matters connected with the militia. I understood that high military authorities in England had approved this equipment. Further experiment may have improved it. But thirty years ago I bore, as a private soldier, the burden which had to be carried by one who went out at the call of his country. I know that it is an almost intolerable burthen. I asked the Major General whether, under the circumstances and in view of the price asked, it was best to make this change, and, on his recommendation, and with the concurrence of the Government, it was deided upon. I hope that, if there is a better equipment, we may get it. But let us have it soon. Long enough have the volunteers of Canada borne an equipment which they ought not to be compelled to bear. They have been able to bear it, because many of our volunteers, I am proud to say, are young and strong. But still, this equipment is a serious impediment to the performance of their duties in the field. There was no question of party politics about it. The only reason why I brought up this question was to urge that not only should we get the best equipment within our means but that we should get it soon. It is twenty years since it was possible for us to improve upon our present equipment, and improvements have been going on ever since. No doubt, further improvement will be made, but let us not wait five, or ten, or twenty years more, but let us get the best we can now. If there was anything I was proud of doing for my fellow-soldiers, it was proposing this change. I was willing to relieve my successor of this responsibility and I did nothing that I would not be glad to do again.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In reply to the inquiry of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), as to

the new rifles, as I have already said, we have received 9,000. They have been distributed as follows:—Royal Regiments of Infantry, 4 companies, 100 each company, in all 400: camp at Aldershot, N.S., 500; camp at London, Ont., 500; Niagara, 500; Fredericton, N.B., 400; Levis, 400; Laprairie, 500; St. Johns, Que., 400; Charlottetown, P.E.I., 500; Kingston, Ont., 100; total, 3,700. There are 5,000 in store at Quebec, 200 at Kingston, and 100 at Ottawa, making in all 9,000. The rifles shipped for practice to the camps are to be returned into store, when the camps of instruction break up.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Do you mean the old rifles?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the new rifles. They are not to be used except in camp for practice in rifle shooting.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to ask a question or two with relation to the camps. Strictly speaking, this may not come under this item, but probably this is the most convenient time to ask this question. I would like to know, in relation to the camp in King's county, N.S., what arrangements were made to obtain tenders for stores.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. With regard to supplies for camps, I may say that in two of the camps it was found impossible to ask for tenders in the usual way, that is, the camps at London and the camp at Aldershot, which began on 8th September. I was advised by my officers that it would be impossible to advertise for tenders for supplies for these camps, and I was informed that the usual course was to ask the D. A. G. of the district to make the best arrangements he could for supplies, and report to Ottawa for approval. I may say that, when I came into the department, I found a list of names of tradesmen to whom patronage was given whenever supplies were required by the militia. I was informed that these were people who had been utilized by the late Government for this purpose, and I was asked to provide a new list. I believe, to be perfectly frank with the House, that the list which I found in the department was a list of tradesmen belonging to the party supporting the late Government. I was told that such was the case, and I was asked if I wished to supply a new list. I consulted the members for the different counties, and asked them to send me names of reputable tradesmen to make up this patronage list. This was done. When the supplies were wanted for the camp at London, the Deputy Adjutant General was instructed to make his arrangements with those whose names were on the patronage lists. In the same way the Deputy Adjutant General for Nova Scotia was instructed to make the best arrangements he could with those whose names were on the lists supplied to him. I believe that the supplies are being provided at as low rates as ever before—at least, as low—and, therefore, the country has not suffered by the arrangement. I was informed by my officers that this was the course which was always pursued under similar circumstances. As to the other camps, tenders were called for by public advertisement, and in every case the lowest price was accepted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may mention to the hon. Minister that I have been informed differently. Most likely he is correct, but the information that reaches me is that a radical change has been made with regard to public advertisements for tenders. I am told that on the last occasion when a camp was held—I suppose, last year—a notice appeared in the papers asking for tenders, that tenders were put in, and that, in many cases, some of which were named in the letter that I received, Liberals were successful in obtaining the contracts, having put in the lowest tenders. That information, of course, is quite at variance with that of the hon. Minister, as these people would not be on such a list as that he mentions. Nevertheless, the statement was that this year, supposing that the same public competition would be opened, the parties who tendered previously vainly attempted to ascertain where, when, or how tenders should go in. One name was given to me, Mr. Douglas Bent, of Aylesford, who drove into Kentville to put in tenders, and was unable to obtain any information where it could be done. But what makes the information more important is that Mr. Dodge, who is the local Liberal member for the county, and Colonel Chipman, one of the active militia officials of the district—I do not know his particular duty—were given charge, and Mr. Dodge was the lucky individual who got the contract. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is absolutely untrue—not a single word of truth in it, as regards Mr. Dodge having received the contract. Mr. Dodge received no contract, has no interest whatever in the contract. I may say that it was suggested to the Deputy Adjutant General who lived in Halifax, Colonel Irving, who is, I believe, a very strong supporter of the Conservative party, that he should consult Lieut.-Col. Chipman, of the 68th Battalion, who lives near Aldershot, and who has been a life-long Conservative, as the hon. member for Pictou knows, and as the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition knows, and who is one of the strongest supporters those gentlemen have in Nova Scotia. He is also agent of the Bank of Nova Scotia and one of our most respectable and influential citizens. The Deputy Adjutant General was

asked to confer with him and with Mr. B. H. Dodge, local member for the county of King's, and form a sort of board to see that they got their prices for the camp at the lowest possible figure. I think my hon. friend did not catch what I said with reference to a departure. I admit at once that it was a departure from the ordinary course with reference to the camp at London and the camp at Aldershot. It was impossible to ask for tenders, because there was not time; it was necessary to deal with certain men because there would not have been time to post advertisements and make contracts. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we shall give all particulars as to what has been done with the parties who have received contracts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, am I right in understanding that in future public competition will be resorted to for securing supplies to the camp?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. As the Minister of Finance states that there is great exigency in the different departments in the service that the main part of the supplies should be passed as quickly as possible, he might allow one of the items, say, No. 111, to remain, on the understanding that all matters concerning the militia may be discussed later on.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is understood that there will be an opportunity of discussing all these items upon the one that has been reserved.

Grants in aid of Artillery and Rifle Association, bands and military institutes $37,000

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia if he could not see his way to give a larger grant to the Dominion Artillery Association. At present they only get $2,000 from the Government, whereas the Dominion Rifle Association get $10,000. Now, this year we have seen Dominion artillerymen go across to the old country and carry away the highest prize against the whole of the militia forces. I think, as the hon. gentleman knows, the artillery is a very important branch of the service, it is a branch that requires a great deal more study on the part of the officers than the infantry does; they have to spend more hours at drill, and have to pass a more difficult examination, although I do not say they are any better men. I think the country can well afford to give the association a larger grant to assist them every year in sending across a Shoeburyness team to see what Canada can do in competition with the old country.

Mr. DOMVILLE. A good idea.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I shall be very glad to accede to the request made by the hon. gentleman, but, of course, it would involve an increase in the total vote. I do not think it possible to reduce any of the grants made now, the tendency seems to be altogether in the opposite direction. Does the hon. gentleman think it would be impossible to increase this particular vote?

Mr. PRIOR. Put it in the Supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Very well.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen contingencies $15,000

Mr. BRITTON. For the year 1894-95, I see that one gentleman, D. Bergin, is paid $700 on account of travelling and personal expenses. I suppose that is the gentleman who is a member of this House, and who has been the Surgeon General. I would ask the Minister if he is still employed in that capacity, and will that amount be required to pay him?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no change. That hon. gentleman is not in the House just now.

Mr. BRITTON. Do I understand, then, that he is in receipt of $700 from this Government, although a member of the House?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am informed that this $700 was to pay travelling expenses of the Surgeon General who was sent out by the then Minister of Militia to inspect the sanitary condition of several localities.

Defence of Esquimalt, B.C. $6,500

Mr. PRIOR. I desire to ask the Minister whether this expenditure is for works, or to provide for pay and allowances for the Royal Marines.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These works at Esquimalt have been carried out by arrangement with the Imperial Government. They have almost been completed.

Intercolonial Railway $211,500

Mr. McDOUGALL. I observe an item of $20,000 for extension to deep water at Sydney. The extension to deep water at Sydney is already complete. This branch is a revote, and applies to North Sydney.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is intended to be North Sydney, and if the word "North" is omitted, it is simply a clerical error.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to a point to which I directed the attention of the committee last year. I applied for a statement from the late Minister as to the number of hands employed on the Intercolonial Railway. He furnished a reply, and I made

an estimate from the statement by which it appeared that there were three and one-third men for every mile of road, or 33⅓ men for every 10 miles. There is no road in Canada that has an equal number of men employed to the mile, not even the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway. I now draw the attention of the Minister to this state of things, and I hope that the reduction which has taken place in the Public Works Department will be extended to the Intercolonial Railway. I believe there are more men employed on the road than are necessary, and I trust that, when the Minister investigates its operation, he will be able to make considerable reductions, and at the same time maintain its present efficiency.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. member must be mistaken in some way. I am acquainted with the portion of the road in Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia. There are not more than 3 men for 5 or 6 miles over that section of the road.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the class of employees referred to ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I included all employees usually engaged on the railway. That, of course, included station masters, trackmen, and, in fact, the whole staff. I was informed that there were three and a third men to every mile on the Intercolonial Railway. I made inquiries in regard to other roads, and I can assure the committee that there is no other road in Canada having such a number of men to the mile.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you the figures to give to the committee ?

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Minister possesses the information, it may be desirable that he should furnish it. How many men are employed on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A complete list of the employees in the different branches of the Intercolonial Railway is being prepared, but at the present time it is not in my possession. I shall certainly take occasion to consider very carefully the subject to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has referred.

Mr. SPROULE. I observe by the newspapers that several dismissals have taken place. Will the hon. gentleman inform the committee as to the number of men dismissed since he took charge of the department ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot state the number at this moment. I have in mind three or four daily workmen whom I have authorized to be removed, but those have been replaced by others. I do not know that there are more than three or four in all. There have been no changes whatever in that class of em-

ployees which could be classified as permanent employees or experienced officials.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I remember the discussion that took place last year, but I think it had special reference to the comparative proportion of trackmen employed on the Intercolonial Railway as compared with other railways. If I remember correctly, the information which was given to the committee then, showed that the road in that direction at least, was run quite as cheaply as other lines of railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. I classified the men, station men, baggage men, night men, day men, &c., and the Minister gave me the gross number that were engaged. I then took the length of the road and divided it by the number of men and the result was that there were 3⅓ men to the mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) must be wrong, because the Minister of Railways has just told us that where he found occasion to remove three or four men he has promptly replaced them by three or four others. If this road was over-manned, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) seems to think, surely it is quite impossible that the Minister of Railways would not have availed himself of the opportunity to reduce the force by the number of men he dismissed. If there are a large number of persons more than required to do the work of that road, there is no reason why they should be retained and paid. It is a very important question, and if the Minister could give us the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway and the total number of persons employed, compared with the mileage of the Grand Trunk Railway and total number of persons employed, it would give us some opportunity for comparison.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree that that would be valuable information to have. The Minister has only come into his office within a few days and it cannot be expected that in such a short time he would be able to look over the employees with a view of reducing the number. These men who were dismissed and whose places were filled may have been a class of employees with which the road is not overburdened.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) include all the hands on the track and in the shops, or merely the men engaged in the operation of the road ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I included all the men engaged in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That plan of comparison I think would be a very imperfect one, because you can scarcely find two railways that are run upon the same system. One may employ hundreds of people building its own rolling stock, and another may

not build its own rolling stock at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) will see, therefore, that it would be perfectly unfair to compare the staff of one road with the staff of another not operated in the same way. If the hon. gentleman wants a pretty fair comparison, he should take the train mileage run by the Intercolonial Railway and the train mileage run by other railways, or take the passenger traffic on the Intercolonial Railway and the passenger traffic on the other road, and then adopt this as the basis of the running expenses generally.

Mr. McMULLEN. All these returns could be got from the Year-book. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway build their own rolling stock almost entirely, whereas I believe the Intercolonial Railway build less of their rolling stock in proportion. That comparison would not be fair to either the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. In making the comparison I took the gross number of men employed on both lines, and the result is as I have stated.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I confess to be entirely unable to express any opinion to the committee as to whether the Intercolonial Railway is unduly manned or not. I do intend to address myself later to a full and careful investigation of that subject. Assuming to be true what the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) has stated, that the number of employees on this road amounts to 3¼ men per mile, I am quite unable to say that that is too many. I do not think the committee has the information before it which would enable it to arrive at that conclusion ; at all events I have not that information. I do not therefore see, that the procuring for the committee of the exact number of men who are now in the employ of the different branches of that system in all its departments, would furnish us after all with a very great deal of useful information. Let me add, that the conclusion which the hon. the leader of the Opposition drew from the fact that two or three, or four it may be, of those who were discharged, were replaced by others, would not perhaps be a fair or reasonable conclusion to draw. The men who were discharged were trackmen and they were replaced by other trackmen. I would not like to have it assumed by the leader of the Opposition, that I considered the road as not over-manned because I allowed these vacancies to be filled.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman state, if these trackmen were dispossessed of their shovels and picks for political reasons. It was because of reasons of inefficiency, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, they were displaced on the strong representation of gentlemen whose opinions and whose statements upon the subject I felt myself warranted in accepting. They were not permanent or skilled employees. They were not persons who were discharging other than that class of labour which an ordinary labourer can do. I have not felt that I was called upon to enter into any very elaborate inquiry as to whether a workman on the system had been guilty—to have it proved by formal evidence, at all events, to me—that a man had been guilty of any political offence in order to entitle him to be removed. I have acted upon this rule, that unless the employee is a skilled person or a person of experience, and is filling a permanent position, I would not take very much time or enter personally upon very much of an inquiry as to whether he ought to be replaced by another or not. I am going to be guided, so far as my administration of the department is concerned, in these matters by the advice and information of those responsible gentlemen who have been elected to be representatives of the people, and whose advice I know can be safely taken by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not quite see the justice of the distinction which my hon. friend has drawn between poor labouring men and those who are skilled. In reference to the labouring men, he seems to lay down the rule that they have no rights ; but that if a man is skilled and gets a high salary and occupies a permanent place, a different rule should be applied to him. I should rather come to the conclusion that it would be better to have the greater care for the labouring man, the unskilled man. It is often very difficult for him to get employment. But what I want to ask the hon. gentleman is this. He says he took the advice of responsible persons. I want to ask him, did he dismiss those men on the advice of the officers of his department, who are the responsible persons, so far as the running of the road is concerned ? I do not suppose my hon. friend intends to give up the railway to a committee of members to be run by them. There are experts on the road, from the head down, whose advice he surely asks. Was it on the advice of those officers that the labouring men were discharged, or on the advice of outside parties ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have insisted, in the very few cases with which I have been called upon to deal, on the head of the branch of the department concerned being careful that the persons employed were proper persons to be employed, and that at present, until the matter could be more fully inquired into, they should not be employed on any terms less favourable to the service than were those who had been removed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must enter my protest in the most solemn and formal

manner against the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways to this committee to-day. During my experience in this House, until this moment, I have never heard a member of a Government announce that he intended not to use but to abuse the power which the country has placed in his hands, of summarily dismissing and depriving of his bread any man at the request of a member supporting him in the House of Commons. It is a monstrous doctrine, one subversive of every liberty of the subject, and I think the hon. gentleman must have made that statement without due consideration of reflection. Is it to be supposed that a man holding in his hand the power of depriving of their bread, upon an hour's notice, thousands of people in this country, is only to say: "I am prepared to dismiss a man whenever any member supporting this Government says he wants that man's place for one of his friends"? The hon. gentleman has not stated that he has been furnished with any ground whatever for dismissing these people and depriving them of their means of living. He says it was done at the request simply of members elected to this House. We have had a good deal of discussion on the principle of dismissing persons from the public service; but down to this hour I have never heard from any member of a Government, of any party in this House, the statement broadly made that the tenure of employment, however well and industriously a man may discharge his duties to the country in the position in which he is placed—at all events, a man in a humble position in life, a person earning his bread by manual labour—that his tenure of employment is to be at the call of any gentleman supporting the Government who wants his place for one of his friends.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the names of the four whom he has dismissed, and on whose recommendation they have been dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will furnish the hon. gentleman with the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to have it now.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman give us any information as to how this road is paying now—the gross and net earnings of the road, and the running expenses?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information as to the year that has just closed. It has not yet come to me The officials of the road have not yet prepared the information in detail, nor even, I think, in a general way. The best information I can give to the hon. gentleman is in regard to the operations of the road for the year ending the 30th of June, 1895.

Mr. SPROULE. We had that last session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the 28th of August I asked for information with respect to the dismissal of two men who were employed in taking charge of the draw on the railway bridge crossing the harbour at Pictou. Those men were dismissed summarily. No complaints were laid against them. They are to this day, as I am informed, ignorant of any cause of dismissal. Later I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the subject, and sent to him across the House, I think at his own request, a memorandum in regard to it. At any rate, I told him that I particularly hoped that he would be able to give me in Supply the reasons for the dismissal of these two men, and the names of ten others who were discharged in the county of Antigonish in the month of August from positions they had held on the Intercolonial Railway for a number of years. I gave in the statement, and it is found in "Hansard," as to the number of years during which these men had been employed. This year they were discharged, and after they were absent from the work for a few days, other men were put in their places. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would now give me the particular information I desire in reference to all of them, that is, the grounds of their dismissal, and any further particulars he may care to mention.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have the information with regard to the two men whose names were mentioned by my hon. friend from Pictou—Roderick McLeod and Robert McKay. I made inquiries and procured that information, which I intended to lay on the Table this afternoon, but I did not happen to be in in time. These men were employed as bridge tenders on the draw of Pictou harbour bridge. Complaint was made by Mr. M. E. Macdonald, a gentleman with whom I think my hon. friend from Pictou is acquainted, complaining that these men had been very active partisans in the late election, and requesting that they should be removed, and that two others, Messrs. Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas, should be appointed in their places. I directed him to communicate with Mr. Maxwell; Mr. Maxwell communicated with Mr. Archibald; and, under general directions, touching these two cases, which I gave to Mr. Pottinger, these men were removed, and the two persons, Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas, were appointed in their stead. I have no doubt, from the positive statements made to me that the charge against these men by Mr. Macdonald was true. I acted upon it, and authorized their removal on that ground. As to the other cases which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, I have no information. I do not know the names of the persons said to have been dismissed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I gave the list to the hon. gentleman, and referred to the page in "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will inquire about that, but have not the information at the moment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Am I to undestand that Mr. Archibald or Mr. Pottinger or any other officer investigated into the truth of the charge preferred by Mr. Macdonald ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAS AND CANALS. I do not think they did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Am I to understand that if Mr. Macdonald the defeated candidate for the county of Pictou, charges any officer in the public servince with having actively opposed him or having committed other offences, even more grave, the hon. gentleman proposes to remove the accused from the service without investigation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will answer the hon. gentleman's questions as to any specific cases that have arisen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to understand the principle upon which the hon. gentleman intends to administer his department. He says it is sufficient for him to know that my opponent wishes these men removed, and that if my opponent prefers a charge against them, he will accept that charge without investigation. I wish to know if he proposes to act on that principle.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say that it was sufficient for me to know that the opponent of the hon. member wished these men discharged. I did not act upon any such principle, nor shall I do so. There must be a charge preferred, and I must be well satisfied that the charge is well founded, but I propose to draw a distinction between permanent officials of the road, persons who are in continuous employ, as officials, and those who are simply employed as day labourers. I cannot do otherwise. It would be utterly impossible for me to administer this department, with 5,000 people employed in it, on any other principle, and I came to the conclusion that if any responsible gentleman—any member of this House, whose advice the Government would consider it safe to act upon, or any responsible candidate before the country, who had been defeated in the late election, in the interests of the Liberal party,—made representations to me that, of his own personal knowledge, persons whose names he had mentioned and who were in the employ of the Government, in the capacities I have mentioned, had taken an active part in the election, and assured me of that from his personal knowledge, on his personal honour, I would accept the statements thus made and permit the officials of the department to allow the changes to take place. I want to say to my hon. friends opposite that it is perfectly idle for them to tell this House or the country that, in dealing with officials in the public service, even in prominent, and much less in subordinate capacities, they have proceeded upon any nice rule. They have never done it. They have simply decapitated the individual, when they felt that the interests of their party demanded his decapitation ; and while I shall not act upon any such principle, and would be sorry to do any injustice to any individual, whether employed in an inferior or superior capacity, yet in administering my department, it would be utterly impossible for me to make a personal investigation or to adopt any system of inquiry which would be as elaborate as the hon. gentleman would suggest, with regard to the hundreds and thousands of employees on the Intercolonial Railway and canal service of the country. I shall endeavour to avoid doing any injustice, and shall only act upon the representations and assurances of gentlemen who tell me that they know the truth of the facts they affirm, whether they are members of this House supporting the Government or gentlemen who have been selected to be our candidates.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that is the most monstrous doctrine I have ever heard. It would be difficult to find language to characterize as it should be characterized, such an extraordinary principle as this one, upon which a Minister of Railways, for the first time in our history, proposes to govern a large department in this country. And I think it will be a very serious question whether this House should put in his hands the control of a large sum of public money, when he avows this small political spirit as the one which shall guide him in conducting the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. He has drawn the line distinctly between the poor man and those better off. He treats with contempt and cruelty, and proposes to continue to treat with contempt and cruelty, the labouring element on the Intercolonial. Any man who is paid by the day is to have one rule applied to him. A man employed by the year, occupying a higher position, is to enjoy the rights of a British subject and be treated with a certain amount of justice ; but if the man's position be a humble one, the hon. gentleman neither has the time nor the spirit to treat him with the same amount of fairness and justice. But knowing that he has avowed a nasty doctrine, knowing that there was something mean and contemptible about it, the hon. gentleman turns on his opponents and accuses them of having also been mean and nasty and not nice in this matter. He charges them with having cut off heads without notice, and therefore he is going to proceed with the same summary and abrupt decapitation. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, time and again, vainly attempted to fasten charges of that kind on their opponents. No member of the

late Government and no member of Parliament that I can remember since 1882, ever had the audacity in this House to advocate the justice of such a course or the reasonableness of it. I am within the book when I say that the hon. gentleman cannot give an instance, in a long period of years, when any member sitting on the Treasury or on these benches laid down such a revolutionary and outrageous proposition. What is that proposition of the Minister of Railways? It is that he will take the statement of members sitting behind him or those who fought his party battles in this country and were defeated, that he will take their bare ipse dixit, and cut off ruthlessly the heads of public servants whenever he is told that they are Conservatives or that their places are wanted, and they are paid by the day. The fact that they are paid by the day is his justification for thus endeavouring to bolster up the political fortunes of his party. I protest in the most serious manner against that policy, and I think it would be well worth the consideration of this House to dwell with the subject more thoroughly, at a future stage of the session, unless that doctrine is promptly repudiated by the leader of the Government. The leader of the Government has had to repudiate the ideas of his colleagues, in this very short session, several times already, and I trust this will be another of these occasions, for there is no doctrine more pernicious or offensive than that which the hon. Minister of Railways has laid down as his guide in connectio nwith the appointment and dismissal of public officials.

Mr. QUINN. Representing, as I do, a constituency in which probably the largest vote is that of the labouring men, it would be impossible for me to remain silent, after an announcement such as that which we have heard from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). I rise to make the most formal and decided and solemn protest that can be made by a member of this House against such an outrageous doctrine. If that doctrine be carried to the extent to which the hon. Minister threatens to carry it, it will mean this, in the future, the labouring man—he who is most liable to be unduly influenced by men in power—is to be at the mercy and dictation of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and his supporters. It means that it will be impossible, in any portion of the country, for any workingman opposed to the Government to seek employment, or even to retain employment on Government works. It means, in a word, that these men, in whose independence and honesty lies the welfare of our country, are to be oppressed and subjected to a system of terrorism unequalled even in Russia. Men who are depending upon their daily bread for the support of their families will be taken virtually by the throat and compelled to support Government candidates, or else, on the mere recommendation of that candidate, they will be ruthlessly thrown out on the world and deprived of their means of livelihood. It would not be possible for me, without violating the rules of the House, to give proper expression to the contempt I feel, not only for such a course of conduct, but for the people who adopt it in the administration of public affairs, and who are not even ashamed to proclaim it in this cold-blooded manner. And we hear the charges made that gentlemen who have occupied the Treasury benches before the Conservatives of this country have adopted the same course. Why, Sir, I am in a position, from my own experience, limited as it is, to give a most formal denial to this statement. I am in a position to say and to tell this House that within a very short time I saw a Government officer canvassing his labourers to vote against me, to vote against the man who was defending the Conservative interests in the election immediately preceding my own. But I challenge the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to show that any charge was made by me against him or against the labouring men who were working under him. And yet we are told that gentlemen on this side have done the same thing. I deny it from my own experience, short and limited as it has been. I deny it as being wholly opposed to the record, wholly opposed to the traditions of the party of which I am a member.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are much amused at the indignation of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Ste. Ann's, Montreal (Mr. Quinn), denies that the dismissal of officials on political grounds was practiced by the Conservative party. We had this question up a few nights ago, and I refer the hon. gentleman to the fact that I then stated that the "Hansard" translators were ruthlessly dismissed without a hearing and without any opportunity to defend themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, they were. The hon. gentleman, when he undertakes to speak of the Conservative record, should have a more extended experience than he has had. He tells us that he is only a politician of yesterday. But we know the record of his party for many years. We know, for instance, that there never were two men upon whom the indignation of a party was visited with greater determination and vindictiveness than in the case of the two translators to whom I have referred. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) works up great indignation at what he calls the monstrous doctrine of the hon. Minister of Railways. When this matter was discussed on a previous occasion, the principle was laid down. It was declared that where any member of Parliament was himself personally cognizant of active interference in the elec-

tion on the part of officials he was justified in reporting to the head of the department, and having that officer dismissed. That was acknowledged as the principle that the head of any department was justfied in acting upon. And the Minister of Railways has carried out that principle and no more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes. These men were reported to have been actively and determinedly and openly interfering in the elections.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will you allow me one word ?

Mr. McMULLEN. What is your question?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman the difference between the principle upon which the Minister has acted and that for which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) contends in the case of the translators. The hon. gentleman says that the translators should have a fair trial, but in the case of a labourer he would cut his head off at the request of a party heeler.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) states that the doctrine propounded by the Minister of Railways is a most monstrous doctrine. He goes on to say that the treatment accorded to other servants of the Government is not the treatment accorded to the workmen on the Intercolonial Railway. I have sat in this House a good many years, and I never heard in it a more demagogic speech than that the hon. gentleman has just delivered. What are the facts ? The Intercolonial Railway was under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite for eighteen long years. They used it as a vast political machine. Why, Sir, we know that there is scarcely a man from the head of the railway down to the occupant of the most subordinate office who is not a Tory, prepared to support the Tory party through thick and thin. The hon. member for Pictou knows that well. We know that hon. gentlemen opposite have abused their power, they have given passes to their political friends throughout the country, they have carried freight for their political friends at merely nominal rates ; and we know that some hon. gentlemen who sit in this House to-day hold their seats in Parliament because of the fact that the Intercolonial employees in the last election voted solidly for the Conservative party. We know perfectly well that the position of an employee on that road while these gentlemen were in power was most unpleasant unless he was an avowed supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why do these men take an active part in politics ? They have been trained up to it, they have been taught that adherence to the Tory party was the price of preferment. They thought, as the leader of the late Government thought and stated down in Nova Scotia, that we had no chance in the wide world of carrying the last election. He announced to the people that he was sure of success. And these people believed him, and they did as they had been doing for eighteen years before, they openly supported the Conservative candidates throughout the country. They were found in many cases openly supporting that party and taking an offensive part in the contest, assailing the leader of our party and the party generally. Not content with discussing political questions, they must needs go on to attack the personal as well as the political character of gentlemen opposed to them. Sir, they must learn that neutrality in political matters is the price of office. They must understand that, for the future, whether this Government or any other Government is in power, they are expected to be neutral in politics, so long as they hold office under the Crown and receive the money of the people. And I say my hon. friend is accused of having done what hon. gentlemen on the other side actually have done over and over again, dismissed public servants without cause, though no complaint was made against them and for no reason except that they were adherents of the Liberal party. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) talks. He is a new politician ; he does not know the men he is associated with ; he has only been with them a few weeks. If he had been near them for the last fourteen or fifteen long years he would know more about them. Let me tell him that almost the first act of the party he supports when they came into power in 1878 was to dismiss not one but hundreds of officers by repealing a statute and re-enacting it so as to enable them to appoint their political friends. Then, Sir, the breast of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was not bursting with sympathy for the poor people. Men with families were thrown out by the dozen, simply by Act of Parliament passed by these hon. gentlemen to give them an excuse for dismissing hundreds and hundreds of good men. Go over this country, take the departments here, if you will, and I venture to say that not five per cent of the public service in Ottawa are Liberals. If they are Liberals at all, they have had to speak below their breath, they dare not come out openly and exercise the rights these gentlemen are now advocating. If they voted, they did so in silence. They were subjected to spies throughout the departments, and if they opened their mouth the chances were that they would be decapitated. How dare hon. gentlemen come to this House and try to arouse the country with such a record as they have, a record that shows that from one end of Canada to the other, from the time they took office

down to the time they left, a Liberal in Canada has had no chance? If he was an office-holder, he had to be silent or he would lose his position. Sir, we know what the law is as laid down in England, laid down in every colony of England, well known in Canada, and about which there can be no question at all; it provides that a man who accepts office is expected to be neutral in politics, in other words, neutrality is the price of his position in the public service. Sir, the quicker public servants in Canada know this, the quicker they will cease from interfering in elections. The time will come when we will go to the country again, and hon. gentlemen who will be opposing us will then appreciate, to some extent, how offensive it is to have men who are being paid with the money of both Conservatives and Liberals, using their influence for the purpose of defeating one political party and helping the other party into power. Now, let it be well understood throughout the length and breadth of Canada that men who enter the civil service, while they have a right to exercise their franchise, must be absolutely neutral in politics. They have a right to vote, their political sympathies should not be interfered with at all, but they should devote their lives to the service of the country, and then there will be no political party in this country who will desire to put them out of office. It does not come with good grace from hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about the dismissals that have taken place, or may take place. Sir, the most offensive partisans that could be found in this country were to be found amongst men drawing pay from Canada, making their living out of the public service, and these men should not be permitted to hold office any longer. Men who exercise the franchise should not be disturbed, they should feel as secure in their positions as men can feel: and I venture to say that there will not be in any constituency in Canada a desire to interfere with these men who attended to their duties. But men who are politicians must accept the fate of the party with which they are allied, and when that party is defeated, they must expect to go out of office.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has been good enough to say that I did not know my friends on this side of the House. Well, I have the advantage, in the short time I have been here, of knowing the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and knowing the position they occupy. They seem to me to occupy the position on the other side of the House of the long stops in a cricket match. The Ministers may stand up and defend any charges that are made, and then come in my hon. friends from Lambton and North Wellington and act as long stops.

Mr. LISTER. What stop do you take?

Mr. COCHRANE. Stop your mouth.

Mr. QUINN. Another position they occupy is this: they occupy the position of men who try to distract attention from the subject under consideration. We are not now discussing the question whether public officials have a right to vote or interfere in elections, as both those hon. gentlemen have tried to make the committee believe, but we are discussing the pernicious, the outrageous doctrine that has been enunciated by the Minister of Railways and Canals, that he will, on the 'ipse dixit' of any member on the Government side, or of any defeated Liberal candidate, dismiss any labourer who happens to be in his department, and without investigation. Now, that is the principle which has been enunciated here. It may be clothed in different language, but that is the principle. Now, I ask these hon. gentlemen who have done so much to root up in the political swill barrel all the scandals they can against the Conservative party, and to trot them out before the House—I ask even them if they will advocate a principle of that kind. I ask even men having the tendency of the hon. members for Lambton and North Wellington, if they will approve of that doctrine. Sir, from what I know of members on this side of the House, I believe there will not be found one who will approve of the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Lambton said that all men have a right to vote, that these public officials have a right to vote, and that they shall not be interfered with no matter for what party they vote. But according to the views of the Minister of Railways and Canals, they have not a right to vote, because, on the mere representation of the defeated candidate or of a Liberal member in this House, a labourer is to be dismissed. That is the doctrine, and I have no doubt the hon. Minister will give proper effect to it if he is allowed to remain there much longer. Mr. Chairman, I again wish, in the most solemn and most positive manner, to protest against such a pernicious doctrine.

Mr. POWELL. Representing as I do a county in which there is probably a larger proportion of railway employees than in any other constituency in Canada, I cannot allow certain charges put forward by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) to go unchallenged. Now, I make bold to say—and in doing so I hope I shall not give such an exhibition of large-mindedness and patriotism as he has given, but I shall confine myself to a few simple statements of facts—I make bold to say that since 1882 down to the present time there has uniformly been passed a most generous policy and one diametrically opposite to that stated by this hon. gentleman. I defy any hon.

gentleman opposite, I challenge the Minister of Railways and Canals, who is familiar with my county, to name a single mechanic who was dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway during these fifteen years because he was a Liberal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). There was not a Liberal among them. You never employed a Liberal as a labouring man on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries says we never employed a Liberal. I have heard statements from that hon. gentleman before, I know very well how his imagination sometimes runs away with his recollection and his judgment. I have heard him in my own constituency.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Name a Liberal that you employed.

Mr. POWELL. Sir, I have much pleasure in giving him names. I can name not only one but dozens. I will give one who is employed in the Intercolonial Railway offices, and if the Minister of Railways will look at the list of officials he will find his name, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Walker, who was appointed a few years ago under the Liberal-Conservative regime. I can also name two other men named Sutton, and I can name dozens of others. At the time a large number of dismissals were made from the Intercolonial Railway shops a few years ago, about one-half of those men who were dismissed were Liberal-Conservatives. The dismissals were made entirely irrespective of politics, and when men were taken on, Liberals and Liberal-Conservatives were taken on together promiscuously.

An hon. MEMBER. What about 1878 ?

Mr. POWELL. I am not going back into ancient history as far as 1878. I will come down to the charge made by the hon. gentleman that members are sitting on this side of the House who have been elected by and owe their election entirely to the votes of railway men. The hon. gentleman looked at me when he made that statement, and no doubt he had me in his mind's eye. At the last election I did not receive anything like half the railway vote at Moncton.

Mr. LISTER. How was it in the election before ?

Mr. POWELL. At the previous election I about divided the vote ; but in the general election in the month of June last the two large booths where the railway vote was deposited, I was defeated by a very large majority indeed. When the statement is made that the Intercolonial Railway is run for political purposes and ends, that statement is unfounded in fact, and is indeed nothing more than an idle rumour. There is no basis whatever for such a charge. This fact rebuts the charge, for since 1882 no Liberal has been dismissed on account of politics, and the charges against the late Government and myself are entirely false.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is the hon. gentleman aware of the fact that at the last election railway men, supposed to sympathize with Liberal opinions, were sent out of Moncton in order that they should not vote against the Government ?

Mr. POWELL. I am not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I undertake to say that I know them, for I met them on the way.

Mr. POWELL. This mild-mannered man, the Minister of Finance, can assume a tremendous attitude of acerbity. I can assure the hon. gentleman that this was far from being the case. There are in elections tricks resorted to by both sides. I do not say our party is entirely pure and that your party is entirely corrupt. Men are men on either side of politics, and there may have been an instance or two. But I tell the hon. gentleman this, that the machinery of the Intercolonial Railway cannot stop because of election day, and if the hon. gentleman says that men were sent out of Moncton because they happened to be Liberals, he is making too large a deduction from a single fact when he says this has systematically been done as a part of a settled policy—conceding that the statement of the Minister of Finance is correct in its fulness of meaning of which I am very sceptical.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance a question. I desire to know whether it is correct that railway employees in Nova Scotia—they being suspected of being in a large degree Tories—were disfranchised by the local government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am delighted to have an opportunity of answering the question. There is a law in Nova Scotia under which a large number of Dominion officials are disfranchised. Far from regarding it as obnoxious, I think there is much to be said in favour not only of retaining it, but extending it. I have been appealed to by officials who expressed a desire to be disfranchised, because then they would be perfectly free to abstain from voting ; and I tell the hon. gentleman that under Dominion Government management in Nova Scotia there was created a system of terrorism among employees, whereby those suspected of holding Liberal principles dare not vote, and disfranchisement would have been a real benefit to those men. Hon. gentlemen opposite rise in this House and assume the position of possessing superior virtue, and yet they dismiss men without cause. If their speeches are read in the maritime provinces and by employees on the

Intercolonial road, not only Liberals but Conservatives will laugh openly at the statements made, because they are aware that in the maritime provinces, not only the Intercolonial Railway, but the Customs, Post Office and other services have been converted into political engines. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not have had a Conservative party in Nova Scotia if there had not been Dominion officials to constitute its backbone; and more than that, they would not always have had candidates unless they had been able to secure Dominion officers. I am sure the members from Nova Scotia in the Opposition are smiling and chuckling to-day at this discussion, when they know, as we do, that down in the maritime provinces any man in the public service suspected of being a Liberal was made to feel that he was under a ban. If officials supported the Dominion Government they were protected, otherwise opportunity was sought to drive them out. They reduced the salary, as was mentioned in a case the other night, with the hope that the officer would resign, and when the Government could do nothing else, they dismissed officials. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite pretended that they exhibited in office great virtues—a proposition that is simply ridiculous and hardly admits of serious discussion. I can assure hon. gentlemen that throughout the length and breadth of the maritime provinces—and I speak of those provinces because I know them best—the whole Dominion service has been made a political engine, not only in Dominion but also in provincial affairs. Where officials were not allowed to vote, many of them worked at the polls in opposition to the Liberal local government, year after year. They carried party politics into municipal affairs. I remember a case where a man who was a Dominion official, a candidate at a municipal election, had signed a requisition to a candidate for municipal honours who was a Liberal, and who had to withdraw his name, because he was made to fear that if he interfered in municipal affairs and supported a Liberal, he would be punished by his superior officers. It is beyond question that in Nova Scotia the whole Dominion service has been used as a political engine, and it is high time there was a change.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I do not wish to detain the House at any length, but I consider that I would be lacking in my duty to my constituents, my party and my country if I did not meet the statement of the Finance Minister with a square denial. If I had the opportunity to make this denial in any other place, I would make my statement very much stronger. A more dastardly, contemptible statement in regard to Nova Scotia was never enunciated.

An hon. MEMBER. He is bringing in local politics.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Certainly, it is bringing local politics here. So far as it has been within the power of the hon. gentleman opposite and the majority supporting him, he has denied the right of voting to every man who was a Liberal-Conservative. He has done everything that would tend to oppose the Liberal-Conservative party and the policy and principles it advocates. As long as it was possible, he denied the privilege to our school children of having a national holiday. I know the politics of the province; and at Pictou men known to be Liberals have been appointed to office; and the hon. gentleman opposite went too far in assuming that every one in the civil service in Nova Scotia was a Conservative.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We did not assume it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). You not only assumed it, but you said it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You stated it this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were appointed by you, and many of them were wise enough to change their opinion afterwards.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It would be well for the hon. gentleman to pay more attention to the statements made by his supporters. The point to which we direct our strong objection, is the statement——

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 13) respecting the Hamilton Powder Comnpay.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Chairman, the statements made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) just before recess, in reference to the conduct of the Liberal-Conservative party in connection with the treatment of officials, was, in my experience, so very much at variance with the actual state of affairs, that I think it is only right, in justice to our party and to our province, to show that the calumnies heaped upon that province by the Finance Minister are entirely undeserved. In the county of Pictou there has been no dismissal of officials by the Conservative party on account of any ac-

tion those officials have taken in our political struggles. When the Liberals were in power before, a gentleman belonging to the Conservative party had been removed from office, in order to appoint to his vacant place a gentleman supporting the Liberal party; but, on the accession to power of the Conservative party, in 1879, that Liberal official was not dismissed, but was removed to an equally good position in another part of the province, in order that justice might be done to the Liberal-Conservative who had been unjustly deprived of his office by the Liberal Government. That is the only instance within my recollection in which any change was made with respect to an official in the county of Pictou. There are numerous railway and other officials in the county which I have the honour to represent. Many of these are Liberals, and, so far as they chose, they have always exercised their right to vote, and have never been found fault with for so doing. Nay, they command the respect of the Conservatives of that county, on account of the manner in which they have adhered to their principles and their party. I may say that some of these gentlemen have even gone so far as to be active partisans. I have within my recollection a case in which a life-long Liberal, a station master on the Eastern Extension Railway, acted in a manner that would justify any one in characterizing his conduct as being disorderly in the extreme, and such as would warrant dismissal. Yet, so far as I know, no charge has been brought against him, and I am sure no charge will be brought against him by any member of the Liberal-Conservative party. Therefore, when the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) told this House that the Liberal-Conservatives had practically set up a reign of terror—these are his exact words, I think—in the province of Nova Scotia, he slandered that province, and he slandered the Liberal-Conservative party. Not only has there been no reign of terror there, but, as I say, Liberal officials who were appointed by the Liberal Government, when in power, have never been interfered with. Moreover, they have voted in perfect safety, and they are thought the more of because they exercised their right to vote. I know numerous cases in the town of New Glasgow. The station master in that town is a life-long Liberal. I have no doubt, and I believe no man in New Glasgow has any doubt, that he has always voted for his political friends; yet there has been no voice to accuse him or to find fault with him. The collectorship of customs in Pictou, the best office in the county, is held by a Liberal. I do not know whether he votes or not; but I do know that a subordinate of his, a gentleman named Russell, has always voted; and I am sure that if he were here, he would be glad to bear testimony to the fact that he has always done so without any interference whatever. In fact—I am sorry to have to say it—so far as the part of the province from which I come is concerned, the position of affairs is utterly at variance with the statement made by the Finance Minister. But when we come to consider who the Finance Minister is and what his career has been in the province of Nova Scotia, if the members of this House were as well acquainted with that hon. gentleman and his career as I am, they would share with me the wonder and amazement with which I heard the impassioned manner in which that gentleman poured forth to this House to-day a series of statements in which he himself could not have believed. That gentleman has not, at any time during his political career, shown any inaptitude or hesitancy in using the power held by him in Nova Scotia, as leader of the Government of that province, to advance the interests of his party. I would like that gentleman to mention any case in which he or the gentlemen who have supported him in Nova Scotia have ever appointed to an office of emolument one of their political opponents. Has he ever failed to draw more and more into the power of the local government the patronage of that province, and to use it as far as he could to advance the interests of his friends? Ever since 1867 the Liberals have held power in Nova Scotia, with the exception of four years, from 1878 to 1882; so that you may easily understand that in that province, almost without exception, every official is a supporter of the party to which the hon. Finance Minister belongs. Yet so anxious was he to make the very most of his power and position that when, after that brief interval, the Liberal party again came into power in Nova Scotia, they actually changed the law in order to bring into their own hands, and under their own control and disposal, the important office of sheriff in the various counties of the province; and from that time, whatever few appointments the Liberal-Conservative party had been able to make in the province, in the shape of registrars of deeds and prothonotaries, were open to the attack of every greedy office-hunter in the county in which they lived. Some of those registrars of deeds were placed on trial for the most paltry and petty offences, such as errors in counting the number of folios in documents which they registered; and if any petty offence could be proved against them, their heads came off. More han this, the hon. gentleman claimed a great deal of credit for the fact that he and his party had disfranchised Dominion officials in Nova Scotia, going so far as to represent that those officials were grateful to him for that act, and that some of the officials who were not disfranchised had come to him, and almost with tears in their eyes had implored him to put them in the same happy position. The hon. gentleman knows that when the Liberal-Conservative party held power in Nova Scotia, those people petitioned that party to restore to them those rights as men of which they had unjustly

been deprived. He knows that the Liberal-Conservatives in Nova Scotia have introduced legislation to restore to those officials the franchise, and that that legislation has always been defeated by the gentleman who is Finance Minister of Canada to-day and the party who followed him. But when the occasion came, when the Liberal-Conservative party held control of the lower branch of the legislature, and when they passed an Act to restore that privilege, they failed to carry it into law, because the legislative council, which remained under the control of Mr. Fielding and his friends, refused to allow the lower branch of the legislature to do the act of justice. More than that, this hon. gentleman, who speaks so warmly of the improper conduct of his opponents, who sets up himself and his party as exemplars of the highest virtue and purity, did not hesitate to gerrymander the various counties of Nova Scotia in order to affect the political complexion of the county councils. They have not stopped at even smaller acts. They even passed an Act to prevent a political opponent from holding the small office of clerk of a county council in some cases. In one of the counties of Nova Scotia, first of all, in order to strike at one individual, an Act was passed declaring that no member of the Dominion House of Commons or Senate could hold the office of clerk of the county council. Then a new Act was passed providing that the partner of such an individual could not hold that office ; and, to show to what an extreme of smallness these men are capable of descending, in spite of all their protestations of political virtue, they finally passed an Act providing that the clerk or employee of such a person could not be a clerk of the county council. I think this House ought to be grateful indeed to the hon. gentleman for giving it an opportunity to discover the breadth of statesmanship displayed by the Liberals of Nova Scotia. Now, Sir, I think I am perfectly safe in saying that I can repel with the utmost confidence the charge that the Liberal-Conservative party ever terrorized or attempted to terrorize over or interfere with any Dominion official whatever in the exercise of his franchise. I think I have made a very good case to show the character of these gentlemen who attempt to make these charges, presuming that because they are a thousand miles from the scene of their operations, distance may give them some security ; but I think the evidence I have adduced here, which is incontrovertible and which is recorded in the statutes of the province of Nova Scotia, shows that these gentlemen are capable of descending to any base use of the legislature of a country over which they may have obtained control, for party advantages. But it may be said that possibly these gentlemen are honest and in earnest, that their zeal to disfranchise Dominion officials grew out of love and regard for those officials. Do they not say that those officials came to them in tears imploring to be protected ; but, marvellous to relate, those bowels of compassion which they feel impelled to exercise towards their opponents are not moved at all in the case of their own supporters. The Dominion officials were protected by these gentlemen, but the local officials, of whom there are a great many more, were left unprotected. Marvellous to relate, though they came to these gentlemen on their knees and implored for protection, they were left to suffer from the evil consequences of having the franchise. The truth of the matter is that in this as in every other matter in which the two parties come into comparison and contrast, the professions of the Liberal party stand in inverso ratio to their performances. The more they cry purity, the less trouble you will have to discern the absence of whiteness on their shield ; the more loudly they proclaim their adherence to everything good and pure, the more hastily you will button up your pocket, the more you will be on the alert, and the more carefully you will watch them, because the louder their assertions the worse their practices.

I have devoted as much time to the hon. gentleman and his career in Nova Scotia as is becoming, but I may say there are several chapters of these reminiscences which may be drawn upon, if necessary, in the future. Let us revert to the cause of our being engaged in this controversy now. What is it ? It is the declaration of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) that, so far as he is concerned, and so far as he represents the Government of Canada, there is one unfortunate class in this country that does not appeal to them for protection or sympathy, or, even justice. What class is that ? Is it the class that is best able to sustain the storms of evil fortune ? Is it the class that is best able to protect itself ? Is it the class that has the most resources to fall back on in the day of disaster ? No, but, wonderful to relate, this Liberal Minister of Railways and Canals, this Minister of a Liberal Administration, coolly and in the most callous and heartless manner, affirms that where the stipend, the existence, the very life of the workingman hangs in suspense, there he has not time to inquire into the matter, but he deliberately hands the unfortunate man over to the machinery of his department to be decapitated without benefit of clergy or any other benefit whatever. I need scarcely say that this is an amazing revelation to those who might have been led to believe in the past that the Liberal party stands for the principles of Liberalism. So far, however, as my political education has gone—and I do not know but that I may be open to the charge which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) made against the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) to-day, that of being a chicken politician, who has no right to rise and set his opinion against the dictum of a Minister—but even if we be young in this House, we have learned in other

fields as well as here something about the true inwardness of that party which claims to represent the true principles and spirit of Liberalism. I have heard in the legislature of Nova Scotia a very distinguished Liberal coolly and openly proclaim that the Liberal party was a great and good party and that the other party was made up of the common working people and the aristocrats, and that these had no claim whatever on the protection of the Liberal party. Now, that is a very strong doctrine, and we ought to thank the Minister of Railways for preaching it so frankly and openly. We did not expect, even if it were, as we have reason to believe, the policy of the Liberal party to treat their opponents without consideration and dismiss them, whenever it suited them, in order to put their own friends into positions, that a gentleman, occupying so high a position as the Minister of Railways, would proclaim, with such unblushing frankness, that, so far as he was concerned, the poor workingman had no rights which should be respected. I would not care to call upon the workingmen of the country to make capital of this somewhat extraordinary statement. I do not think that would be a proper act, because it would savour of appealing to them as a class ; but I must say, as far as this side of the House is concerned, that the statement of the Minister of Railways meets with no response whatever. We do not, on this side, see any reason why the poor man who has to live on $1.15 per day, deserves no consideration whatever at the hands of the Administration and is to be handed over deliberately by the Administration to be destroyed and ruined, simply at the dictates of a defeated politician. Now the Minister of Railways, if he was not misrepresented, did say, in the course of his canvass in Queen's county, that railway men might vote as they liked, that, so far as he was concerned, no penalty would be visited on them for voting against the Administration or against him. I have not had time to verify the statement, but it was made openly, and I believe it is correct ; and yet we find him here, just as soon as the workingmen have served his purpose, abandoning that most creditable position and deliberately announcing his set purpose to dismiss from office, without trial and without sympathy, every man whose head is demanded by any politician of the Liberal party, whether that politician be in office or has been refused a seat in Parliament by the people. A more dangerous doctrine I could not imagine. And yet, remarkable to relate, when hon. gentlemen on this side raise their voices in protest against this open, cold-blooded, unfeeling proclamation, they are greeted with laughter from the other side. The fact that they rose to make a solemn protest against such a doctrine was the ground apparently of well enjoyed merriment on the other side. I wonder do these hon. gentlemen think that this is a laughing matter for the thousands of workingmen who, according to the authority of the Minister of Railways, are existing in such a state of uncertainty, that, at any moment, their heads may be taken off. I wonder if any one of these workingmen, who have to look forward to a coming winter and keep house and maintain a family on their small allowance of $1.15 per day, will read that statement with laughter? Not so. It must be a most dreadful threat to those workingmen to learn that their chances of making a decent living depend on the accusation brought against them by some defeated politician, unsupported by any evidence and without inquiry of any kind. On such an accusation, without inquiry, brought against them by some man who has not been able to secure the confidence of the people, who has been discarded by his county, they are liable to be deprived of their means of existence. One hon. gentleman on the other side assumed that the doctrine had been accepted by this House, that those persons who took any part in politics were to be dismissed, and that the price of their continued existence in office was absolutely neutrality. That doctrine has not been accepted by any one on this side ; and I need scarcely say that this heartless cruel extension of it, promulgated by the Minister of Railways, cannot meet with acceptance on this side, but must meet with our most indignant condemnation and protest. I had hoped that the Minister of Railways had declared this in an unguarded moment, but he repeated it twice or three times in the course of the afternoon. I would like to know on what basis the hon. gentleman draws the distinction he did. He told us that he drew the line so that it would exclude from the region of mercy and hopefulness the men who most required protection. If the workingmen should use his power in the state in the light of the statement made by the Minister of Railways that hon. gentleman would see that to this legislature very few hon. gentlemen will come who are capable of meeting with laughter the protests made against the announcement of the Minister of Railways to-day. On this side of the House, we cannot accept the doctrine enunciated by the hon. gentleman. We cannot allow the country to believe that we agree in the proposition that it is to be left to our opponents, to defeated politicians, in many cases, to dismiss without trial men who have come under their dislike and ill-will. To show how dangerous it is, take the case of the dismissals made in Pictou by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That gentleman assured us, in the House, that he had grounds for dismissing Messrs. Noonan and Davies, because he knew they were active, aggressive and offensive politicians.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. BELL. I presume this is rather strict ruling, not often applied, I think. I do not wish in any way to violate the rules. And I may say that there is every reason to believe that this power of accusing and condemning will be exercised, and exercised without the slightest attempt whatever to gain information in relation to the party accused. What is the motive in all these cases? Simply that the party has come into power and its adherents desire positions. That is the sentiment reflected in the speech of the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Somerville). They say the Conservative party have been in power long enough; they have been in office eighteen years, and it is time they were dismissed, and now the Liberals are to have their turn. The consequence will be that men who have never made themselves obnoxious, who are prepared to state and prove that they have never taken an active part in politics, are going to be dismissed, and not because this is determined by the responsible Administration. This is the most disagreeable thing about the whole affair, for where the Administration does not shirk responsibility, some reply can be had to the accusation of injustice. But they do not assume responsibility. They say: We delegate our authority to behead these men to our supporters in the House or our defeated supporters in the country. Now, I am sure that it is not in the interest of Canada that any such doctrine should prevail. It is not a part of the platform of the Liberal-Conservative party to consent to the adoption of such a policy. I hope, and we have every reason to believe, that if, in some counties in this Dominion, this power is exercised as coldly, and unfeelingly, and as callously as, from the statement of the Minister of Railways, we might expect, there are other counties in which better feelings will prevail and better sentiments exist, and the officials there may hope to have their official existence spared through the kindness of their neighbours. Why should this Administration deliberately incur the odium of being converted into an executioner, in order to gratify the malignant, revengeful or greedy sentiments of the lowest and poorest class of politicians that are to be found in the Liberal ranks? It appears to me that, as a party, they cannot afford to take such a position. Let them be in this case, as they should be in everything else, guided by their best men, by those who occupy the highest positions in the estimation of the people of Canada, and not undertake the odium of being represented, or rather misrepresented, by those who have less claim to the consideration and respect of the people of this country. I think we should remember, in this matter, that there is one great interest to be considered, and that is the interests of the country. I believe in the whole people being served by these officers and employees—if there is to be a distinction between these two classes who have been thus named. The interests of the country demand that, no matter what party is in power, the guarantee should be given to every man engaged in the public service that he will be allowed to retain his position until good reason can be shown, after fair trial and an opportunity to rebut evidence, that he should be dismissed. And the Liberal-Conservative party are ready to take their stand upon that, and they do so, throwing back with indignant denial the charges of hon. gentlemen on the other side that they were guilty of wholesale dismissals. In 1879, after the Government of Sir John Macdonald came into power, all the changes, superannuations, removals and dismissals did not reach a total of 200. And the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie set for hon. gentlemen opposite, in this matter, as in many others, a good example that they might well follow, and that was that the dogs of destruction should not be let loose among the officials and employees in every county because the Liberals have been successful at the polls and have come into power. It is only for us to protest; we cannot do more. If it be the pleasure of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if there be no restraining influence, in their own party, if there be no better feeling prevailing among them, it is perfectly evident that they can carry on these dismissals. Under the doctrine laid down in this House by the hon. Minister of Railways, there is nothing controlling them in this matter, and nothing to prevent them dismissing every official appointed by the Liberal-Conservative party. And still, I find it hard to believe that the Liberal party will deliberately surrender itself to such a course as that marked out by my hon. friend. And most of all do I hesitate to believe that the Liberal party will deliberately inform the workingmen of Canada that, while the official drawing such a salary as enables him to live in a style somewhat approaching gentility, is to be protected with something like care, the workingman, the horny-handed son of toil, as he is sometimes called, the bone and sinew of the country, as the Liberal party is fond of calling him, has no rights, no privilege, and that no justice is to be extended to him. I hesitate, and I will hesitate a long time, to believe that, in making this declaration, the Minister of Railways and Canals spoke for an undivided Cabinet. In the debate of yesterday, the facts showed a division existing in the ranks of the Cabinet on the question of the fast line, just as it was shown that they were divided on the question of Chinese immigration. So the facts, I think, will bring to the knowledge of the country that even in relation to these dismissals and the wholesale decapitation of officers, there is not a united Cabinet. I hope that is the case, that there is some better feeling and some more kindly influence in the Government, that all are not wedded to this heartless, cruel doctrine. Finally, the hon. Minister of Railways gave

his reason for exercising his authority as he proposed to do. He said there were about 5,000 in his department, and it would be impossible for him to administer the affairs of the department and see that every man got justice. Surely the hon. gentleman must have anticipated that there was going to be a wholesale attack on the officers. If all the place-holders appeal to him at once, of course, he could not find time to hear the cases. But is it possible that the whole railway and canal service is to be thrown open to the thugs and the despoilers? I would fain hope that forty or fifty cases would be all that would arise. Is it possible the Minister says he is administering that department and will not take time to try the cases of forty or fifty poor workmen? Has it come to this, that at this time of day, the material things handled by his department, the ties, rails, and so on, the inanimate part of his department, appeal to the hon. Minister more strongly than do the hearts, the flesh and blood of the poor employees entrusted to his care?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I am more than surprised to see that the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Bell) works himself into such heat at the very thought of the present Liberal Government doing anything for the Liberals of Pictou county. He told this House, with the greatest emphasis, that the Liberals were determined to cut off the heads of the officials of the county of Pictou without benefit of clergy. Well, I tell the hon. member for Pictou that the time is not long since when the very men with whom he is now associated cut off his head without calling in a clergyman, either. Sir, the time is not long since, I say, when he had to fall back upon the friends of the Minister of Finance, when his present associates declared that he was not wanted in the county of Pictou when he resigned his seat in the local legislature in order to secure a nomination in that fine county. I say to the hon. gentleman, and to his associates also, that it was well for him, then, that the Minister of Finance was not such a political bigot as to call upon his friends in the fine county of Pictou—the Liberals in that county—to refuse to support that gentleman in his dire extremity, when his friends had abandoned him. The hon. the Finance Minister, then the Premier of Nova Scotia, who had great influence in that province, and still has, permitted the Liberals of Pictou to come to the rescue of the hon. gentleman when his friends failed to nominate him in that county. The Liberals of Pictou manfully stood by that hon. gentleman on that occasion, manfully voted for him, and saved—his deposit.

An hon. MEMBER. When was that.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). In 1887. The hon. gentleman, following in the footsteps of some other leading gentlemen in that party, came back to the party, and is now one of the most docile supporters of the leader of the Opposition among hon. gentlemen opposite. I remember the time when I had a seat in the local legislature of Nova Scotia, and when the hon. gentleman held a position in that House in opposition to the Administration led by the Minister of Finance. I was elected on that occasion as a supporter of that hon. gentleman. Like himself I abandoned that party, but unlike him I will never go back to it. On that occasion I was associated with one of the most respected members of that legislature, and who still occupies a seat in it, namely, Mr. Alexander Campbell, the present member for Inverness. That gentleman and myself, and the member for the county of Halifax, were constrained by sheer force of the requirements of our constituents, to abandon the lead of that hon. gentleman, and to support the policy of the Minister of Finance in a measure which saddled the province of Nova Scotia with a debt of one and a half millions, namely, half the gross debt with which that hon. gentleman's administration is now charged by the Conservatives of Nova Scotia, as being so recklessly incurred. We, elected as Conservatives, I say, were constrained by sheer force of the needs of our constituents, to support the administration of the Finance Minister on that occasion. I therefore think that it is only due to the hon. Minister of Finance to say that two of the leading counties in the province of Nova Scotia electing Conservative representatives, were obliged to support the administration of that hon. gentleman upon its most important measures. And need I give a better testimony of the manner in which that hon. gentleman administered the affairs of Nova Scotia than to tell the hon. member for Pictou that out of 38 members of the local legislature today, there are only seven or eight Tories in the whole body? And yet the Minister of Finance led the government of that province for the past fourteen years. Is this House to be told, then, and through this House the country, that the hon. Minister of Finance led the government of Nova Scotia unsuccessfully and to the detriment of the interests of that fine province. I say the very fact of that hon. gentleman having at his back three-fourths of the representatives of the people of Nova Scotia when he took the honourable position of Finance Minister of Canada, should be a sufficient certificate of the character of his administration, and should weigh much more with this House than any objections the hon. member for Pictou can present. Now, with regard to Liberals being determined to cut off the heads of Tory officials, I say that I can only admire the square and fair manner in which the hon. Minister of Railways declared his reasons for dismissing certain parties in the employment of that department. In that respect he differs widely from others who dismissed much more important officials,

but had not the manliness to come before this House or before the country, and give their true reasons. I will give an instance of this in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. The Eastern Nova Scotia terminus of the Intercolonial Railway is at Port Mulgrave, on the Strait of Canso. A steamer connects the Island of Cape Breton with Nova Scotia proper, and constitutes a portion of the Intercolonial Railway, inasmuch as it ferries passengers and freight from one side of the Strait of Canso to the other, and from one train to the other, from the Nova Scotia side to the Cape Breton side. On the Cape Breton side there are two termini. At one of these termini was appointed by the Dominion Administration, a Liberal, namely, George C. Lawrence, Esq., a gentleman who is a most efficient officer, by the way, a brother of the Speaker of the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia, educated and of excellent ability. It was found rather inconvenient to take that man squarely by the official throat. But other means were found, not the frank, fair, square and manly way declared by the Minister of Railways this evening, but a round-about way, a measure and a manner that enabled the leader of the then Government to protest against the party being guilty of this, that and the other heinous crime against political decency. It was done in this way: Commands were given from headquarters that Port Hastings was no more to be the railway terminus of that ferry steamer, that the railway steamer, as it is called, was no longer to stop at Port Hastings. Mr. Lawrence then found that he was—his official head cut off as this is now-a-days called—out of office. In order to give their action a show of decency, a few months were permitted to elapse, and lo and behold! a brand new Tory official starts up and ensconces himself in the office of the railway agent at Port Hastings, and is there to this hour. I would ask the hon. leader of the Opposition if he would solemnly protest against my recommending to this Government a measure of the same description being meted out to every gentleman who holds office in that way now. I say to this Government that the people of Inverness would consider that I was recreant to my duty as their representative if I failed to ask this Government to dismiss partisan officials in my county. In regard to the statement made with respect to the line of demarcation between partisan and non-partisan officials, I hold that public opinion is the court of last resort, and the electors of Inverness County have sent me here to ask among other needed reforms the Liberal Government of Canada to dismiss any partisan official in my county, and I feel that this Government can safely rely upon public opinion in that county not to command anything in this regard to offend public or political decency. The leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Pictou invaded my county at three points in last May, during the heat of the campaign, surrounded by an escort of individuals, seven out of ten of whom were Dominion officials, and he and the then Solicitor General predicted, and did their utmost endeavours to secure, my defeat; and why I ask should I now heed their protests in regard to dismissals of these same partisan officials however solemnly and emphatically these may be made. I say here and now that it is unreasonable in these gentlemen to expect me to pay heed to these solemn protests in view of the action of those partisan officials, the leader of the Opposition being my best witness as to their guilt, at the same time declaring that I would not be elected. I ask if it would be unreasonable for me to ask for the dismissal of the partisan officials who went around with the leader of the Opposition in the steamer "Blue Hill," when they invaded my constituency and announced that I would be defeated by the then representative who had been in Parliament eighteen years. They declared I would be left at home; but I am here to represent the county of Inverness, and also to declare that I will ask the present Government to dismiss partisan officials, and I call upon the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to say whether or not seven out of the ten men forming the escort of the leader of the Opposition on that occasion were not Dominion officials? I recall also a party paper published at Port Hawkesbury, containing a portrait of the leader of the Opposition and of my opponent, declaring that the Conservatives would be successful at the elections of 23rd June, describing the magnificent success which had attended the leader's political tour in my county, and depicting in glowing terms the procession that escorted him from Port Hood to the steamer "Blue Hill" to the stirring strains of the pibroch, the tune being equally soul-stirring: "Wha will be king but Charlie." Bonnie Prince Charlie was a pretender to the throne of England. He never became king, however; and history only repeats itself, because the coronation in the case under consideration has been indefinitely postponed. There are Government telegraph lines running through a great portion of my county, and there are six Government telegraph offices, but at the present time there is not a Liberal holding one of them. The office at Margaree, where I reside, was in the hands of a Liberal, but was turned out two or three weeks before the elections, and there was not one operator I could trust to send a message as the instrument was removed to the office of the most violent Tory in the county of Inverness. With respect to Nova Scotia officials, I must say—and I appeal to other Liberal members from that province to endorse my statement—the strongest charge that the Liberals have made and are mak-

ing to-day against the Finance Minister and his Government is that he was too conservative with respect to retaining Tories in office under his government. One of the first speeches I ever delivered in the local assembly of Nova Scotia was against the measure to which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) alluded, and that was with respect to sheriffs. My first public utterance was a protest against that measure. I am happy to say that my predictions on that occasion failed of being realized; for at the present time there is a vigorous Tory official as high sheriff of Inverness, who has held office under the provincial government for the past fourteen years. I need scarcely give stronger proof of his partisanship than the fact that he was appointed by my predecessor as returning officer in his county. We have a Liberal majority in the municipal council of Inverness, but we have a Tory treasurer there, we have a Tory judge of probate, and we have a Tory registrar of probate. These are the principal offices in the gift of the government of Nova Scotia in that county.

Mr. LISTER. Are these men under a Liberal Government?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Don't say anything about it, Sir, but they are. In view of the fact that these questions have very little to do with the subject with which the House has most to deal, I shall not occupy any more of your attention but will later have some further observations to make in reference to more important subjects.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. It is opportune, Sir, to say something about the general principle that should govern the dismissal of officials from the civil service of Canada. When the question came up in the early part of the session, the purely partisan state of the case was emphasized. There was a marked difference of opinion amongst hon. gentlemen as to whether the partisanship of the Ontario civil service was more offensive than the partisanship of the Dominion civil service, and vice versa. In the two cases cited in the previous debate upon the subject, namely, the case of the registrar of one of the divisions of Toronto, and the case of the librarian of the provincial legislature, I know that both these gentlemen have an active, continuous, and very lively interest, not only in provincial but in Dominion politics as well. In the event of a change in the political complexion of the Ontario legislature I do not think that either of those gentlemen could or would complain if they were asked to step down and out. It is all right for an office-holder to say: I will exercise my rights, I will go on the platform, I will talk for my candidate, I will use all my influence and if my party goes down I am ready to do down with it. But, Sir, it seems to me that there is something more important than the interests of the office-holder, if we are to have any approach to the system that is in vogue in the United States.

I doubt not that the Liberal members of this House have good reason to complain of the activity—to use a very mild term—of many of the Dominion civil servants. If I were a revengeful man I too would have complaints, because during the last election, the custom-house, the inland revenue office, and the post office were all committee rooms for my opponent. If the Liberal members of this House have their grievances I have mine, but notwithstanding all our grievances, I would urge the Government to establish the principle, that no civil servant should be an active partisan, but to establish it by not punishing those who have sinned in the past. I maintain that the civil servant has no right in politics beyong the right to vote, and the right to express his opinions in private conversation. The Government owe something to the independent voters of this country. The Government owe something to such of the independent newspapers as were reasonably fair to them when opposition. These papers have spoken for themselves, their utterances agree with the sentiments that I now express, and I believe that my sentiments express the honest convictions of the independent people of this country. Now, Sir, this reform in the civil service cannot be carried out by the dismissal of one set of offensive partisans of one political colour, and the appointing to their places of another set of offensive partisans of a different political colour. The precedent which this Government will make in the present case, will stand as an influence for good or for evil for all time to come in Canadian politics. I do not recollect in my forty years' experience as a close observer of Canadian politics—and my memory goes back to the days when the old Parliament of Canada met in Toronto in 1856—I say that I do not recollect ever having heard a more unique, surprising, and unprecedented statement than that which fell from the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) this afternoon. And when I look at that hon. gentleman with his kindly and benevolent face, I can hardly credit that his own views are these which he announced on the floor of this House. I only hope that when he sleeps over the matter, he will act as the First Minister did in connection with the Chicago "Record" interview; I hope that he will very materially modify his views. I can tell the Minister of Railways and Canals, that his statement will be a great surprise to the workingmen of Ontario, a great surprise to the workingmen of East Toronto, in which I need hardly say, a very large number of the working-people of that city reside. It is a good thing we have no Government railways in Ontario, but we have canals and other public works there, and I do trust

that the Minister will not carry out his intentions with regard to the workingmen of Ontario as he has done with regard to the workingmen down in the eastern provinces. If the Minister of Railways is going to introduce these methods into the administration of the Dominion of Canada, then all I can say is: "God help the Dominion of Canada." I am not saying for a moment that the Government would act unjustly in dismissing active and open enemies; but if the Government should do anything in that direction, it will be a precedent that will encourage the next Government—unless the present Government hang on to power forever—it will encourage the next Government to do more, and the next Government more, and the next Government still more, in the same line. How can we hope for a reform in the civil service if such a precedent is laid down. The safeguards of our civil service will be swept away, and our politics will be degraded into a petty squabble over the right to peddle out offices which are opened by every change of Government. The Government can now establish a precedent that will prevent similar offences in the future without making a gallows to hang the unfortunate sinners who have offended in the past.

Mr. MILLS. When I entered Parliament in 1887, I was taught by the Liberal-Conservative leaders of that day, that no Government official should be dismissed unless there was a proper charge of malfeasance brought against him and sustained. My county of Annapolis was smarting at that time, under the unjust dismissal of a number of its prominent officials by the then local government—I refer more particularly to the high sheriff and to the registrar of deeds—it was smarting as I say under the dismissal of those two officials, men who were eminent as citizens, high in social position in the county, men respected by all classes, but whose positions were desired by the partisans that were bolstering up the local government of Nova Scotia in the county of Annapolis at that date. These officials were dismissed, one upon a most paltry charge—the charge that in the deeds and other documents which he was recording in the registry office he had not counted the exact number of words in the folios for which he charged. Before an unprejudiced and unbiassed man, on the testimony that was brought out, the charges could not be sustained, and were not sustained by the very best people in the county of Annapolis, Liberals and Conservatives alike. Smarting as I say our people were under these gross dismissals of officials, many of them came to me and asked me to dismiss this preventive officer, and that clerk or collector of customs, this postmaster and that postmaster, all Grits. There were no less than three dozen such officials, open and active Liberals, men who took an active part in all the revision courts on behalf of Liberals, who were chairmen of committees, who attended all the caucuses of the Liberal party in the county of Annapolis, who were prominent in everything that was done in the interest of that party. My people came to me and said, "We want these people dismissed." I will mention the names of some of them: Edgar Porter, collector of customs at Thorn's Cove; Augustus Fullerton, collector of customs in the county of Annapolis; Warden Roop, warden of the county of Annapolis, postmaster at Clementsport. There was Elliott, the late postmaster at Port George, a man who was so violent a partisan that in 1887 the only insult I ever received in the county of Annapolis—and it was a most desperate fight that we had in 1887—I received from this man. Charges were brought against him. I came to the leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party in the Dominion Parliament and asked them to dismiss this man. They said, "Bring a charge against him, and have that charge sustained, and we will dismiss him." I went back to my people and told them that. I said, "The policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government is to dismiss no man unless there is a charge of malfeasance brought against him, sustained and proved." That was done time and time again. I could mention more of these names. Not one single man has been dismissed in the county of Annapolis since 1887; and, as I have said, there were no less than about three dozen Liberals acting as postmasters, collectors of customs, preventive officers, and lighthouse keepers in that county. But now, forsooth, the political morality of the Dominion is to be thrown back twenty years, and by whom? By no less than the local premiers of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who have been wallowing around in their little mud holes for the last eighteen years, and doing those very things they want this Dominion Parliament now to do.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Not in New Brunswick.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, and in Nova Scotia as well. I know of my own knowledge that this has been done in Nova Scotia; and now the defeated candidate in Annapolis writes up to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and alleges that certain officials in that county have been active partisans against him, and that he wants them dismissed in order to put in—whom? The most degraded of political partisans. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries smiles. I will mention one man's name.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I would not mention the name.

Mr. MILLS. This man is so insignificant that I will not mention his name.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MILLS. I will not mention his name, as my leader has asked me not to do so; but I am not afraid, so far as the county of

Annapolis is concerned, to mention his name. The man who has circulated that petition against this official, is one of the most degraded human beings in the county of Annapolis; he has been shown to be so in the courts. This is the man who seeks to be put in the place of a man the only charge against whom is that he voted for me and did not vote for the Hon. Mr. Longley. It was a shock to me when I heard the Minister of Railways to-day rise and say, We will do thus and so with reference to these officials. I tell you the better sense of the Liberals of this Dominion will be against this, and I have no doubt the late local premier of New Brunswick will rather modify his statements, as other statements have been modified already in this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Speaker, I think I must have been singularly unfortunate in giving expression to the views I entertain as to the proper method of dealing with charges against officials and persons in the Intercolonial service, if the strictures which have been made by some of our hon. friends opposite are at all warranted by the statement which I made to the committee. I was interrogated by hon. gentlemen opposite on the subject of two or three dismissals which had taken place since I assumed the administration of the department; and, being catechised as to the principle upon which I acted, in these dismissals, and as to the methods on which I proposed to act so long as I held the office, I stated to the committee, as I thought, clearly and frankly, the views which I entertained and by which I hoped to be guided in the future. And, Sir, when it is assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite that I discriminated between the class of officials in the railway service who hold the better offices and the offices to which the greater emoluments are attached, and those who are temporary and from day to day labourers, and that I discriminated unfavourably to the latter, I do think that hon. gentlemen opposite have unwarrantably and unfairly interpreted the language I employed. I did point out that in dealing with employees in this department, I must necessarily be guided by a different rule in treating with that vast class who may be characterized as temporary or day-labourers, from the rule that should be applied to those who fill permanent official positions, who might be said to be in the civil service of the country. I have no desire in my heart to discriminate unfairly against any class in the public service. I have no disposition in mind, heart or thought to deal unfairly by the labouring class. It would be the last thing which I would be guilty of doing. I have not the slightest intention of meting out to any class of the public employees anything but the fullest measure of justice. I am not appearing here in a public capacity for the first time in my life. I have a somewhat lengthy public record behind me. For a long time I have been responsible, in a considerable measure, for the legislation which has been placed upon the statute-books of New Brunswick, and I can point with the utmost confidence and with some pride to that legislation, during a period of fourteen years as showing that it is dotted with measures having for their object the improvement and the protection of the interests of the labouring classes. I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to make that investigation of these statutes, with the utmost and unbounded confidence, and I do not fear that when any statements which I have made in this House to-day come to the knowledge of those who have watched my public course, they will not interpret anything I have said as unfavourable to the great labouring classes of the country, nor will they believe that my administration is likely to be wanting in justice or fair play to them. There is this difficulty which will confront any man who administers the office I have the honour to hold. There are in that department hundreds, and indeed thousands of persons who fill, in the fullest and largest sense, temporary positions in the employ of the Government. They cannot be classified as belonging to the civil service, or as being permanent employees of the Government, but they are dotted all over the counties in the maritime provinces, and, so far as our canals are concerned, all over Ontario and Quebec. I feel that, when responsible men, whether they are representatives in this House or have been deemed worthy of being the standard-bearers of the great Liberal party, give me the positive assurance, upon their word of honour and on their personal knowledge, that any of these temporary employees, as I have described them, have been active partisans in the elections, and have departed from the policy of neutrality, which it is the duty of the lowest, as well as the highest, employees of the Government to observe, I think I am justified in taking these men at their word and in dealing with them as being guilty of the charges made against them. It would be absolutely impossible for me, or any one filling this position, to institute the same close, minute character of judicial inquiry which I would be able to make if I had only to deal with two or three hundred permanent officials of the Government, under continual official supervision. Into the cases which have been the subject of this debate, those of Roderick McLeod and McKay, I invite the closest scrutiny, confident that such scrutiny will furnish evidence that I have dealt with them in a fair, judicial spirit. I have no personal desire to cut off any man's head who is in the service of the country. I take no pleasure in seeking to deprive any one of his employment or office. For fourteen years I

was in the Government of New Brunswick, and during all that time I never once, without the weightiest cause, took upon myself to interfere with any man's tenure of office, and during all that period there were men whom I retained in office under me, who were strong, though of course not active, political opponents of mine. I am, therefore, not bringing with me from the province of New Brunswick any disposition at all to pursue a severe or rigorous course with regard to the employees in the public service. Now, what did I do in the two cases to which the hon. member for Pictou called particular attention? There is no one in this House who will not admit that Mr. Macdonald is a responsible man. There is no one in this House whose personal assurance and statement would be accepted more readily than that of Mr. Macdonald, barrister, who was the opponent of the hon. member for Pictou. When he wrote to me to say that these two men had had been active in the campaign and should be removed, I wrote to him and said I trusted he was not making the statements without having every assurance of their accuracy. I said to him: I want you to satisfy yourself beyond the shadow of a doubt that what you say is true, and I trust that you will only ask me to sanction these removals until you have convinced yourself and can give your personal guarantee that what you state against these men is perfectly true. He assured me, in reply, that he knew, from his own personal and actual knowledge, that these two persons had been active partisans in the campaign. I do not care, Mr. Chairman, what may be the opinions of hon. gentlemen on the other side as to the fairness of my treatment of these two men. I want to say and I am prepared to take the responsibility, as the head of this department, of acting upon this principle, that, when it is brought to my knowledge, when I am satisfied—acting as I am determined to act, in a spirit of fair-play and justice to all—that a man, whether his position be high or low, whether he fills the office of a temporary employee or is a permanent employee, has acted as these men were said to have acted, has entered actively into the campaign and chosen to put his official life into the hands of his opponents, then I am prepared, as the head of this department, to dispense with the services of such a man. I feel myself justified in this, because I do not think that we can carry on party government, as we have been carrying it on in times past, if we act in any other way or upon any other principle. It is all very well for our hon. friends opposite, who have filled every department of the public service with their own appointees to cry out gainst the adoption of this rule, when it operates against them, and when by crying out against it they hope to reap some political advantage. Why have they not applied this principle in times past, when they had it in their power to do so? Talk about 200 persons only being removed at the time or following the defeat of the Mackenzie Government. Two hundred—it is ridiculous to us who know the actual facts to make such a statement. Why, the heads of unoffending Liberals fell in all directions, and without the shadow of a judicial inquiry. I have in my possession the sworn declarations of gentlemen who were thus treated, gentlemen of the highest character and credibility, who have satisfied me, and will satisfy the public, if the occasion offers, that they were not dealt with in the judicial manner in which persons ought to be dealt with who are permanently employed in the public service. The evidence of this lies on every hand. I say it is not unreasonable that the Liberals of this country, who have during even the whole period of Conservative administration constituted at least one-half of the population of Canada, should have some share in the civil service and in the patronage of the Government of the country. When a charge is made and sustained—I do not say by any process of official inquiry, held by myself personally, because that cannot be available—when a responsible Minister is satisfied by evidence which is at his hand, or which he receives from persons upon whom he may rely, that any employee of the Government, against whom a complaint is made, has violated this principle of neutrality, has been an active and violent partisan, has entered into a campaign against his opponents, no one can complain, least of all those on the other side, if the Government exercises its undoubted right to dispense with the services of that man. Before I take my seat, I wish to give the information to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) concerning which he called my attention this afternoon, and which he says he asked me for a few days since. I have referred to "Hansard," and have procured the names of the persons he spoke of. I find that the following are the names of those for whom he inquired:—

John G. McDougall, R. McLean, Hugh McPherson, D. A. McDougall, James Landry, John Morrell, D. R. McLean.

The hon. gentleman asked me whether or not these persons have been dismissed from the Intercolonial. I may say that I was not aware, and personally I am not now aware, as to whether or not these persons were dismissed. I have been informed by the Deputy Minister of the department that John G. McDougall, R. McLean, Hugh McPherson, D. A. McDougall, James Landry, John Morrell and D. R. McLean were seven carpenters employed in repairing bridges and stations on the line between New Glasgow and Port Mulgrave. As soon as the work on which they were engaged was completed, in July last, their services were dispensed with, which caused no vacancies, as they

were merely extra carpenters; however, John McGillivray, Wm. F. McDonald, John J. McDougall and John McDonald have been employed for the last two days in putting in a culvert near Pine Hill bridge, about four miles east of New Glasgow. There have been no dismissals for political causes approved by me, except these two, and another that I spoke of this afternoon, in which I acted on the strong representations and statements of an hon. member of this House, that the person against whom he made this charge had been actively participating in the elections. These are the only three cases of which I have knowledge. If gentlemen opposite choose to characterize the statement I make, as to the course I ought to pursue, as a mean course, as an unworthy course, I can only make them a present of their judgment and opinion upon the question. I can truly say that I do not set a high value upon the opinion which they entertain of what is a manly and honourable course. I think it infinitely more manly and more honourable than the course which hon. gentlemen opposite unquestionably pursued in their administration of the railway department in this country. That is not too much to say, for, as the hon. Finance Minister stated this afternoon, there was a system of terrorism prevailing from one end of the line of railway to the other. The workman or employee who was in sympathy with the Liberal party dare not whisper the fact to his nearest neighbour. He dare not let it be breached, lest he should be dismissed the service, or that means would be taken to prevent him exercising his franchise. I think it is infinitely meaner to resort to expedients to prevent a citizen of this country, upon whom the law has conferred the franchise, from casting his ballot freely. I think it is infinitely meaner treatment, and I prefer being classed as mean and brutal among the men who will take pains to satisfy their honest judgment as respects a charge made against a servant of the public—no matter whether he be high or low—and, if satisfied, acts upon the conclusion at which he then arrives, rather than with these truly honourable men who terrorize the independent electors of the country who happen to be in the Government employ. One word to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I was correctly reported when I was represented as saying that, so long as I remained at the head of this department, so long as I was capable of exercising any influence over its administration, I would see to it that the men employed by the department are left free to cast their ballots according to their honest judgment. I never will sanction or permit the use of any means to deprive them of that privilege. If the labouring classes of the country are led by the misinterpretation of my words and meaning persisted in by gentlemen opposite to think me capable of treating them unjustly, then I am afraid I must allow them to retain that judgment and entertain that opinion.

Mr. DYMENT. It may be on account of my youth, but for whatever the reason, it seems to me, I am more appreciative of a joke than some hon. members of this House. To me it seems extremely funny to observe the righteous indignation of these hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on behalf of the poor workingman. And yet all the time they were in power, during the last eighteen years, almost every man employed under them has been nothing but a slave. These men could not even exercise the right to vote as they saw fit. I have instances of this here to which I wish to draw the particular attention of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). The hon. gentleman says he came into this House in 1887, I think. The policy of the Conservative party at that time, he says, was that before an official could be dismissed, a complaint must be made and the charge investigated and substantiated. Now, in that very year, 1887, occurred an incident that proved the contrary. In 1884, one of the officials in the Customs Department was removed from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. In 1887, he was summarily dismissed. If I may be permitted, I will read an extract from his letter:

> In 1884 I was sent to Port Arthur from Winnipeg in the Customs service to assist Collector Nicholson, who was the only officer at that port at the time. I was there until the close of 1887, when I was dismissed to make room for a secretary of the Conservative Association of Port Arthur, and one of their most zealous workers. In all my time in the Customs service I took no part in politics whatever, but somehow they found me out and I had to go.

The sleuth hounds were on his track. They found that he had voted Liberal, and he had to go. He asked the reason, and this is what was written by the head of the Customs Department, Sir Mackenzie Bowell:

> Department has a high appreciation of your services as an officer, but the Government could not overlook the claims of the Port Arthur Conservatives.

Mr. SPROULE. Name.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I want to know if the hon. gentleman is not bound to give the name of the writer. I believe that the rules provide for that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman is bound to give the name of the writer of a private letter.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) was asked to give the name. At first, he said he would, but his friends behind him told him not to, and he did not.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that no judge in any court would allow a letter to be read

without requiring it to be filed, and the name of the signer to be given. Although I know of no case such as this laid down in our procedure, at the same time, I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that no hon. member should read a letter in this House bringing evidence to bear as to the truth of what he is stating to this House, without necessarily laying that letter upon the Table, or at least giving the name of the writer. I do not believe any hon. member who has been in this House for a number of years, would dispute that position.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). An hon. gentleman has a right to read a letter in this House, and it goes for what it is worth. But no one has a right to ask him for the date or for the name.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. On this point I will quote from Bourinot, at page 407 :

It has been laid down by the highest authorities that when a Minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced. But it is allowable to repeat to the House information which is contained in a private communication. When such private papers are quoted in the House, there is no rule requiring them to be laid on the Table. The rule respecting the production of public papers, quoted by a Minister of the Crown, is necessary to give the House the same information he possesses, and enable it to come to a correct conclusion on a question. It does not appear that the English Commons has ever applied this rule to the case of private members citing public documents not in the possession of the House.

Mr. DYMENT. If the committee will allow me, I will read a quotation from another letter. It is from a gentleman asking to be reinstated, if possible, to an office in my riding, a postmaster in one of the towns.

The position had been taken from me by Mr. Macdonell, the late Conservative member, and the reason given by him, which the Post Office Inspector informed me, was that I had gone Grit in the preceding election.

Now, I would like the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) to consider that carefully and digest it.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman would, after having cited these instances, give us the names of the persons who have written the letters so that we might have recourse to the documents and investigate the matter, it might be found that quite a different set of circumstances surrounded each of these cases from what is given in the correspondence from the gentlemen themselves. The portion that was read in each case was simply a statement by the person who had been dispossessed of the office, giving his reason therefor. But, certainly, as every member of the House knows, the value to be attached to testimony of that kind shrinks into insignificance unless there is an opportunity, first, to know who the person is, then to have a chance of referring to the records in order to find out the whole facts of the case. The hon. gentleman can keep the names to himself if he chooses, but he thereby diminishes the worth of the testimony he has been trying to adduce. If he wants to have the case fairly decided, let him give the names of these two officials.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want briefly to recall to the committee the manner in which this discussion started, and to some phases of it. Most of the hon. gentlemen opposite, without attempting to go into the merits of the question which has been raised, have been trying to take a wider range and to carry the discussion on over the whole question of dismissals by different parties. That is not germane to the question, though it may be interesting. But it appears as if all who spoke on that side of the House felt themselves obliged to keep as far away as possible from the real statement made by the hon. gentleman, and the principle which he laid down as the one upon which his practice would be carried out. I think they were wise in doing that. I think the leader of the Government was wise in sitting still and saying nothing. I think the other members of the Government were wise, the most of them, in sitting still and saying nothing, and the one who did speak in straying as far as possible from the question at issue. Now, if the committee have attended carefully to the statements of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, they will have noticed that there has been at once a great difference and at the same time a great similarity between them. The hon. gentleman arose the second time and introduced his remarks by asserting his determination to do justice to every class of persons, to labouring men as well as others. That is a good sentiment, and everybody will approve of it. He then cited his fourteen years of provincial service, in which he said that he had done a great many things for the labouring man. I am not so well acquainted with his provincial course as other gentlemen who are in this House, and for the time being I do not propose to touch that question at all. But my hon. friend had not proceeded far until he re-affirmed the statement that he made in the afternoon, and out of which this whole discussion has arisen. And what was that statement ? Baldly it was that the man who was engaged on a railway in a temporary capacity at a dollar or a dollar and a fraction thereof per day, was a man who would be dismissed, if he were complained against, and would be dismissed without any investigation, whilst those who held a higher position and got a larger salary, and were more permanent, would have extended to them the courtesy and the right of having an official investigation, and would not be dismissed until the result of that investigation was known. Now, my hon. friend himself will not deny that, he re-

affirmed this in his last remarks. He affirmed again what he stated in that respect, and he affirmed it in almost the same words. Now, I take issue with him there. The point arose about four men whom he said he had dismissed, and when I asked the hon. gentleman whether they had been dismissed for political reasons, with an impression in my mind that they had not been dismissed for political reasons, he baldly stated that they had been dismissed, and that they had been dismissed on representations made, not from officers of his department, not on charges which were preferred and which were investigated as well as preferred, but that they had been dismissed because a defeated candidate, forsooth, had told him that these men were opposed to him during the last election. Now, I say that we ought calmly to look at the principle thus laid down. And looking at it, what will happen if the practice is founded upon it, either in the hon. gentleman's department alone, or in the other departments of the Government? What is the principle that he lays down? Surely the poor man who is a temporary worker at $1 or $1.25 a day, has the same interest in his little work as the other man doing a larger work has in his larger work; in each case it is the living of the man. The labouring man who works for $1 or $1.25 a day, his whole stake is in that work, and on its payment he maintains his family and gets his living. It is just as important to him in his capacity as the $800, or the $1,000, or the $2,000 is to a higher official in his capacity, and he ought to be surrounded with just the same safeguards as the man in the higher capacity. I think there can be no dissent from that on principle and upon even justice. But under the principle which the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt, and for which he urges the virtue of frankness so far as temporary employees are concerned, it is that the labouring man who works with pick and shovel and who receives but $1 or $1.25 per day, is a case of a quite different fashion. The hon. gentleman has not time in his case to make investigation. He simply submits this principle for the acceptance of the House—that because a great many men are interested in a certain thing justice shall not be done, but where only a few are particularly interested, their views shall be considered. This means that justice shall not be done because there are many of them, but the great man's attention can be given to the demands of the few, not to the demands of the mass. I will submit to the hon. gentleman a certain way to get rid of that responsibility, which is, not to disturb the poor labouring man. He has been engaged in his work on the road. He has worked faithfully, and to the satisfaction of the section boss and the superintendent. He has exercised his right to vote, as he had a perfect right to do, and because he did not vote for a certain party or candidate, the hon. Minister says that the representations of that candidate, whether he be successful or non-successful, are quite sufficient; that he, the Minister, has not time to hear their cases or to deal out fair and even-handed justice, because there are so many of them. The hon. Minister tries to get rid of his responsibility by saying that these cases are too small, and that, in carrying out so great a department, he cannot go down to section men on the railway and investigate their cases, but that they will be summarily dismissed, if they happen to have voted for some person who is not a party supporter of the hon. Minister. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to members of Parliament as regards making representations in these matters, he would not have been so far astray. A representative sitting in this Parliament has a certain position that a defeated candidate does not and cannot possess. He at least is the choice of his party, he at least is the representative of his people here, and in that capacity his representations have a certain weight which would not otherwise attach to them; and if the hon. Minister had stated his proposal with respect to those principles to be that if a member of Parliament, as a representative man, stated to him and convinced him that certain public employees had taken an active and offensive part in the campaign and they should be dismissed, and he subsequently dismissed them, he would not have been so far astray, but even then he should hear the man's case. There is, moreover, this important point, that a representative holding a seat in Parliament can be questioned about this matter and made responsible for his answer, and held responsible to the people in a parliamentary sense. But the hon. Minister goes further, and says that any defeated candidate, no matter who he may be, who has made a claim to represent the people, and where the people have refused to elect him to represent them, has simply to tell him that these poor labouring men voted against him, and their heads will be cut off, and some other men will be employed. That is a principle and practice which I do not think the good sense of the Liberals or Conservatives in this country will approve, and it is a practice which I am very sorry to hear the hon. gentleman state is to be put into practice in the great department over which he presides. Let me ask, what is the direct influence of a course of that kind? It is simply this. My young friend who has just come into Parliament has truly stated that hon. gentlemen opposite have declared that the employee of the Liberal-Conservative Government was a slave. Hon. gentlemen opposite have declared that there was a reign of terrorism. The Minister of Railways and Canals has declared, without bringing a particle of truth to support his statement, that there was a reign of ter-

rorism under the Liberal-Conservative Government, and that employees were slaves. What will be the position of the employee on the railways and canals when he reads the dictum of the Minister, and when he understands what that dictum means, that he must crawl before the defeated candidate or the person who wished to be a representative of the people, and must do his bidding, and fawn around him before he has a chance to get a place on railway or canal, that his political future is to be reserved and conserved to him by this same fawning to the defeated or prospective candidate, or even to the member. Will that make a slave or a free man? Is that going to improve the position of the labouring men of this country, their bread and butter depending on the mere whisper of a defeated candidate in the ear of the great man who employs them. On the one side there is his manhood and independence as a man; on the other side there is bread and butter and the defeated candidate, who cannot secure the suffrages of the people, standing as the fate to decide whether that man shall get his bread and butter or keep his independence. Does that make labouring men good citizens of this country? I think no man will answer that it does. The principle is wrong, and the practice based on that principle cannot be considered to be right by the good common sense of this country. There is no principle of justice in it. Again, who is to run the Department of Railways? The department is an entity from the head down to the lowest man in the service of the road, and its prosperity depends upon what? Upon the discipline and the quality of the servants employed on the road. Where will the discipline of the road be after the dictum of the Minister of Railways has gone out, that every labouring man, every temporary man, every one of the two or three thousand men on the railway is dependent upon the breath, whim or will of a defeated candidate as to whether he shall retain his place or not. If the men depend for the position on a defeated candidate, that man is their master, not the superintendent of the section or the superintendent of the line. They have obtained their places through the defeated candidate. They know they can keep them if they remain on the right side of the defeated candidate. Where is the position to the road? Throughout the service there will be lack of discipline and disregard of the officers of the road, which will come about entirely from instilling into the minds of the employees, which the hon. Minister has done under his dictum, the idea that if they want to get on they must fawn to the defeated or successful candidate, and if they want to retain their positions, all they have to do is to pursue the same course. I say it is against the discipline and usefulness of a great system like the Intercolonial Railway to introduce a practice founded on a principle of that kind. More than that, Sir, who is to run the road? It is to be run by the representatives of the people and the defeated candidates of the people; Liberals, of course. They are to run the Intercolonial Railway so far as the officering of the road is concerned. Look at it from whichever point of view you like, the statement that has been made, and the rule that has been laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is a vicious statement and a bad rule, and it cannot but be productive of evil in the service of the road and in the general interest of the country.

But what justice is there in this, Sir: that a man shall stand up here and declare that political neutrality is the price to be paid for office, when the very moment that they create a vacancy by this kind of sword practice, the very next moment, who fills it? Is it the neutral man in politics; not by any means. It is filled by the most decided partisan in politics. Is there any justice in that? If hon. gentlemen, on Liberal principles and on the line of policy which they consider is good, say that political neutrality must be the price of office, let them make it that, so that both the man who holds the office shall know it and the man who wants the office shall know it. But, so long as what is the penalty in one case becomes the reward in the other case, the hon. gentlemen opposite are inconsistent, and instead of curing they ten thousand times aggravate the very evil they say they wish to cure. These are sentiments which I believe we, sitting without partisan bias,—if we could put ourselves in that position for a single moment—would believe to be proper and right. Will the course taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) help or hurt in that matter, and what is to be the effect? Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes talk about the spoils system of the United States, but these hon. gentlemen know very well that they cannot make that reproach to the United States to-day. The time was when they could. The time was when this vicious system which my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is introducing into Canada now, which teaches every man to fight for the spoils of office, and to get them by making himself solid with his party candidate; the time was when that was in vogue in the United States. But that was years ago, and to-day the system no longer exists. Within the last ten years the civil service on fixed principles has given place to the spoils system until now on a change of Government, there is the smallest possible change of the offices in the United States. They have left the spoil system, but we are going back to it. Let it be recorded in history that the party which is post-dating civil service progress in this country, is the great Liberal party which might be expected to be in favour of the strengthening and purifying of our civil service. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) made the observation, that he does not propose

to discriminate, but his lips were not cold from that declaration until he declared that he had not time to investigate and must, therefore, discriminate against the labouring man. What is the evidence he will take? If a man who runs against me in my county and is defeated comes to him and says——

Mr. DOMVILLE. You have no county.

Mr. FOSTER. I have adopted the policy of leaving my hon. friend (Mr. Domville) to the calm judgment of the House, and I shall pursue that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) will not rile my temper in the least, and I trust he will not interrupt me. What I was going on to say was this. I stated that in the United States the spoils system had been supplanted by the better system, and that now in Canada we were going back to the old system of spoils. Nothing that has transpired in this Parliament will tend to do that more rapidly than the statement which has been made by the Minister of Railways and Canals to-night. My hon. friend the leader of the Government, I do not think was in his seat when the statement was made, but he cannot be ignorant of it. He went far the other night when he laid down the principle that a man should have the right to vote but that he should not have the right to go any further. He also said that that man had a right to fair-play. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) behind him, a member of his Government, goes as far as does the Prime Minister, but he goes further than him, and he says that amongst the labouring men he has no time to see that they shall have a fair trial, and so he will just take an assertion.

The hon. the leader of the Government shakes his head. Does he not know that his Minister of Railways said this afternoon, in reply to a question from myself: that with regard to labouring men who are temporary men, he had not time to investigate their cases, and that when representations were made to him against a labouring man by the defeated candidate or by the member he would take these representations, and he would displace that man as he has already displaced several on that same principle on the Intercolonial Railway. Without judge or jury, Sir! The labouring man's living is there, but that is nothing. The man's daily work is there upon which alone he has to live, but that is nothing. The whisper of the defeated candidate is sufficient that the man should lose his work and have his means of livelihood taken from him though he does his work satisfactorily to every man on the road. That poor man has no recourse, no redress, no opportunity to show whether these statements that have been made against him are true or false. Yet my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) calls that justice. Is it justice in any court of law that the accuser shall be the jury to find the verdict, and that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is going to be simply the judge who records that verdict. That is not justice. It is a discrimination against the labouring man, and it is an unfair discrimination against any class of men. I care not whether they labour in the higher or in the lower degree, whether in skilled or in unskilled work.

Now, Sir, we may depend upon it that if my hon. friend the leader of the Government chooses to allow his Minister of Railways and Canals to carry out that principle, and to go still further than he himself has laid down as the policy of the Government; we may depend upon it that he will have to reckon with a disorganized branch of the service in the first place, and later on, he will have to reckon with what I believe will be the righteous indignation of the sober-minded people of this country when they find out just what will result from this practice. My hon. friends opposite think they have a perfect answer to this when they cite some one case or other in which some Liberal had been dismissed by the Liberal-Conservative Government. I say that you cannot make much of such a case as that, unless you go into an examination to see what were the causes that led to the dismissal. I say that nearly all these assertions that have been made on the other side, have been general assertions without special proofs, and even when we come to the citation of a special proof the hon. gentleman who refers to it will not give the names so that we might be able to see whether there are other circumstances in connection with it or not. I say that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government has not been to disturb men in office because they were Liberals. I understand this thoroughly well from my own experience. In 1882 I became a member of this House, and up to 1885, while I remained a member of this House, the same representations were made to me over and over again. I always got the answer which my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) stated: "If you will bring a charge of malfeasance in office or neglect of duty or anything of that kind, and that charge is substantiated, and you have a good case, the man will be dismissed, otherwise he will not be." And I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to the records of the Railway Department which are at his disposal; he can go back over them for twelve years if he likes; and I invite him to do that and find a single case in whch I endeavoured to interfere with a man connected with the Intercolonial Railway, because he was of a different political persuasion from myself. He will not find a single case. That was the principle on which the Liberal-Conservative Government went then, and it was the principle on which they went when I was a member of the Government. You may cite cases in which that principle was sparingly applied; you may quote other cases, the circumstances of which you do not know in which you may think it was not applied. But that has been the rule of the Liberal-Conservative party. Now, how-

ever, we have a different rule, a rule for which the leader of this Government will be responsible if he establishes it himself or allows his Ministers to carry it out. That is not the worst of it: it will be a bad thing for the public service and for this country.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It so happened that I was a member of the Liberal Government which preceded the late Government, and I have a tolerably distinct recollection of what occurred at the time of our retiring from office. Unless my memory is wholly at fault—I am speaking from recollection, and therefore subject to correction—I think that on that occasion every employee on the Prince Edward Island Railroad was dismissed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. True, a certain reorganization took place, and a certain number were reinstated. But a vast number were dismissed. I believe the same thing happened on the Intercolonial Railway. Under pretense of economy and reconstruction; and I think the first man to lose his head was Mr. C. J. Brydges, then manager of the Intercolonial Railway, who made himself especially obnoxious to the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite me. The fact of the matter is that for a great many years back the Intercolonial Railroad has been, from top to bottom, from cellar to garret, a political machine of the very worst type. I am not going to waste the time of this House by dwelling too long on evident facts, which are known to all men of any political experience in this country. But I have here the report of the Civil Service Commission, issued by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1892, and I propose to read a few sentences from that report; and when I have read them, I think every intelligent man in this House will agree with me that for the last eighteen years the Intercolonial Railway has been nothing more nor less than a political machine. Here is the sworn evidence given before that commission by Mr. Schreiber, at present and then the chief manager of the Intercolonial Railway:

How are the station masters, the conductors, the brakesmen and all the other officers, appointed?—In the appointment of station masters, etc., the member for the district is consulted, and his nominee, as a rule, is appointed, unless some good reason is known why he should not be.

And the member for the district nominates the station masters?—The station masters and station operators, section men, section foremen, and brakesmen, as a rule, are taken from the nominees of the member for the district.

Always excepting, I presume, that he is not a supporter of the Liberal Government. But I think the House is tolerably aware what the facts were. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this:

Have you any sort of check upon inefficient men being appointed, or do you require any qualifications?—If we consider a man is really of no use, we object to him, and we ask for another name.

Do you find that you have to do this often with men who are not efficient or not as efficient as you would like?—Yes; we have a large number of men now employed whose services we think could be dispensed with.

Is not the work on the railway of a technical character, so that not everybody is fit for any position there?—A conductor requires to be a man of experience, and a very careful man. If he does not perform his duties satisfactorily he should be dismissed, and so with station masters, train despatchers and others.

Thus they required to be men of special qualifications, and therefore they should not be appointed by the members for the district for political reasons, as they were all through the time of hon. gentlemen opposite. I venture to say that when my hon. friend came into office he did not find one man in a hundred, probably not one in a thousand, on that railroad, who had not been put there by hon. gentlemen opposite more or less for political reasons. Now, what did my hon. friend the Minister of Railways declare? He did not declare that he was going to interfere with any man's political opinions. On the contrary, he most expressly declared that no man should suffer at his hand in exercising the franchise as he pleased. What he did declare was this, that when sufficient evidence was laid before him to satisfy him that a particular man had been an active partisan, then he would dismiss that man. That was what he stated and nothing more; and that, Sir, is, I think, entirely in accord with the declaration made by my hon. friend beside me (the Prime Minister), and entirely in accord with the principles which have always been laid down. Now, Sir, I do not want to see the spoils system introduced in Canada; but I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if civil servants are permitted to take an active part in politics, to speak on public platforms, to act as organizers, or in other ways to identify themselves with any political party, they must share the fate of that party. It is because I do not want to see the spoils system introduced that I uphold my hon. friend, and I say that it is his duty to make an example of all railway servants of the public in any capacity who refuse to abide by this wholesome rule. The rule is plain and clear, and hon. gentlemen have got to abide by it, whether they like it or not. We do not propose to deal with them as they dealt with us in all respects; but we do propose to say that civil servants who have actively interfered in political matters shall suffer the fate they deserve, and be dismissed on sufficient evidence of that fact being adduced.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should not have said another word in this debate but

for the statement that has just fallen from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. In 1878 I had the honour of succeeding the former Premier, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, in the Public Works Department, which at that time embraced railways and canals as well as other public works. The hon. gentleman has said that my first act was to dismiss Mr. C. J. Brydges. That is not exactly the case. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Brydges and myself had come into such strong and violent collision in reference to the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the department over which I presided, that it would have been quite impracticable and quite impossible for me to ask him to continue in the discharge of that duty. Under those circumstances the change was made, but there was another reason, and that was that under Mr. Mackenzie and under the management of Mr. C. J. Brydges, the deficit between the revenue from the Intercolonial and the expenditure was from one-half to three-quarters of a million per annum, and I think I am right in saying that Mr. Brydges had committed himself to a statement, which had become public, to the then president of the Grand Trunk Railway, that the Intercolonial could not be operated without the loss of something like $700,000 a year. The best advice and information I could obtain led me to the belief that a great reduction could be made in the expenditure for the Intercolonial, and I took measures for that purpose. A gentleman was appointed superintendent of that road who, from that time to this, has shown the value of that change by the remarkable success of his administration. The reorganization of the road in such a way as to reduce the expenditure to something like the income involved the dispensing with the services of a large number of individuals. That duty was discharged by gentlemen who were declared by Mr. Brydges himself to be the ablest and best men on the road. It was discharged by them in a thoroughly impartial spirit. They made the selection of the persons who should be retained and whose services should be dispensed with. I make the statement in the presence of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I refer the hon. Minister of Railways to the department, where he will find the facts as I state them, that the reduction of the employees of the Intercolonial, was done without favour or affection for Liberals or Liberal-Conservatives. Although the great body of those employees had been appointed by Mr. Mackenzie and his administration, all who were required and whose services were most valuable were retained, and I was assailed constantly, day in and day out, by Liberal-Conservatives who said to me: you have dispensed with a large number of your own friends and retained a large number of your strongest opponents. That does not bear out the statement which the hon. gentleman has made at all. The effect of that reorganization of the department was of a most striking character. It enabled us, as my hon. friend will find by the records of the department, to bring its expenses practically within the receipts. Nothing can be more unjust than the aspersion that there was any reorganization for the purpose of getting rid of the Liberals and placing Liberal-Conservatives in their place. Nothing of the kind was done. I am not able to charge my mind now, having had the honour of administering the Department of Railways and Canals for many years, with a single instance in which a person's services were dispensed with because he was a Liberal or had supported Liberal candidates in the elections. An effort was always made to retain the best men; and so long as I remained in charge of the department, if the gentlemen who had the responsibility of working the Intercolonial, said that a person was not required for any particular post, no person was pressed upon them nor were they called upon to obtain the services of any such person. No one knows better than the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, how strongly the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, who led for so many years the Government of this country, set his face against the spoils system, and how firmly he resisted in every possible way the introduction of the system of political dismissals, and I feel that no greater injury can be done to the public service than to do anything which is calculated to lower the tone and character of a public servant, as it will be, if it is found that civil servants are to be slaves. No system of terrorism, under the Liberal-Conservative administration, with which I have had the honour of being connected, ever existed. We never adopted anything in the shape of terrorism or coercion or anything else to prevent the free and independent exercise of the franchise or that moderate expression of political opinion which both sides of the House were of opinion ought to be tolerated and exercised. I am sorry my hon. friend the First Minister was not in the House to-day, when his colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, made his statement of the policy which governs his administration of that great department. It was one which I think would have startled the First Minister as much as it startled me when it fell on my ears.

Mr. McGREGOR. You were not startled very much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman has no better ground for interrupting, it would be well for him to permit me to complete my remarks, without interrupting me. I believe it would have startled the hon. First Minister as much as it did me. It was greatly in advance of anything intimated by the hon. First Minister as governing the tenure of office in the civil

service. What rendered it more objectionable was that the Minister of Railways did draw, in the most clear and emphatic manner, a line of distinction between the poor man and those who hold better and higher positions. He said that, so far as regarded the day labourers, the persons who were concerned in manual employment, the great body of the poorer employees connected with the public service—which cannot be less than four or five thousand, at the lowest computation of the Minister of Railways and Canals—so far as they were concerned, it was impossible for him to give personal attention to the charges of complaints made against them, and that he had taken, and intended to take, the opinions on that subject of the candidate of the Liberal party who had been defeated, or the member who had been elected to support the Government. I do not believe that the hon. First Minister will go that length. I do not believe that he will, for one moment, say that the Government of this country is to deprive a poor man of his living, who does his work faithfully, because he has exercised his franchise in opposition to anybody who is ambitious to sit in this House. That is the length to which the hon. gentleman went.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman not only went that length, but in his later defence, in which he drew us away to what he had achieved in the province of New Brunswick, upon which I do not intend to say a word, because I dare say that the hon. gentleman may have done all he said he did,—he came back again to the subject and reiterated practically the same thing, and that was that it was impossible for him to undertake to deal with the numberless cases that might be presented in connection with the employees engaged in his department, and that he would have to depend, and intended to depend on the advice he received and the opinions expressed to him by gentlemen who had the distinguished honour of bearing the Liberal flag at the general elections, whether successfully or unsuccessfully. That is the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman. It means that the word goes forth to-morrow to the thousands of employees who are under the thumb of the hon. gentleman to-day: Support the standard-bearer of the Liberal party, or your employment will cease.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, Sir, there is no other meaning that can be given to the statement than that. If the hon. gentleman stands by what he said in the most clear and emphatic terms, and if "Hansard" reports his words as they fell from his lips, the First Minister will see that that statement is accurate, that the hon. gentleman, while explaining that it was impossible for him to investigate the cases of these lower classes of employees, the officials might not be too numerous for him to investigate their cases. So far as the employees were concerned, he intended to rely upon the statements made to him by the standard-bearers of his party, whether they had been successful or unsuccessful. That is the statement made and reiterated. And what does it mean? It means that the fiat goes forth and that every man who is in the employ of this Government and from that employment obtains bread for himself and family, is told that his continued employment, his means of supporting his wife and children depends——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but it is not a laughing matter to men whose bread is at stake. But they will find that a deep feeling of indignation will be aroused in this country, not only among the employees, but in the heart of every honest son of toil, and that there will be a universal feeling that a more tyrannical, a more terrorizing doctrine never was promulgated by a public man on the floor of Parliament. This doctrine means that even the man who has been rejected at the polls, has practically the power of life or death, so far as the living and happiness of these poor people are concerned. It is a startling doctrine. It is a doctrine at variance with every principle professed by the Liberal party, when they were in power before, at variance with every principle adopted by the Liberal-Conservative party, when in power, and repugnant to the principle of common justice, that should appeal to every man. I regret that the First Minister was not here to hear this statement. I have told my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) the circumstances under which the reorganization of the Intercolonial took place. I have told him of the care that was exercised during the period I had the honour of discharging those duties, and which, I believe, has been continued in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. But to those who believe that the Intercolonial Railway has been made the means of terrorizing employees or controlling public affairs, I will offer the evidence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). I stated in my place in this House what I believed then, and believe now, that in the recent elections at least one-half of the employees of the Intercolonial, from the highest to the lowest, voted against the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. More than half.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend says, more than half. He knows I always like to keep within the mark. But the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that 75 per cent of them would prefer to vote against the Government. If, after

eighteen years of Conservative administration of the Intercolonial, such a statement is true, it can hardly be said that we exercised a very despotic control in the management. This subject is one of the most vital character to Canada, one of the most vital import to the Government and to every man who wishes to see an honest and impartial administration of affairs in this country. I trust the First Minister will give it his careful consideration, and that means will be taken to make sure that there is not established in the management of this great work a despotism compared with which anything of the kind that exists in Russia is insignificant.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) seems to have forgotten the circumstances of the dismissal of Mr. Brydges and his assistant. I thought then that they were very properly dismissed, because they were interfering with the party whose policy they were supposed to carry out. They were replaced by gentlemen who have served the Liberal-Conservative party up to date. And some of them will have to be got rid of for the very same reason that justified Mr. Brydges' dismissal—that the Government cannot place confidence in them. The hon. member tried to confuse the cases of the employees on the road and the officials, and tried to make it appear that the Minister of Railways was dealing unfairly with one class. But the hon. gentleman knows, and I know, and the country knows, that some of the men serving that road on a very small salary are rich men—at least, rich enough for all ordinary purposes. I can only put it down to their economy in living. When a man receives a salary of $1,200 or $1,500 a year, and can accumulate a fortune upon it, perhaps that might be a justification for his remaining on the railway, that he might get richer on a smaller salary. There are matters concerning the past on the Intercolonial that I would not care to discuss, but the hon. gentleman must know that, with the present party in power, there cannot be the confidence between the Government and the officials as a body that should exist.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not with 75 per cent of them their political friends ?

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend says 75 per cent. I tell him here that not 75 per cent, but 95 per cent of the men on the Intercolonial Railway would vote for the Minister of Railways and vote for the Liberal party if they were permitted to do so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will have to now.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, if they do vote for us, all the better. But I can give instances right along that line of railway where men were instructed by telegram and by letter to go away, that they could not vote. I will take the case of Mr. Joel Gross, stationmaster at Penobsquis. A letter was written to him by one of the committee of the hon. gentleman's friends, because the hon. gentleman went down to King's county and organized that wonderful organization that did such wonderful work. One of his leading men there, a lawyer, a Mr. MacIntyre, wrote a letter to Joel Gross and told him that he was suspected of taking some part in the election. It was thought he was giving me some influence, and he was warned that if he did, they would turn him out when the election was over. I can give the case of Mr. Gambling, in my hon. friend's own riding. Why did he turn out Mr. Gambling from the Fisheries Department, and put in his friend Mr. Pierson, a strong partisan ? I took his word down, but he qualified it afterwards, because he saw my eye on him, and he put in the words "so far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned"—qualified it with what we call in boat racing, a sliding seat. Will he tell me what he did with Fairweather, postmaster at White's Corners, when he turned him out for political reasons and placed the office in the hands of Mr. Keirstead, who was his political standard-bearer, the man who placed the money for him in his county, and to whom he telephoned after the election was over to know what had become of Springfield and the money he had put into it.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me—I am obliged to rise in my seat in order that other gentlemen may not be led away by this statement, and to characterize it right here as being entirely without foundation.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend always characterizes everything without foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I shall have to in your case.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I can remember when I had the pleasure of unseating him in 1882, and when I had him up before the court trying him, his standard answer was "It has no foundation in fact." It was the stereotyped answer. My hon. friend has a marvellous way of getting rid of difficulties. Why, when we were trying to get him to face some difficulties in King's county in 1891, he went out of the county, and his deputy went with him from the county. He avoided the difficulty by going away. He is trying now to lead people astray in King's county and the rest of the country, by his attack on the Minister of Railways. Now, when the hon. gentleman ran away from King's county on that occasion, it put me in mind of a story I heard of a battle down south. They were fighting, and the general came along and he saw the sergeant-major and said to him : "What in thunder are you running away for" ? "Why," said the major, "because I have not got wings."

Well, Sir, I am satisfied, and my record on the statements I make is pretty good in King's county—I am satisfied that there has been a reign of terror all along that railway. I am satisfied there has been more than terrorism, there has been undue influence in every way. I will tell you that during the last election at one poll men were directed to fold up their ballot in a certain way, and they would show it folded that way to the representatives of the Conservative candidate at the poll, so that when they would get the counterfoil off the edge, it could be opened up to see how they had voted. Take the case of my hon. friend when he ran his last election with me. He was heralded throughout the country as a paragon of virtue, as the great prohibition leader of this country, the man who had stated on a platform that if a bottle of rum or a dollar bill would give him his election, he would not take it. I am now going to state an actual fact that occurred on that railway. I make this statement fearlessly, because I can prove it by twenty men. The section-master at Rothesay, actually, in broad daylight—I could not believe the man would do it himself, he would not do it except under orders—received a consignment of liquor which was sent up and ladled out on the account of the hon. member for York from the section master's own house. Yes, Sir, in a moment of weakness that section-master forgot all the preachings of his leader, the member for York, he forgot himself so far as to accept that liquor when he was told that he should touch not, taste not, and handle not. And yet my hon. friend comes here and talks in this manner with all these things before him, with the liquor and the railway in his interest—men sent away that they might not vote against him. A station-master threatened to be turned away if any evidence was seen in them of supporting the Liberal candidate. The station-master had done nothing, but he was cautioned. A caution was sent to him and his friends warning them that neither they nor their relations were to give their support directly or indirectly to the Liberal candidate, and if that poll did not give a certain vote, the station-master would be turned out. Now, is that a correct state of things? The hon. gentleman talks about the labouring men in New Brunswick. There is not a labouring man on the Intercolonial Railway, there is not a labouring man around the city of St. John, or in York County either, I have no doubt, who would not gladly place his case in the hands of Mr. Blair and look upon him as their friend now and hereafter. Then, Sir, the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) drags his Nova Scotia politics into this discussion. I would advise him to keep them to himself, because we don't want him to drag New Brunswick into the same category as he has brought his own province. Then my hon. friend from York said that he was startled. Now, that hon. gentleman makes these speeches, and they sound well here to an appreciative audience, and they are sent through the country by thousands. But when they go down to the county of York and go through New Brunswick, people will simply fling them aside, and say that he has been so unfortunate in his own province as to do nothing for it, nor to those whom he represents, that he never did anything for the county of King's, nor for the city of St. John. We have had to-day a deputation from St. John, and it was easy to see how pleased the people at the head of it were to find that the present Administration are looking after their interests.

Mr. MILLS. And the steamships going to Portland.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I wish you would go to Portland, too. Mr. Chairman, if you could but see the happy faces of these gentlemen who came here. They came up feeling that St. John is going to have something done for it, feeling that an era of prosperity is opening to the whole country, feeling that they have got friends in the Government, notwithstanding what the hon. member for York will say, because they will say to him : Sir, we cannot rely on your statements. You told us you were going to carry the country, you told us you would carry King's, you told us you would carry Queen's and Sunbury, and you failed in them all. The hon. gentleman has obtained a seat, and I will not say anything about that ; but he is aware that the people of New Brunswick have no confidence in his statements, that they have withdrawn the confidence they reposed in him in the past ; and when the hon. gentleman tells this House that disastrous effects are going to be produced in the maritime provinces in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, I venture to say there is not, even among the Conservatives of New Brunswick, any one who will accuse the hon. Minister of Railways of attempting to do what is unfair or prejudicial to the interests of workingmen. It is an unfair attack. It is unfair to the hon. Minister to endeavour through the press to arouse the workingmen of this country. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) or the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) talk about Government employees being slaves. Do those hon. gentlemen forget that a Conservative Government repealed the Weights and Measures Act in 1875 ? They wiped out 200 or 300 employees without thinking of the men or their families, and they never considered whether they would have bread to eat or water to drink. That was not the worst of it, because later on, as they had to find places for supporters, they re-enacted the Act and replaced those discharged by their own friends and partisans. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) was in the House at that time and was a party to this measure, and in fact was re-

sponsible for it as a member of the Government. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is not acting with a proper measure of fair-play, and even this House will not consider he did justice to himself when he attempted to place the hon. Minister in a false position, for generally there may be two readings of a statement, and the hon. Minister no doubt considered there were cases in which, when the evidence was placed before him and the facts stated, he would be in a position, being an able lawyer and a far-seeing man, to decide them on its merits without sending them to any tribunal. Is there anything wrong in taking that position? In my opinion, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me, we should have a permanent civil service, into which men should enter by competitive examination; that men should not be pitchforked into positions—and I hope that practice will not be followed by the present Government—and that political hacks should not be in office; because owing to this system our boys who have passed the military college or the Port Hope school, or other similar institutions are forced to leave the country and the positions are secured by partisans who are prepared to do the biddings of their party at all hazard and risk, receiving as a reward the thirty pieces of silver. If we had a civil service into which our young men could enter by competitive examination, in which they could steadily rise to the high positions, our young men would hold these positions in the service and would be a credit to Canada and to its Parliament when we have passed away. I hope one of these days the Government will be able to look into this subject, and see what can be done on the line of English civil service. I desire that the Minister of Railways shall not be assailed by one member after another on the Opposition benches on the charge, made by implication, that he is going to hurt the working classes of Canada. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) I am afraid will be disappointed. He has to swallow the medicine—he must do it. I never squealed, and he should not squeal now. I promised to follow him from pillar to post, and I did it. I did my duty to the country, and my county thanked me for it. When the hon. member for Queen's and Sunbury (Mr. Blair) came to Ottawa after his election, I was on the train. As we passed through the county of King's, there were bonfires, bands were out, addresses were presented, because it was felt by the people of King's and by the whole people of New Brunswick that the interests of Canada would be safe in the hands of a man who had done his duty when he was Premier of his own province. I tell the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that if he wishes to regain Paradise he must serve an apprenticeship to virtue. The hon. gentleman must bide his time, and probably in the great hereafter, when he is quite an old man, when all hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have passed away and party lines have changed, he may have the honour of being recalled to power, perhaps from his own province, although I think that is very doubtful, and I shall regret if when that day comes I am not able to be on the Opposition side to criticise his measures, as the hon. gentleman is doing here to-day, but I trust it will be not in such a spirit of captiousness and carping as the hon. gentleman who possesses undoubted ability, pursues a course of asking questions on subjects which he has dealt with during the last twelve or fourteen years, and unfairly endeavours to embarrass the Government by questioning Ministers who have not had time to read up the subjects involved.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot attempt, in anything I may say, to compete with the interest and sparkle of the speech to which we have just listened, nor shall I try to do so. But I do wish to say a word on this question to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will say it in all earnestness and sincerity. I entirely agree with what has been said by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Robertson). It is what I myself have endeavoured to express before, and it does seem to me that the principle underlying those remarks should commend itself to the intelligence of the House. I do think, as has been said by the hon. member for East Toronto, that, so far as the civil servants are concerned, if the Government intend to pursue so strict a method with them, the proper course to adopt is, first, to lay down a rule—let hon. gentlemen make their rule as severe as they please—but, for goodness' sake, do not inflict the extreme penalty of dismissal upon officials who have broken no rule whatever of the civil service. It is a most cruel thing to turn out permanent employees who have broken no rule of their employer: and especially is it cruel to turn them out during a period of depression in the country, to look for a livelihood in the best way they can, and to support themselves and their families as best they may. It is, I say, cruel to dismiss men who have for eighteen years been accustomed to a different régime, and who have never been taught that it was improper for them to take a reasonable part in politics. I am quite sure, Sir, that the country will never approve of a policy of that kind. If I were speaking from a party point of view, and if I had no regard for the interests of those who are to be sacrificed, I would say that the Government could not play any game better calculated to strengthen the hands of the Conservative party and, per contra, to weaken the hands of the Liberal party, than to pursue this policy of dismissing civil servants. I wish, Sir, to say a few words in regard to another class of persons who,

greatly to my astonishment, I find are in danger. I refer to the labourers of the country. What Government labourer in Canada ever heard before that he would be dismissed from his employment, if he took a part in politics ? Where is the justification to the Government for such a course ? It may be said that, in the case of civil servants, there is a different condition of things, and that warning has been given them across the floor of this House (though I repudiate that argument), but where, and when, have the labourers of this country ever received any warning ? But, Sir, before passing from the case of the civil servants, I wish to emphasize what I have already said and what has been stated by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), that my experience, since I have had anything to do with public life, has been that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party, as enunciated by Sir John A. Macdonald to myself, has been the very opposite from that policy which has been enunciated to this House by a Liberal Government. I am sure there is not a member of this House who will doubt my statement in this regard. That is what I learned from Sir John A. Macdonald, when I spoke to him on this subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No one doubts the hon. gentleman's statement, but every one in the maritime province knows that the practice has been different.

Mr. MILLS. Every one from the maratime provinces does not know that.

Mr. McNEILL. We have had the evidence from my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) from the maritime provinces, who gave case after case, and stated exactly the contrary to what the Minister of Marine says. Even if there have been individual departures by members of Conservative Governments from that general rule, I hope that is not a reason why a cruel and general rule should for the first time be laid down by the Liberal Government, and that a man should be punished by infliction of the extremest penalty for breaking a rule which never existed.

Now, with regard to the labouring men, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they will kindly consider this question from the point of view that they are threatening in a most serious manner the political liberties of the whole labouring classes of this country. I ask, without any desire to be unfair, that the Minister of Railways himself should regard the matter from this point of view. Let him consider that the Government is a great employer of labour, that the manner in which the Government treat their labourers will be to a large extent an example to other employers of labour in Canada, and that, if the Government lay down the principle that their labourers are to be dismissed, if they take any other part in politics than to vote, then that other employers of labour will be inclined to act in a similar way, and plead as an excuse for their conduct the example of the Government. Why did we establish the ballot ? Was it not for the protection of the labouring men, and was it not because we wished that these men should have the fullest liberty to discharge their duties as citizens. But how can you say that the labouring man has the fullest liberty, if you say that he is to take no other part in politics than simply to vote ? Why, we never heard before of such a thing in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend says "Oh." I ask him if such a principle has ever been laid down before, and I ask him is it to be the great Liberal party which is to lay down the principle that any employer of labour is justified in dismissing his employee, if that employee happens to exercise his right, as a British subject, to work for whichever party he thinks best in the interests of his country. Whatever excuse there may be with regard to civil servants, I say there can be no possible excuse for applying such a principle as that to the labourers of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McNEILL. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but it is a very serious question, and the labourers of this country will consider it a serious matter.

Mr. BRITTON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. BRITTON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if these men are allowed to work in elections, where is he to draw the line ? We confess that they should have the fullest possible liberty to vote, and my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) says that, if they are not allowed to work in elections, then their privileges are interfered with. If they are allowed to work, where is he to draw the line so that they may not be considered the partisans that are complained of ?

Mr. McNEILL. I do not draw the line at all, so far as the labourers are concerned ; and I say that I never before heard of the line being drawn in the case of labourers in this country. I never before heard of any political party in this country maintaining the principle that an employer of labour should coerce his employee and should not allow him to take any part in politics that he pleased.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Some of them do it.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not say it has not been done ; but I say that it has always been considered as shameful to the man who did it. It has always been considered, if known of, as something worthy of reproach ; and I have heard with astonishment that the great Liberal party of this country

has committed itself to that policy and that principle to-day.

Mr. McGREGOR. You have been doing it all the time.

Mr. CRAIG. I wish to say this on this important question—and if I did not think the question important, I should keep quiet at this hour of the night—that if I were looking at this matter from a strictly party point of view, I would be very glad that the Minister of Railways had used the expression which he did use to-day, because I think nothing could hurt his party or his Government more than the words he used. But I regret that he used that expression, because I do not look at the matter from a party point of view.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. It may seem strange that I should say that; but I assure you that such is the case, although it may seem to some members of this House quite impossible, as it is impossible for some to look at any question except from a party point of view. I think that is very unfortunate. There are some questions, and I think this is one of them, that should be looked at by members of this House entirely apart from party. What was the statement made by the Minister of Railways? I will give it as I heard it myself. The statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways, as I heard it, was this, that he had dismissed some men? Why? Because he had been asked to do so by a defeated candidate in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, I do not know which; and he said that he proposed to follow this course—that if a defeated candidate or a member of this House, belonging to the Liberal party, recommended the dismissal of any workingman on the Intercolonial Railway, he proposed to take their advice and dimiss those men.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. CRAIG. I am saying what I understood the hon. Minister to say. I am very glad indeed that the hon. leader of the Government and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries repudiate this statement,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not intend to repudiate any statement made by my colleague at all.

Mr. CRAIG. I refer to the statement I made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend made no such statement and used no language that could be construed into such a meaning.

Mr. CRAIG. I understood the hon. Minister of Railways to say, with reference to labouring men working on the Intercolonial Railway, that he intended that if a defeated candidate of the Liberal party or a member of this House belonging to the Liberal party recommended the dismissal of any of those men, he intended to dismiss them without any further investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He did say so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister might explain what he did say. Certainly the House understood him to make the statement which has just been made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am exceedingly sorry that I failed to make myself understood, and—I want to say it in all fairness and candour—I am at a loss to understand how any gentleman using his faculties could draw such a conclusion from what I said. I stated that when a charge was made against an official or a person in the employ of the Government on the Intercolonial Railway, I would necessarily be quite unable personally to investigate it myself; there are such a number of persons who are largely temporary employees that I would necessarily have to be satisfied upon evidence and by other means. But I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I never, directly or indirectly, hinted or intended to hint at the intention of removing any person in the public service unless there were charges preferred against him which I was satisfied had been substantiated. I could not be satisfied that those charges were substantiated by investigating them myself; but I could be satisfied if they were established by the personal statements of persons of reliability and credit which I could accept.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister will remember that the two men whose names brought this matter up were two bridge tenders on the Pictou Bridge who were dismissed on the complaint of Mr. Macdonald. Will he kindly say, in the first place, what the specific charge was against these men, and then, whether the investigation of the charge went any further than Mr. Macdonald's letter or communication?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a fair question, and I am very willing to answer it. Mr. Macdonald first wrote to me to say that there were two men—and he gave their names, and they are in the recollection of the hon. member—then in the employ of the railway who had actively intervened in the election, who were exceedingly active and exceedingly offensive.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was the activity described?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He certainly did describe to me that they were active canvassers in the election; and in a subsequent conversation

which I had with Mr. Macdonald, he entered somewhat more fully into details. On receiving that letter from Mr. Macdonald, I immediately wrote to him saying that I proposed to take a very careful course with regard to Government employees ; that while I could not investigate the matter myself, I desired him to tell me what the facts were on his own personal assurance as a gentleman, or something to that effect, implying that I relied on his word of honour as a gentleman, that what he alleged was true ; and on his giving me that assurance, I authorized Mr. Pottinger to permit the displacement of those men. Let me say further that these two men were not in the permanent employ at all. They were persons called on to work from time to time as their services might be required.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Year in and year out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they were not employed year in and year out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I mean that they were the regular men for that duty. There were no other men.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I quite concede that for three or four years, perhaps longer, they were called on when required.

Mr. CRAIG. I beg to assure the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that I have no intention of misrepresenting him at all, and I think he said just now that in this case he did discharge the men on the representation of this defeated candidate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the personal assurance of Mr. Macdonald.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, Mr. Macdonald is just as reliable a gentleman as any in this House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No person proposes to attack his character, but any man's opinion may be wrong.

Mr. CRAIG. Then it comes down to this, after all, that without any further investigation, and relying on the assurance of a defeated candidate or of a Liberal member of this House, men will be dismissed if these gentlemen wish it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. Nothing of the kind. There must be substantial evidence.

Mr. CRAIG. I cannot understand how there can be substantial evidence when it is done at the mere wish of a Liberal candidate or member.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not at the mere wish of the candidate. There must be a specific charge made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to say this, which is entirely in accord with the view upon which I have stated I should act, that if, upon being satisfied by the best evidence that is open to me, that the charge is sustained and a removal follows, and the person who is removed upon making representations satisfies me that he was not open to the charge I should not hesitate to redress the wrong and restore him to his position.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why not do that before dismissing him ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I regard it as practically impossible, that, with the vast staff of men who are in the employ of the department, I could institute a personal investigation into each case. I could not do it nor could the hon. gentleman do it, and it has never been done.

Mr. CRAIG. No doubt the hon. Minister of Railways thinks he is acting on proper principles, but I am afraid that the country will not think so. After all I do not think it is a commendable course to take the evidence of a defeated candidate. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) drew a distinction between a Liberal member of this House and a Liberal defeated candidate, which ought to have some weight with the hon. gentleman. A defeated candidate naturally smarts under his defeat, and no doubt will magnify the partisanship of those who have been against him ; and I am satisfied that a great many of these men, before they have cooled down sufficiently, will think that those who had merely voted against them, acted as partisans and would be very glad to be revenged by getting them dismissed. I think it is an unfortunate position for a Minister to take, that, on the assurance of a defeated candidate that a labourer has been a political partisan, he feels called upon to dismiss him. I am glad the hon. Minister has somewhat modified that by saying that if a party who has been dismissed proves his innocence, he will reinstate him. But it certainly is opposed to British fair-play to punish a man first and then find him not guilty afterwards. I think the Government should not take such a stand. I think there is something in what the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has laid down this evening, that labourers do not belong to the same class as civil servants ; but leaving that out of the question, if the principle laid down by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that absolute neutrality, except the act of voting, is the price of continuance in office is to be followed, the Government should at least not make it retroactive. I do not see how the hon. leader of the House can lay that down as a principle of the Liberal party, when we find in Ontario that office-holders are the most active and violent partisans. If the principle laid down by the

hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) be that of the Liberal party, surely they would have it put in force in Ontario. But in that province, the local officials are rather encouraged to take an active part in politics and become sometimes offensive partisans—

The PRIME MINISTER. How would my hon. friend deal with them if he came into office in Ontario ?

Mr. CRAIG. I would deal with them in this way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Cut off their heads ?

Mr. CRAIG. No, I would not.

Mr. McGREGOR. Your party has done it.

Mr. CRAIG. That is no argument at all. We have heard that over and over again to-night. In fact, it is the only argument we have heard advanced : You did the same thing some years ago, and would do it now if you had the chance. But the Liberal party came into power with great professions, and I for one hope they will carry them out. I should like to see them govern the country well, and I say, in all disinterestedness, that they will take a most unfortunate step if they inaugurate the system of dismissing every man because he took some part in politics. I never knew it was laid down by any party that office-holders should not take part in politics.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has been laid down in the despatches from the English Home Office, time and time again.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was laid down five and twenty years ago in this House and acted on.

Mr. CRAIG. It is a wonder to me then that the Liberal party in Ontario have not put it in practice. It cannot be held that they have practised it at all. Very often office-holders—I am not blaming them, but merely stating the fact—take a very active part in politics. We naturally expect that the Liberal party would practice as they preach, but they certainly have not done so in the province of Ontario. I could bring in the case of my own election, if I wished, striking evidence of this practice. I find no fault with the man for doing it, and I would not have him turned out, even if I could, for I suppose he thought he was serving his party, but he certainly took a most active part against me and was a most violent partisan. In Ontario that is the way a good many keep their offices. It is laid down by the Liberal party in this House that neutrality is the price of office. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is to be the rule for the future, it ought to be understood. But it is not the rule which was followed in the past. I think I heard the First Minister make this statement, that an offensive partisan should be dismissed ; but that is a very different thing from a mechanic taking a small part in politics and doing little more than voting, and yet he will be brought under this rule. I hope the Liberal party will not make this rule retroactive. If this rule is to be put in force, let office-holders understand that they are to do nothing but vote. They will then understand their position. If necessary, let the railway men on the Intercolonial understand that they are to take no active part in politics. I think it would be most unfortunate that the Minister of Railways should have said that there are so many of these labourers, he would find it impossible to attend to all their cases. That seems to imply that a great many complaints have come before him, and we may expect that hundreds of these men will be dismissed. The hon. Minister's statement really invites charges from defeated candidates. Let the defeated candidate complain that any of these men were active partisans against him in the late election, and they will be dismissed. I think it is an unfortunate step for any party to take. The argument that the Conservative party have done this, and would again, is no argument at all for the Liberal party. They do not pretend to regulate their conduct by that of the Conservative party ; they claim to have a higher ideal of government than we have. I hope they will live up to it. Now, I say this deliberately—I said it at home after the defeat of this party—if the Liberal party can give a better Government to this country and make this country more prosperous, I am willing that they should stay in power. That is the sort of party man I am. I do not live for my party and am willing to give this Government a fair show. In some things I do not agree with them. For instance, I do not agree with them in regard to protection—but I believe they will come to our views pretty much after all, perhaps I may be able to agree with them on everything.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Come over with us.

Mr. CRAIG. Stranger things than that have happened. But I do hope they will not plead the actions of the Conservative party as a justification for their own. Whatever they may think about it, the country will not accept such an excuse. So I would ask them to reconsider this matter, to remember that these labouring men must provide for their families. Even though they may have taken some part in politics, they did it without thinking that they laid themselves open to such punishment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are there no other labouring men having families but those you have appointed to office ?

Mr. CRAIG. Yes ; and there will be a great many chances for appointments in the

course of time; but if the Liberal party are in such a hurry to provide for applicants that they dismiss those now employed, I think they will make a great mistake.

Mr. LOGAN. To a member from the maritime provinces the statement that the Intercolonial Railway has not been used as a terrorizing influence causes a good deal of amusement as well as amazement. I represent the grand old county of Cumberland, in which there is a large mileage of the Intercolonial, not only of the main line but of the short line as well. And I am here to tell you that that railway has been used as a terrorizing influence from end to end of my county and has been so used for eighteen years. I listened with surprise to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), the old war horse of Cumberland, in whose place I am happy to stand, when he stated that the railway was not used to tyrannize over the men. I am sorry he is not in his place, but if he were I could tell him that the railway has been used as a terrorizing influence by his own friends and his own relatives. I can tell him that his own nephew, Charles Tupper Hillson, who has been connected with the road for eighteen years, went up and down the line in the months preceding the last election, coercing the employees to vote for the late Government. That gentleman, while drawing a salary of from $5 to $10 a day, went down to Cape Breton in the last by-election and terrorized the men there so that they did not know whether they could call their very souls their own. In the general election he went to the railway men in my county and said: Vote for Dickey or you leave the service of the Intercolonial Railway. If the Opposition want evidence, I can bring evidence by the volume. I have men by the dozen who will come forward and swear that this gentleman went to them and told them to vote for the ex-Minister of Justice or they would lose their positions and their children would starve. No man has known the existence of this practice better than the hon. leader of the Opposition, who formerly represented Cumberland. I might quote the case of a gentleman who occupies a position on an express train. I hesitate not to give his name, because I am in a position to prove every statement I am making. His name is McKim. Mr. Hillson approached him and said: I hear you are going to vote Grit. The reply was: I am. Then came the threat: If you vote Grit you will lose your job. This gentleman, Mr. McKim, runs on the express from Halifax to Moncton. But on election day the order went forth that he was not to stop at Moncton, but to run through from Halifax to St. John. Why? To disfranchise him; to take from him the right of voting, which every British citizen should have. To say that there has been no terrorizing on the Intercolonial Railway is to talk rot. The ignorance on this subject of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is probably due to the fact that he does not live in a county in which the railway runs, otherwise he would not have the effrontery to tell us that no tyranny was exercised on the road. The hon. gentleman said that under the Conservative rule no official was dismissed unless a charge against him was made and proved. I defy him to name the time and place where a charge was investigated and the tribunal before whom it was tried. When a change was deemed best in the interests of that party, off went the head of the man who stood in the way. In the county of Westmoreland lived a gentleman named Thomas Allen. Every one who comes from Prince Edward Island, and many who come from Nova Scotia, know Tom Allen. He occupied the position of mail carrier from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse for fifty-four years. He entered the service as a young man, spent his middle age in the service and came down to the very verge of the grave, and still in the service of the Government. More, he had suffered severe hardships in his work. He had lain upon the ice all night; he had been upon that boisterous sea three and four days at a time. Yet when he would not endorse the tactics of the Government, the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) then the Minister of Marine, wrote him a letter: Your services are no longer required. There was no superannuation in that case, although this man had served the country for fifty-four years. He is a poor man today living in the town of Amherst. Any one engaged in the by-election in the county of Westmoreland held last year must know that the men in the shops were terrorized. And not only that, but they were watched by spies to find if they were going to vote Liberal. I could quote many cases of dismissals made without cause. In my own county is the town of Northport, a shipping port. The only physician living there is Dr. Campbell. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), no doubt, would say that he lives in splendid medical isolation. He was the medical examiner for ships coming into the port. The salary was about $50 or $60 a year. There was another physician living about twelve miles from the port who was a Conservative, while the doctor at Northport was a supporter of the Liberal party. Dr. Campbell was notified by letter that his services were no longer required, and the position given to the Conservative; and from that day until the present time, when a man become ill on board a ship in Northport harbour, he is rowed ashore and put into a wagon and carried twelve miles to a Tory doctor, and past the door of a Liberal doctor living within half a mile of the ship. This is the way that the public service has been looked after in that province. The hon. gentleman professes great concern for the

political freedom of the employees on the Intercolonial Railway. Sir, I hope I will never drop so low in political degradation as to desire to compel a man to vote against his conscience. A man should exercise his franchise freely; but when a civil servant goes further than that and becomes an obnoxious partisan, then I say it is time his services were dispensed with in the best interests of this country. Why? Because the very maintenance of the public service in a state of efficiency demands that there shall be mutuality between the head of any department and the men who labour therein. You cannot have the Department of Railways or any other department conducted successfully when there are traitors in the camp; and wherever you have active partisans occupying positions in any department, there are certain to be traitors in the camp who will stab you in the back at the first opportunity. Now, the hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) made one of his characteristic harangues in which he referred disparagingly to the Minister of Finance. Now, I would not refer to this to-night if I did not come from the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. member made an onslaught on the local government and on the present Minister of Finance, and intimated that under his administration the spoils system had existed in Nova Scotia. Why, the hon. gentleman must know that the system there is the most distant from the spoils system of almost any government in Canada. In my county of Cumberland, the best and most lucrative office in the whole county is filled by a Liberal-Conservative, and a very decent Liberal-Conservative he is, too. Many other offices in that county are filled by Liberal-Conservatives, but they are men who do not take an active part in political matters. A few years ago the office of Superintendent of Education for Nova Scotia became vacant. It is one of the most important offices in that province, one that requires to be filled by a man of honour, a man of superior education, and a man who has the tact and qualities of the best order. Where did the present Minister of Finance go to get a Superintendent of Education? Did he go into a Grit hive? Did he go into a Grit caucus room to find the man? No; but he went to Dr. McKay, Principal of Pictou Academy, and appointed him Superintendent of Education, although he was a good Conservative and comes from one of the most rabid Conservative families in the province. The hon. gentleman's reference to the Fielding Administration was not a happy one. What about his own connection with governing that province? Suffice it to say he occupied the position of provincial secretary at one time. He kept it for a period of three months. He and his party went to the people, and they were snowed under, and for fourteen long years the administration of the government of that province has been presided over by the Minister of Finance, and I will tell you why. While he may be admired and respected in the larger field of Dominion politics, I can tell you that among the Liberals and many Conservatives in Nova Scotia he is not only admired but loved; and when he appealed to the country he was returned with a large majority at his back every time, while the hon. gentleman and his party were politically annihilated. Soon the hon. gentleman disappeared from provincial politics. Only a few years ago he was known as a free trader, who denounced the National Policy and the Tuppers, but now we find him sitting cheek by jowl beside those hon. gentlemen, and probably we will find him before long lauding the National Policy and high protection in this country.

Now, Sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition has made a statement here to-night that 75 per cent of the railway employees on the Intercolonial Railway have become Grits. Well, why is that? It is because they have not been used with common decency by the Government and its officials heretofore. The salaried officials on the Intercolonial Railway, have ground the labouring men down, and I have not the slightest doubt that a large number of them did go to the polls and vote against the late Government as a protest against the way in which they had been terrorized. He has spoken to-night with great feeling, saying he was very much startled at the declaration of the Minister of Railways. What declaration? Why, the declaration that men can go to the polls hereafter and exercise their franchise as they please, without being interfered with. That is the declaration made by the Minister of Railways when he said that employees on the Intercolonial Railway, both Liberals and Conservatives, may go to the polls and vote as their conscience may dictate; and I believe when that declaration is published a great feeling of relief will be experienced by the employees on that railway who will recognize it as a declaration of liberty, and that in the future they will be free men to vote as they please, and be treated like men and not like serfs.

Mr. TAYLOR. At four o'clock this afternoon when an item in reference to Penitentiaries was brought up, I desired to make some remarks upon it, but my respected leader and the ex-Minister of Finance informed me that the Finance Minister was very anxious to get as much of the Supply Bill through to-day as possible in order to get money to carry on the affairs of the country, and therefore I yielded reluctantly. However, I will take an other opportunity on concurrence to discuss this question fully. It is now 12 o'clock, and from the evidence we have seen, the Minister of Finance and the leader of the Government are not very anxious to go on and get a Supply Bill passed. The hon. member for North Wellington

(Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) made an attack on the Opposition, which has led to a discussion and the members supporting the Government have occupied nearly two-thirds of the time since 4 o'clock saying: You did so and so, and we are going to see you, and go one or two better. But I cannot allow this discussion to close without making a reference to what I have seen in the newspapers to-night with regard to some of my friends with whom I have done business for many years, men of standing, men of means who have been maligned, and their names have gone broadcast through this land, as men who are not worth a dollar. The statements made in the newspapers are to the effect that these gentlemen have purchased binder twine from the Government, that the Government cannot collect a dollar from them, and that they are Tory heelers. The first man I will mention is that of a personal friend of mine, though a political opponent, and his name appears in the press as not being worth a dollar, that the Government cannot collect a dollar from him. It is stated in the papers to-day that Mr. Mowat, of Toronto, the respected nephew of Sir Oliver Mowat, is not able to pay for the binder twine sold him by the Government last year, to the tune of $254. He was one of the Tory heelers to whom the late Government sold binding twine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are discussing the item of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am discussing what I read in the papers to-day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself as much as possible to the item under discussion. The hon. gentleman appears to have forgotten the item, which is concerning the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. TAYLOR. An hon. gentleman, in discussing the item, took the privilege of speaking with regard to himself. The gentlemen to whom I desire to refer are not members of this House; they are personal friends of my own.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order. The hon. gentleman may have a statement to make, but there is a proper way of doing it. We are discussing the item of railways.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will not be long.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman can make a statement on the motion of the adjournment of the House; but we are now discussing the item of railways.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say this on behalf of my friends.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine his remarks to the item.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I am not going to have those gentlemen lie under these imputations.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to speak when the motion is made to adjourn the House. I do not desire to deprive the hon. gentleman of doing so, but, if we are to proceed with business, hon. members must discuss the item before the committee. The hon. gentleman knows that, as well as I do.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought the committee was about to rise, and that I could make a statement; but hon. gentlemen, apparently, intend to rule me out of order. I shall take the opportunity, if we stay here till morning, to make my statement, because I do not think hon. members desire that the names of gentlemen should be published throughout the country as bankrupt, and they should be glad to allow any member the earliest opportunity to say a word in their behalf.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly, at the proper time.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not want specially to discuss the item. I yielded to the Government to-day, when I had the opportunity to bring up this matter, but the Government do not appear anxious to have the Estimates pass, because they put up man after man to abuse members of the Opposition. They have laid down the doctrine that every poor man in this country working for his dollar a day——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say that in my county as many Government officials turned out, voted and worked against me, as supported me. If we are going to speak about workingmen, I may say that men out of our own factory at Gananoque turned out, and the foreman took the stump against me; yet they were not called to account. Workingmen would not be called to account by any honourable employer. Yet these Liberals, who now control the destinies of the country, declare, as regards the labouring man, that, if he voted against even a defeated candidate, his head must be cut off without trial by judge or jury. That is the policy of the Liberal party, as exemplified by hon. members to-day. A poor fellow employed in Kingston, got three day's notice before his head was cut off; he does not yet know the reason.

Mr. McGREGOR. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) was always a most orderly man. He took his medicine from the then Government side of the House—

and it was always mild—and he never said anything; but since the hon. gentleman has crossed the floor, no hon. member can speak more than a few minutes without the hon. gentleman interrupting him. I hope, in the future, that, when hon. members are addressing the Chair in a respectful manner, he will try and hold his peace and not interrupt. I could tell the hon. gentlemen opposite something they would not like to hear, but, no doubt, they will rule me out, although I yielded to-day to a request made by the Government. But, when Concurrence comes, more time will be occupied than would have been occupied to-night, as I did not intend to speak for more than a few minutes. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare we are obstructionists. I have been looking through "Hansard," and estimating the space occupied by members of the Government and the Opposition, and before the session closes I believe two-thirds of the "Hansard" will be occupied with speeches delivered by members of the Administration and their supporters, thus showing that they have been obstructionists, and not members of the Opposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, the hon. gentleman had better take his seat.

Mr. TAYLOR. We want to get even with hon. gentlemen. Although the Opposition is not so strong in numbers as the Government, we think we can equal hon. gentlemen opposite in speaking, and they will find that we will be able to fight them. As it is apparent that hon. members will not be able to go to their homes at twelve o'clock, I shall occupy a few minutes when the motion for adjournment is made, in rebutting the vile slanders uttered against honourable, upright, honest business men of the country by hon. members last night.

Mr. McALISTER. I regret to be compelled to offer any remarks at this time, as I did not intend to say anything, but, as the matter of interference with Intercolonial Railway employees has been dealt with at some length, I think it is my duty to refer to what has been done in my county. I live in a county where a great many railway men are employed, and, so far as I am concerned, and so far as I am informed by officials of the Intercolonial Railway, no pressure whatever was brought to bear on any of the Intercolonial Railway men in my county. The day before the elections, an arrangement was made by which all the train hands going in different directions along the line to have them brought in on election day, as far as possible, in order to allow them to vote, irrespective of party or of the way in which they intended to vote. The only complaint I heard made was that two men, a driver and his fireman, were sent up in the morning to Metis, and did not get back in time to vote, and they made complaint; but the singular part of that occurrence is that those men declared their intention to vote for me. I do not know whether such was really the case, but, at all events, the superintendent of the road had nothing whatever to do with keeping them from voting.

With that exception, I am not aware of any other in the county who was kept back from voting. Further than that, the only man I know of who took a most active part and an offensive part I may say, was a man who took a part against me. I said nothing to him. I did not try to influence him in any way to refrain from voting or to vote for me. He was allowed to vote, he was allowed to say what he liked at any of the public meetings or in committee meetings without any pressure whatever being brought to bear upon him. So far as interference was concerned in the county of Restigouche there can be no complaint whatever on the part of the Government, or on the part of any person, as to any undue influence whatever being brought to bear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was asked in the early part of this discussion for a statement as to the earnings and expenses during the past year on the different branches of the Government railways. I find that I am now in a position to furnish that information to the committee. It is as follows:—

Statement of earnings and working expenses of the Government railways for the year ended 30th June, 1896:

Intercolonial Railway—		
Earnings	$2,957,640 10	
Working expenses	3,012,827 62	
Loss		$55,187 52
Prince Edward Island Railway—		
Earnings	$146,476 54	
Working expenses	225,138 56	
Loss		78,662 02
Total loss		$133,849 54
Windsor Branch Railway—		
Earnings	$36,561 83	
Working expenses	16,476 46	
Profit		20,085 37
Net loss		$113,764 17

Mr. POWELL. In this vote to increase the accommodation at Moncton, is it intended to provide for a new station house?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was $20,000 placed in the Estimates for a proposed new station house at Moncton, and I am informed that in addition to that it was found necessary to continue making provision for the proper equipment of the workshops. There is, therefore, $10,500 for machinery, making $33,500 in all. I may say to the hon. gentleman that it is not to be supposed, from the fact that the Estimates only asked for this

amount for a station house at Moncton, that that sum would not more than begin to cover the cost of the building.

Mr. POWELL. Is it intended that the station should be built in accordance with the plans and specifications that have already been prepared ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not quite able to answer the hon. gentleman's question. It has been impossible for me to give any attention to this matter as yet, but I propose to do so at the earliest possible date.

An hon. MEMBER. Strike it out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no. I have no doubt whatever that it is necessary to make additional provision for station accommodation in that city. The only reason why I am not able at the moment to answer the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) is, that I would like to apply my own judgment somewhat to the plans and provisions that have been made. It may be that the plans will be adopted just as it has been prepared, but I have not been able to look into the matter at all as yet.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the Minister a question which I know the late Minister of Railways intended to ask if he were present. There were some promotions made in the Department of Railways and Canals in the last days of the late Government. Is the hon. gentleman in possession of the facts just now so as to enable him to tell me what has been done in reference to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can say this much to the hon. member (Mr. Montague). There were two, if not three recommendations for promotion from inferior to superior classes in the department. These recommendations were not—as of course the hon. gentleman knows—they were not completed before the change of Government, and therefore they had to come for consideration before the new Administration. I believe the Treasury Board has not decided to approve of the recommendations. Action, or inaction, perhaps, was taken before I came to my department here, and the recommendations were permitted to stand over as I understand it. No action has yet been taken in respect to them. I think it has been decided not to recommend them, or at all events no action whatever has been taken.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to an item in the vote for "increased accommodation at Pictou." When that item appeared in the last Estimates I brought to the attention of the then Minister of Railways representations that had been made to me as to the inadequacy of that amount to do anything like furnish the accommodation that the business interests demanded there. I merely wish to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that his predecessor, after consulting his officers, led me to believe that the Supplementary Estimates would contain a further amount for that work. I would like if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) would take occasion to confer with his officers, as to how much more, if anything, is needed to give the accommodation required on that part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DIMOCK. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a matter somewhat similar to that mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I refer to the item of $1,000 to extend the freight shed at Truro. The town of Truro is a growing town, and I am sure that the hon. Minister's deputy will tell him that with our growing business we need more accommodation than can be provided by $1,000 spent extending that structure. The building is entirely too small; our trade has been for years beyond its capacity. Therefore, I respectfully call the attention of the Minister to this matter, and would ask that in the Supplementary Estimates he will provide such an amount as will give us the accommodation we require for the increased freight trade of the town of Truro and the surrounding county of Colchester.

Mr. MARTIN. I was very much pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) say that if any officials had been discharged without investigation he would take much pleasure in having them reinstated if the circumstances justified him n doing so. I desire to say that in the little province from which I come there have been many officials discharged without investigation, and I hope the hon. Minister will carry out his promise and have them reinstated, as the officials in the province of Prince Edward Island have taken little or no part in the elections. I, however, understand that quite a number were discharged from the Railway Department at Charlottetown very shortly after the accession of the present Government to power, and I would like that those discharged would be fairly treated and reinstated. While on my feet, I wish to call attention to a false impression that might be drawn from the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). He said that he understood that a wholesale dismissal of officials had been made from the railway in Prince Edward Island in 1878. I venture to make this statement, that more men have been dismissed from the Railway Department since the present Government came into power in July last than were dismissed in the last eighteen years during Conservative rule, or in fact since confederation. I think I can safely make that statement. I may say, for the information of this House, that there are to-day in the pro-

vince of Prince Edward Island quite a number of people in the employ of the Railway Department who have been there since 1874 or 1875, when the Prince Edward Island Railway was opened for traffic—men occupying very important positions, men who were known to be Liberals and strong party men who did not conceal their ideas on the political questions of the day. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) knows this very well. Prince Edward has been cited as an example of what the Liberal-Conservatives did in 1878. The Government of the day cannot find a precedent in Prince Edward Island for the wholesale dismissals which have been lately made. In that Island the Liberal-Conservative party have dealt very fairly and generously with the employees they found there in 1878. I think there were only two or three dismissals. Indeed, the record of the Liberal-Conservative party in their dealing with the civil service of Canada, is a very creditable one. They have sought to raise the standard of the civil service by making the positions in it as permanent as possible, and I think every lover of this Dominion will approve of their course. I trust the Government will not degrade the civil service of Canada. The great Liberal party will surely not fall back on precedents which they condemned, to justify any improper course.

Mr. HALE. I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals a question of great importance to the people of Carleton county, whom I have the honour to represent. It is well known that the Intercolonial Railway has been run at a loss to this country ever since it has been built. The section of country I represent, especially the river counties, is affected by this more than any other section of the Dominion of Canada, I think, as we receive no advantage from the railway, either directly or indirectly. The coal that is shipped from the lower provinces is an advantage to the province of Nova Scotia and also to the upper provinces Another matter which is against the agricultural interest of our county is that produce is shipped from the upper provinces to the lower provinces to our natural market at a very much lower rate of freight than we have to pay to get our produce carried a distance of 150 miles to the city of St. John or to the other markets of our province. Freights are carried on the Intercolonial Railway a distance of a thousand miles from the province of Quebec at a very much lower rate than they are from the county I represent. This operates very seriously to the detriment of our people; and now that we have a Minister of Railways from our own province, I hope he will give this very important matter his attention. I brought this matter to the attention of the late lamented Mr. Pope when he was Minister of Railways, and he told me I was entirely mistaken about it. After I had talked with him for a while on the subject, he consented to look into it, and after he had done so he told me that I was right, and that he would undertake to have it rectified. But that gentleman did not live to carry out his wish in that regard, I am very sorry to say. The road should be run on business principles and the same rate should be imposed for up and down freight, and the rates generally should be proportional to the distance carried and imposed with fairness to every section of the country. There is another matter which has been pretty well threshed out in this House, that is, the dismissal of public employees. While I am elected to represent the people of my county, I came here to assist in doing the business of the country as best I could. I do not come here for the purpose of telling the employees of this country how they should vote. I do not come here to tell any man in this country, rich or poor, how he should cast his ballot. I believe that is each man's right, whether he is rich or poor. While I am elected by the people, I am the servant of the people. Every man in this House is a servant of the people. The hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches to-day are servants of the people just as much as the employees of the Intercolonial Railway. While they only receive very small allowances, these hon. gentlemen receive large amounts, and I claim that they are just as much entitled to vote and to speak as they see fit, as any gentleman in this House. I do hope that the hon. Minister of Railways will not carry out the course which has been attributed to him to-night, because I do not think he is made of that kind of stuff. I believe he will give the labouring men in our country fair-play and a fair, honest trial before dismissing them, and I hope we will hear no more of this matter in this House. I think there has been a great deal of valuable time wasted, which would have been spent to much better advantage doing the business of the country, instead of undertaking to tell the poor labouring men how they should vote. Their vote is all they have. All the comfort they have is their little home and the wage they receive for their day's labour; and, no matter from whom they receive it, they ought to have the freedom of this country, and I believe that every honest man will agree with me that that is their right. And no man, no matter what position he may occupy, has a right to dictate to them how they should vote. Every hon. gentleman who sits on the Treasury benches, has the right to have a man of his own political complexion and whom he can trust as his deputy, but, outside of that, he has no right to interfere with any other man in the employ of this country. These hon. gentlemen are just as much employees of the country as the men who handle the pick and shovel, and I believe the people will bear that out.

Resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

BINDER TWINE.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the House adjourns, I wish to refer to a matter which I brought up a few moments ago, when you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ruled me out of order. I have read in the press of to-day that a number of prominent business men in this country are reported as owing amounts to the Government, and that the Government are unable to collect these debts. On behalf of some of these gentlemen, who are thus reported, and who are not able to contradict the statement themselves in this House, I beg to say that the statements are not correct. Mowatt & Co., of Trenton, are reported as owing $252.61 to the Government which the Government cannot collect. Well, Messrs. Mowatt & Co. are a firm of good standing, able to pay any liabilities that they incur. N. Turner & Sons, Cornwall, are reported as owing $41.48. I have done business with them for many years, and I know that they are men of good standing, well able to pay any debt they incur. J. H. Ashdowne, of Winnipeg, a gentleman with whom we have been doing business many years, and who is well able to pay his debts, is reported as owing $39.90. W. H. Anderson, of Kemptville, is put down as owing $120. He also is a man of means, able to pay anything demanded of him. P. S. Stewart, of Renfrew, also a man of means, and well able to pay, and now not owing the Government or anybody else a dollar, for he always pays cash, is put down as owing $115. George Sears, of Kingston, a gentleman to whom we have sold for years, and who has always paid his bills, and can pay anything the Government has against him, is entered as owing $81.38. James Reid, of Perth, always pays cash at the same discount, yet he is down for $201.70. George Thompson, of Cobourg, another gentleman able and willing to pay any debt he contracts, is charged as owing $240.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Does he do business with you ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly ; I am speaking of men with whom we do business. There are a number of men in that list whom I know to be men of means. And yet they are reported to be worthless and in debt to the Government. I may say, for the benefit of my hon. friend who said they were all Tory heelers, that out of ten names on the list eight of them are those of supporters of gentlemen opposite.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is about the proportion among good business men.

An hon. MEMBER. We will take it back about them.

Mr. TAYLOR. You cannot take it back after having published it that these men are in debt to the Government and are unable to pay. Then there is the Shirah Milling Company.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are Liberals.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have never done business with them, but I had the pleasure of going through their premises. They are men of means, I should fancy, and Liberals I believe. These are the men who are published as Tory heelers who made purchases from the Government and were not able to pay. I might name others, but no doubt other gentlemen are better acquainted with some of those whose names are here than I am. As to the gentlemen I have mentioned, it seemed that as they were customers of ours it was my duty to say what I knew of them. I think there is not a dollar they owe that they are not able and willing to pay.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I think that when the hon. gentleman comes to do business with these people again he will find that they remember not the statements made in the newspapers but the statements made in "Hansard." I cannot understand how a gentleman can rise in good faith and make the remarks the hon. gentleman has made after having heard the discussion last night. The hon. gentleman said I referred to Messrs. Wood, Vallance & Co., as not having paid this account. I would ask leave to read from "Hansard" on that point :

> Now, about Mr. Wood, I am directed to say that so far as he is concerned, he dealt with Connor to the extent of $3,200. He became suspicious of Connor's dealings and wrote to the department to ascertain whether he should pay this money to Connor or to the department. I have got the letter here somewhere, and I find he was informed that he might deal with Connor, and he did deal with him, and the $1,200 the hon. member for Lisgar referred to as being due by Wood, Vallance & Co., has been paid. That is the information I have from the officers of the department, and it is entered in the schedule as still due.

That is what I said in the hearing of the hon. member last night. Let us see as to the other point to which he draws attention. In the first place I did not say that anything was due or not due except in the manner I have indicated. Now the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) spoke on this point, and he said :

> Large quantities of this twine, I may inform the House, were advanced to gentlemen all over the Dominion of Canada ; and I am credibly informed, and it is my belief, that the men, or the greater portion of the men, who got this twine were political partisans, Conservatives—

And that is true.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not true.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The greater portion of these men are Conservatives. That is true.

Mr. COCHRANE. What difference does that make if they pay their bills ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Allow me to proceed.

—and the amounts owing by them on the twine have not yet been paid.

There is not one word as to their ability to pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, there is. Read what the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) said.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am reading what the hon. member for Lisgar said and what I said.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not refer to you at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have to deal with the transaction between the Government and Connor. This man Connor was indebted to the Government on a contract made with the Government. When, in March last, it was ascertained that he owed a large amount of money he made a contract with the Government under which he transferred to them certain securities as collateral for the payment of his debt and among the securities were accounts which he represented to be due. Up to to-day at 12 o'clock, so far as the Department of Justice was concerned these accounts appeared to be due. So clear was the case that action has been taken by the Department of Justice against Connor and against Connolly to recover the balance due, and in the proceedings it is stated that these accounts were handed over to the Government and represented as unpaid. The information comes to us from the officials of the Department of Justice and was communicated by me to the member for Lisgar and dealt with by him on that assumption. No such statements were made as have been spoken of either by me or by the hon. member for Lisgar to whom I communicated the information.

Mr. GUILLET. Have the parties who are presumed to be indebted been requested to pay ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As to the methods adopted by the late Government to collect the accounts, I cannot say. As soon as we came in we took up the case and sued the parties concerned.

Mr. GUILLET. All of them ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Connor and Connolly, not the others. I said that up to 12 o'clock to-day, so far as I knew, the department really held claims against these persons under the assignment. I had an amended statement made up to 12 o'clock, because I thought it proper to lay on the Table of the House the statement of the account. That statement goes to show that some of these amounts were really paid. This afternoon I had the statement, thinking that this subject would come up. But I have not it here now.

Mr. GUILLET. One of the gentlemen named here is Mr. George Thompson, of Cobourg. He is a merchant carrying on an extensive business as head of the Evaporator Company. He has good financial standing. He is not known as a Conservative but as a life-long Reformer. He may have voted Conservative occasionally as he is an independent-minded man.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When we find this $1,200 alleged to be due by Wood, Vallance & Company is really paid, it leads us to suppose that there are others in the same position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Lisgar said these amounts were not paid.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) was speaking from information furnished by me and I am responsible for it, not he.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was not here when the debate took place. But I understand that the statement is that sums are due from certain parties to the Government, and that these people are largely supporters of the Conservative party. That carries with it the meaning that it was through some political pull that these amounts were allowed to be owed.

Now, I know nothing of the general question, I had nothing to do with it, but, of course, am responsible for it as a member of the Government. I only wish to say that there is one gentleman named there who is a resident of my riding. I never knew he had any dealings with Mr. Connor or the Government. He is a very strong Liberal, and consequently it would be through no influence of mine that he got this trade. Further than that, I am doubtful whether Mr. Sherry owes a dollar to the Government, because he is abundantly able to pay his debts.

Mr. CASEY. Do I understand the Solicitor General to say that these accounts had been paid to Connor, or had been handed over by him to the Government ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When I made the statement to the House, as I only came to the department within a month, I simply repeated what had been told to me by the Tory employees of the Department of Justice. When I asked for the amended statement to-day, I asked for one showing the condition of affairs now, and that will be produced in the House on Monday.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill. He is trying to fasten on hon. gentlemen on this side the odium of having called certain gentlemen political

heelers. The hon. gentleman is just about as accurate in that statement as he is in many others. In the remarks I took occasion to make last night respecting this extraordinary transaction, I had reference to certain matters which my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) mentioned—people living in the North-west to whom large quantities of this twine had been sold, and whom my hon. friend stated to the House were wholly irresponsible. They were not only irresponsible, but he stated, and I assume it to be true, that they were all officials of certain political organizations throughout that country, wholly worthless, and in fact bankrupts, and men apparently to whom no honest sale of goods of this amount could have been made. My hon. friend should not have taken the ground he did in making that statement as a little bit of political capital. No doubt the gentlemen he mentioned as having dealt with his firm, are all honourable gentlemen; if they were not, they would not be dealing with his firm. But the reference I made was to political friends of the late Government, those whom my hon. friend mentioned as living in the North-west country, and men who are totally irresponsible for this or any other debt.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just one word.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order, the hon. gentleman has spoken once.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. gentleman that this debate was altogether out of order. I permitted it because I understood it was a matter of explanation between the Prime Minister and the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just want to say this. The Solicitor General quoted from "Hansard" and he asked me to reply.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Solicitor General said he would bring all the papers here on Monday.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is one word I desire to say myself in view of the statement of the Solicitor General. The whole trouble has arisen from access being allowed to these papers by a member of the House. I was pressed in Committee of Supply for the names of parties owing the department for binder twine, and I relying on the good sense of the members of the House, said that of course if I were pressed, the Government would have to give the fullest information; but that unless there was some serious reason, or serious action was intended, I thought the department, carrying on that business in the nature of a trade, would be greatly embarrassed: that business firms never displayed their accounts, or mention the account outstanding in their books. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) found himself in an awkward position when his name was found in the list with an intimation that he was still owing these accounts. The information was totally inaccurate, but it had been gleaned in the Department of Justice. I would suggest to the Solicitor General that in future, unless there is a demand in Parliament for some serious purpose, and he finds it necessary to give information of this kind, it should be withheld, and on no occasion be brought down unless means are taken to test the accuracy of that information.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This case shows the wisdom of the rule pointed out by my hon. and learned friend. But I may mention that what I said to the hon. member for Lisgar was that he should produce the information filed in court.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 28) to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

IMPORT DUTIES ON LIQUORS.

Mr. DEVLIN (for Mr. Cameron) asked:

What was the total amount of duties collected upon importations of ales, beer or other malt liquors and upon wines and spirituous liquors for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The duties referred to were as follows:—Ale, beer and other malt liquors, $57,966.49; wines of all kinds, $240,477.10; spirituous liquors, $1,942,724.86, making a total of $2,241,168.45.

CAPTAIN ALFRED FAGES.

Mr. DEVLIN (for Mr. Choquette) asked:

Did Captain Alfred Fages, of the Military School at St. Johns, P.Q., obtain leave of absence in order to go and vote at Quebec on 23rd June last? If so, what was the duration of the said leave?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Captain Fages asked and obtained from the Commandant of the Royal Canadian Infantry at St. John's, three days' leave of absence on the evening of the 22nd June, to go to Quebec on personal affairs.

AGRICULTURIST AT THE EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

How many applications have been received for the position of Agriculturist in connection with the Experimental Farm? Has any appointment been made thereto? If so, to whom?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). One application has been received, that of Mr. Thomas Henderson, of Ottawa. No appointment has been made.

FORTIFICATIONS AT KINGSTON.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Britton) asked:

Is the Government aware that the fortifications at and near Kingston are very much out of repair, and rapidly becoming worse? Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates to be brought down this session, for the repair of the fort and towers, or any of them, or any part thereof?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). This matter is now under consideration of the Government. The officers of the department have been asked to make a special report in regard to these fortifications.

REPAIRS OF FORT ANNE.

Mr. MILLS asked:

Does the Government intend to complete the repairs of Fort Anne, in the county of Annapolis? If so, when?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The Government intend to complete the repairs begun at Fort Anne last year, and will do so at the earliest possible moment.

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates during the present session for the repairs and extension of the L'Ardoise Breakwater, Richmond County, Cape Breton?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I have to inform my hon. friend that this question is now under the consideration of the Government.

LIGHTHOUSE NEAR POINT CLAIRE.

Mr. DIMOCK (for Mr. Monk) asked:

Is the Government aware that one of the lighthouses on Lake St. Louis, near Point Claire, P.Q., has been burned? Is it the intention of the Goverment to rebuild this lighthouse without delay?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Government is aware that one of the lighthouses on Lake St. Louis, near Point Claire, has been burned. It is the intention of the Government to rebuild this lighthouse without delay; the plans have been prepared, and immediate steps will be taken to go on with the work.

MR. A. P. LEPINE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Casgrain) asked:

1. Has Mr. A. P. Lepine, of Quebec, been dismissed from the public service?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Has any person been appointed in his stead, and if so, who?

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Mr. Lepine has been notified that his services are no longer required. 2. Because at the time there were no works going on in Quebec on which his services could be utilized. 3. Some time afterwards when work recommenced Mr. Phileas Béland was employed.

LOBSTER FISHERY AND FISHERY PROTECTION.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Whether the Government have received any petition or memorial from the lobster packers in the province of Prince Edward Island for a change in the lobster fishing regulations? Whether the Government propose to make any change in regard to the fishing season for lobsters in that province, and the nature of the change; and whether the Government propose to make any change in the fishery protection service in that province or in the staff at present employed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Government have received a petition such as that referred to. As to change in regard to fishing season for lobsters in Prince Edward Island, I would say that the whole question will be carefully considered and steps will be taken to ascertain the views of those most interested in the industry, before any change is made. In reply to the question respecting change in the fishery protection service in Prince Edward Island or in the staff at present employed, I have to inform the hon. gentleman that the whole question of any necessary changes in the fisheries protection will receive full consideration before any change is made.

COST OF BUILDINGS, EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What buildings have been built on the Experimental Farm at Ottawa, and what has been the cost of each?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The following table shows the details:—

Barn and stables	$ 22,124	06
Museum, official and chemical laboratory	15,231	45
Greenhouses	5,566	40
Poultry buildings	5,009	08
Dairy and piggery	4,495	95
Implement building	4,835	00
Root house	1,111	37
Director's house	12,500	00
Four houses — Entomologist, Chemist, Horticulturist and Agriculturist	22,291	55
Three cottages and stable	5,919	71..
Sheep building— Estimated total cost, $5,085.62 Cost to date	3,755	62
	$102,840	19

In addition to these figures, I may say that there have been expended the following sums :—

Purchase of lands through Department of Agriculture	$ 65,438	35
Cost of heating apparatuses through Department of Public Works	6,852	40
Alterations, Clerk of Works, furniture through Department of Public Works	50,590	77
	$122,881	52

Total amount expended to 30th June, 1896, $225,721.71. No portion of the above expenditure went against the sum of $6,000 voted every year for repairing, &c., the experimental farm buildings, except the cost of the sheep building constructed in 1895-96 at an expenditure of $3,755.62. Since the 1st July, 1892, the Department of Public Works has had an annual vote of $6,000, called "New buildings, improvements, repairs, &c.," which covers all the repairs required for all the experimental farms in Canada. Out of that vote of $6,000, the share of the Ottawa experimental farm has been every year since the first vote, as follows :—

For the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1893.	$4,264	84
" " " 1894.	3,234	04
" " " 1895.	3,907	40
" " " 1896.	4,322	76
Total	$15,729	04

I may add that it is not possible to apportion the above sum of $15,729.04 to each of the buildings mentioned in the statement of the cost of construction, as the accounts as rendered do not show that distribution. The whole cost is $160,283.36.

FAIR AT THREE RIVERS.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Mr. Sproule) asked:

How many head of cattle were sent from the Experimental Farm to the fair at Three Rivers ? What breeds were they ? What was the cost of transport to and from the exhibition ? By whom was the expense borne ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No cattle were sent from the experimental farm to the fair at Three Rivers ; but, for the information of the hon. member, I may say that the following exhibit was sent :—Seven hogs, the description of which I have here, but which I do not suppose would interest the hon. member ; and coops of seven breeds of chickens. The cost of transport to and from was $36, which expense was borne by the department.

SALE OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. McMullen) asked :

Is there still any balance due by the person or persons controlling the sale of binding twine manufactured at Kingston ? If so, who are the parties in arrears and what amount is due by each, and how long overdue ? What security is held for the amount due, and if considered good and ample ? Have the Government given any instructions to collect overdue accounts ? If not, why not ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to call at the Department of Railways and the Department of Justice, he will get all the information he requires. There is some information asked for here that I do not think we ought to communicate to the House now, concerning the names of those supposed to be indebted, and the amounts.

REFORMATORY AT ALEXANDRIA.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry) asked :

(a.) On what date was it first settled, by Order in Council, that the Reformatory was to be built at Alexandria, Glengarry ?

(b.) At what sessions have amounts for it been placed in the Estimates, and how much ?

(c.) Has the land for the site been purchased ? What is the date of transfer, and the amount paid ?

(d.) On what date has the contract been signed, and for what portion of the building, and the amount of contract ?

(e.) When did the work commence, and what is the amount and date of estimate returned, and amount of work done since return of estimate ? Is the work still in progress ? If discontinued, for what reason ?

(f.) Do the Government intend to go on with building and continue to completion on the present site at Alexandria, Glengarry, and how soon do they propose to start it again ?

(g.) Has the difficulty between contractor and architect about the plans and specifications of the foundation walls been settled ? If so, how ?

(h.) Has the clerk appointed at the commencement of the work been dismissed ? If so, for what reason ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (a) This arrangement was made by the Justice Department, but there appears to be no Order in Council in the matter. There is an Order in Council for the purchase of the site selected by the Department of Justice, the date of which is 25th March, 1895. (b) In 1894-95 Parliament voted towards the construction of said reformatory $10,000 ; in 1895-96, $20,000 ; 1896-97, $30,000. (c) Yes, the land for the site has

been purchased. The transfer is dated 17th April, 1895, and the amount paid $5,000. (d) The contract was signed on the 17th March, 1896, for one cell wing and rotunda (main hall), and the amount of the contract is $95,000. (e) Work commenced shortly after contract was awarded. Only one estimate was rendered since the beginning of the work, and that amounts to $2,490. The work is progressing. (f) The work is progressing, and the contractor has not signified his intention of abandoning his contract. (g) The contractor has been ordered by the Minister to follow plans and specifications, and he has agreed to do so. (h) The services of the clerk of works were dispensed with at the time on account of the slow progress of the work, which did not necessitate a highly-paid supervision.

TRADE WITH AUSTRALIAN COLONIES.

Mr. COPP asked.

What percentage in value of Canadian exports of native products to the Australian Colonies during the years 1893-94, 1894-95 and 1895-96 was carried by the line of steamers receiving a Dominion subsidy? Also, what percentage in value of imports into Canada from the Australian Colonies arrived by the line of steamships receiving a subsidy from the Dominion during the years 1893-94, 1894-95, 1895-96?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The statistical returns furnished by the Customs Department do not show what percentage in value of Canadian exports of native produce to the Australian Colonies, during the years 1893-94, 1894-95 and 1895-96, was carried by the line of steamers receiving a Dominion subsidy, or what percentage in value of imports into Canada from the Australian colonies arrived by the line of steamships receiving a subsidy from the Dominion during the years 1893-94, 1894-95, 1895-96. I am informed that statements would have to be specially compiled at various ports to give this information, requiring a good deal of time. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow this question to stand as a notice of motion, and the return will be prepared as soon as possible.

Mr. COPP. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my question stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question cannot stand in that way as a notice of motion. The hon. gentleman will have to send it in to the Clerk.

CRUISER "LA CANADIENNE."

Mr. LEMIEUX asked:

1. Whether Commander Wakeham has made known to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the motives which induced him to place the cruiser "La Canadienne" at the disposal of the Conservative candidate in Gaspé, during the late general elections?

2. Who authorized Commander Wakeham to carry the Conservative candidate to the Magdalen Islands?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies.) 1. Yes. The report is in the department, and I will be happy to show it to the hon. gentleman, if he calls there, or to bring it down, if he moves for it. 2. The Hon. Mr. Angers.

T. D. GREENE, D.L.S.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

In what capacity and locality was T. D. Greene, D.L.S., employed by the Department of Indian Affairs, during the month of June last, and how many miles of lines did he survey during that month?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The official record does not show what particular locality Mr. Greene was employed in during the month of June, or how many miles of lines he surveyed during that month. He is now engaged on the St. Peter's Reserve, near West Selkirk, Man., and has been asked to furnish the department with the desired information. 2. Mr. Greene was engaged from the 21st May to the 6th July in Ontario, in retracing the south-east boundary of the Six Nations Reserve, which boundary is in the electoral district of Haldimand, and near to the electoral district of Brant, and in retracing the boundaries of the lands held by the Mount Elgin Institute, on the Indian Reserve in the township of Caradoc, in the electoral district of Middlesex, and in surveying and subdividing some Indian holdings in the same reserve. 3. The returns received from Mr. Greene show that the total length of lines surveyed by him in that time amounts to about 21 miles.

OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

Did fishing oysters, under the authority of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, commence in the East and West Rivers, near Charlottetown, in the province of Prince Edward Island, on the 14th September instant? Was the same privilege allowed in the other rivers and bays of that province? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes. 2. No; because the privileges was not asked for, and was conceded in the east and west rivers to enable the oyster men to supply the provincial exhibition, export being prohibited.

THE SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

What was the estimated cost of the Soulanges Canal when tenders were asked? Who were the original contractors? What is the amount of money already spent on the canal? What are the names of the different contractors, and the

amount of money they have received respectively ? Is the work progressing satisfactorily ? When is it seriously expected that the work will be finished ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The estimated cost of the Soulanges Canal, when tenders were asked, was $4,750,000. The original contractors' names were : Archibald Stewart, O'Leary Brothers, George Goodwin, Charles Raynor, Randolph MacDonald, Rogers & Taylor, O'Brien & Co., Dominion Bridge Co., Hyde & Co., C. J. De Sola, Bellhouse, Dillon & Co. The amount of money spent on the canal to the 18th September, 1896, is $2,279,977.62. The names of the different contractors are : Archibald Stewart, O'Leary Brothers, George Goodwin, Charles Raynor, Randolph MacDonald, Rogers & Taylor and Poupore, Fraser & Co., Dominion Bridge Co., Hyde & Co., C. J. De Sola, Bellhouse, Dillon & Co. The amount of money they have received respectively is : $409,500, $147,380.30, $276,780, $179,096, $389,390, $188,036.50, $193,430, $10,267, $10,535.28, $31,187.91, $39,234.62.

Mr. BERGERON. The answer to the last part of the question—when is it expected the work will be finished ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the opinion of the officials of the department, it will take, at the present rate of progress, probably in the neighbourhood of twenty years.

PORT RICHMOND BREAKWATER, N.S.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

Is it intended by the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates, during the present session, for the construction of a breakwater at Port Richmond, Richmond County ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is not the intention of the Government.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. McINNES asked :

1. Prior to the grant of land, known as the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway belt, from the province of British Columbia to the Dominion Government in trust for the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, were any rights acquired by any person by pre-emption or otherwise in any of the land or coal included in said belt ?

2. If so, were any reservations made in said grant in favour of such rights, and were such rights recognized by the Dominion Government in executing the said trust ?

3. Why were the coal rights pertaining to lands pre-empted prior to January 1st, 1882, and situated in the said belt, not granted to the pre-emptors by the Dominion Government ?

4. Has any application been made by the said company to the Dominion Government for a grant of land in lieu of that alienated in the said belt prior to the grant to the said company ? If so, for what amount, and does such application ask for the coal rights pertaining to such lands ?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to investigate the claims of certain settlers on lands in the said belt who claim that they have been deprived of certain rights guaranteed them, by subsection 5 of section 7 of an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada in 47 Victoria, intituled "An Act respecting the Vancouver Island Railway."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes, to the extent as acknowledged by the government of British Columbia, of 86,346 acres. 2. (a.) Yes. The British Columbia statute, 46 Victoria, chapter 14, section 6, provides that the grant "shall not include any lands now held under Crown grant, lease, agreement for sale, or other alienation by the Crown, nor shall it include Indian reserves or settlements. (b.) It was left to the provincial government to complete all transactions which had been initiated before the transfer of the railway reserve to the Dominion Government in trust. 3. As explained in the answer to question No. 2, pre-emptors prior to the 1st January, 1882, and indeed up to the date when the lands in question were transferred by the province to the Dominion, derived their titles from the local government, the lands for which they had records having been excluded by the statute from the transfer to the Dominion Government in trust. The Government of Canada, therefore, had no responsibility for the form of title. It was a question of the completion by the provincial government of a contract into which they had already entered with the pre-emptors. 4. An application has been made by the company to the Dominion Government for a grant of 86,346 acres to compensate for lands alienated by the provincial government to pre-emptors and others either by Crown grant, lease, agreement for sale, or other alienation, up to the date when the lands in question passed to the Dominion. The application does not mention that it includes the coal rights pertaining to the lands applied for. 5. The Government is now considering the propriety of instituting an inquiry into the claims of the settlers.

VANCOUVER ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. McINNES asked :

1. Have any applications been made by or on behalf of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company or the British Pacific Railway Company for the usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards railway construction on Vancouver Island? If so, what is the date of such application ?

2. Did the late Government, in the proposed Supplementary Estimates of last session, or otherwise, make provision for such subsidies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, application was made by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company for the usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards railway construc-

tion on Vancouver Island. The date of application is 24th February, 1896. No provision was made in the Supplementary Estimates of last session or otherwise for this subsidy.

GEORGE R. SMITH.

Mr. GIBSON asked:

Was Mr. G. R. Smith, of the city of Hamilton, recommended by the late Government for a position in the Government service? If so, what was the nature of the recommendation and the salary attached thereto?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Geo. R. Smith was recommended for appointment as preventive officer in the Customs at Niagara Falls, Ont., under date 29th June, 1896, with $700, but the recommendation was withdrawn.

WM. McGIRR.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked:

Has Wm. McGirr, of the Indian Department, who was sent up west during the recent general election ostensibly for the purpose of making a report in regard to matters pertaining to the St. Peter's band of Indians, made any such report, and, if so, will the Government submit it to Parliament? As the St. Peter's Indian band is located near Winnipeg, were Mr. McGirr's expenses to the Territories at that time, paid?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The William McGirr referred to made a report on matters pertaining to the St. Peter's band of Indians when he went to the west on the occasion referred to. 2. The report will be submitted to Parliament if desired. 3. There is no record that Mr. McGirr was paid expenses to the Territories at the time referred to in the inquiry. His expenses were paid to Manitoba.

FISHING BOUNTIES.

Mr. GANONG asked:

Is it the intention of the Government in the distribution of the fishing bounty, to allot any portion among the deep sea weir fishermen, and, if so, what amount?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is not the intention of the Government to allot any portion of the fishing bounty grant among weir fishermen. 2. The bounty is intended as a compensation, and limited to vessels and boat fishermen whose fishing was more immediately affected by the terms of the Washington Treaty. It has never been allowed to the class of fishermen referred to.

SEIZURES IN BEHRING SEA.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked:

What progress has been made towards a settlement of the claims of the owners of schooners "Willie McGowan" and "Ariel," seized by the Russian authorities in the Behring Sea, several years ago and which claims were practically admitted by the Russians?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). There is nothing to add to what has already been communicated to the interested parties, with the sanction of Her Majesty's Government, which was to the effect that some delay has occurred in regard to these claims, owing to the necessity for their detailed examination by the law officers of the Crown. Her Majesty's Government trust, however, that no further considerable delay will take place. This information was communicated to the interested parties in Nova Scotia on the 6th May last.

COMMANDER WAKEHAM.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to remove Commander Wakeham from the position he occupies and to replace him by Dr. Lavoie, of L'Islet?

2. If so, is Dr Lavoie the same person who was dismissed from the public service after an investigation held in relation to an accident which happened to the ss. "Lady Head," of which he was the commander?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No charge has been preferred against Commander Wakeham, and the question of his removal has not been considered.

FISHING SUPPLY AT MAPLE LAKE, N. W. T.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has received the suggestions respecting stocking with fish fry the lakes south of Maple Creek at Four Mile Coulée? Whether the Minister will act on the suggestions?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Yes, he has received them. Owing to the great distance and difficulty of transport, it has been impracticable to send whitefish fry to this locality. These young fish are delicate and they perish if carried to great distances.

WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether the attention of the Minister of Militia has been called to the list of the scouts from Wood Mountain who served during the rebellion and to the certificate of Inspector Macdonell? Whether he will take such steps this session as will enable the Government to give scrip to the Wood Mountain scouts for their services during the rebellion?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). My attention has not been called to this matter, but since the question was

placed on the paper, I have asked the Deputy Minister to make a report on the subject.

RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RAILWAY.

Mr. McALISTER asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to ask Parliament during the present session to grant a revote of subsidies granted in 1892 and 1894 to the Restigouche and Victoria Railway, said subsidies having lapsed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament during the present session to grant a revote of subsidies granted in 1892 and 1894 to the Restigouche and Victoria Railway.

HARBOUR SHELTER AT PETIT DE GRAT.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates during the present session the sum of fifteen hundred dollars, or any other amount, for the construction at Petit de Grat, Isle Madame, county of Richmond ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I should like to amend my answer to question 12 by stating that the amount I gave as the sum total of the cost of the buildings at the Experimental Farm, Ottawa, amounting to $16,000 odd, by adding $15,229, making the two amounts $176,012.40.

DISMISSALS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the return which he laid on the Table of the House on Friday. I think I shall be able to show him that the return is not by any means complete. The return ordered was for :

Copies of any reports or correspondence and the reason for the dismissal of Roderick McLeod and Robert McKay, bridge tenders on the Intercolonial Railway bridge, Pictou, Nova Scotia, and the appointment of Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas in their places and stead.

The Minister of Railways was good enough to inform the committee the other evening that complaint had been made by Mr. McDonald, that these men had been very active partisans in the late election, requesting that they should be removed and two others whose names he gave, should be appointed in their place. The Minister went on to say :

I directed him to communicate with Mr. Maxwell ; Mr. Maxwell communicated with Mr. Archibald ; and under general directions touching these two cases which I gave to Mr. Pottinger these men were removed and two persons, Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas were appointed in their stead.

Again the Minister referring to that subject said——

Mr. SPEAKER I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman is proceeding at too great length. The first part of his reference was in relation to an answer to a question.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It had reference to a return brought down to this House on an order of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is scarcely in order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I am perfectly in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has hardly a right to proceed now with a discussion which may become general.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am perfectly in order, Sir. On the Orders of the Day being called, I am simply calling the attention of the Minister of Railways to an incomplete return, and giving my reasons why I press upon his attention that he should cause to be prepared a supplementary return. I am now merely calling his attention to a statement made in committee. In addition to the statement I have mentioned the hon. Minister said :

Mr. McDonald first wrote to me to say that there were two men employed on the railway who actively intervened in the election, who were exceedingly active and exceedingly offensive. He certainly did describe to me that they were active canvassers in the election.

I pass over a portion of the Minister's remarks because I only wish to refer to this particular part of the communication. The hon. gentleman continued :

I immediately wrote to him saying that I proposed to take a very careful course with regard to Government employees ; that while I could not investigate the matter myself, I desired him to tell me, on his own personal assurance as a gentleman, or something to that effect, implying that I relied on his word of honour as a gentleman, that what he alleged as true ; and on his giving me that assurance, I authorized Mr. Pottinger to permit the displacement of those men.

Now, I desire to say that none of that correspondence appears although the order of the House asks for it. The papers which have been put in the Minister's hands relate to a mere request from Mr. McDonald —without charge or other statement—that two men whom he nominates shall be put in place of these men, and strange to say—and I bring this again to the attention of the Minister—the date of the first communication is the 2nd of July, which was before the late Government had left office and long be-

fore the hon. gentleman was Minister of Railways. Mr. Maxwell the trackmaster says in a letter to Mr. Archibald, dated the 2nd of July :

I herewith inclose you a letter from E. M. McDonald.

That letter is not among these papers and it is referred to more than once. That letter is stated here to be a letter asking for a change of men on the draw bridge on Pictou harbour, and it says :

The men who were always on this draw bridge were Roderick McLeod and McKay. Now they want those men changed and others named in their place.

The Minister will see there is no suggestion of a charge in that. On the 13th of July there was another letter from the trackmaster which referred again to this letter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that it would hardly do to disturb the business of the House by going into a long criticism of this nature.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not going into any criticism.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going through a long criticism of a return which has been produced. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask for a corrected return that is another thing, but I really think his present course would lead to interminable discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I expect no discussion whatever, Mr. Speaker. If, after giving you, Sir, a reference and a precedent for my course, you prefer that I should not address the House at this time, I will certainly obey your ruling. I would like to call your attention to Bourinot, page 423. Referring to this rule 13 and speaking of the calling of orders, after referring to many cases as to the practice of this House, Bourinot goes on to say :

They make these explanations in reference to an inaccuracy in the official record, or in the newspapers, * * * * or in respect to the incompleteness or inaccuracy of certain returns brought down under the order of the House.

I think I can appeal to the Minister of Railways for his support in connection with the observations I have made, when I say that my object now is not at all to raise a discussion but rather to impress upon him the grounds upon which I ask that he shall give orders to his officers to have a complete return prepared. It is obvious from the remarks I have made so far, that this return has been prepared without reference to the many papers that were desired and the existence of which the Minister has proven in this House. I refer to the letters from Mr. E. M. McDonald ; the letters upon which the Minister himself says he took action. I am unable of course to make myself perfectly clear as to the value of these papers, unless with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I am permitted to follow this correspondence at a little greater length. I, of course, am subject to your ruling, and if I am not permitted to follow a full statement now, I shall reserve my observations. I think I am in order, Sir, but I shall defer to your opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has raised a point as to the inaccuracy of this return, and if the Minister desires to make any observations on that statement it will be quite in order to do so. But, what I deprecate is, a long statement which will necessarily be argumentative and lead to a discussion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall endeavour to avoid that. As I stated at the outset, and as I again venture to think the Minister of Railways accepted the statement, my desire was not to provoke a debate or to do more than convince the Minister, that there are other documents required to be submitted before this Order of the House will be obeyed. There is again a letter from Mr. McDonald of July 17th, in which he says :

About a week ago I recommended to Mr. Maxwell two names of men for the position of draw men on the bridge at West River. I understood from him that two men were placed there temporarily pending the decision of the recommendation. Would you be kind enough to arrange, if possible, to have the temporary men laid aside and my recommendation acted upon.

Then Mr. Archibald, the engineer, on July 21st, writes referring to this letter, and Mr. Archibald's letter is absent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the date of the letter which is absent ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The date is not given nor is the letter, but it is apparently the letter upon which the whole action is taken, for instance, he calls attention, in this letter of July 21st, to the other letter, in this way :

Two men named Roderick McLeod and Robert McKay have been employed attending to this draw, at the season of the year it requires to be used, since the road was opened, about nine years ago. The draw is used generally from June until December. In addition to attending to the draw, these men do the track work and general repairs to the long trestle bridge on either side of the draw, but they are always within hailing distance in case it is necessary to open the draw. They are paid $1.25 per day, and insurance is kept off them. This year they were put on on the 1st July. On the 2nd instant Trackmaster Maxwell wrote me inclosing a letter from E. M. McDonald, of Pictou, asking that a change of men be made on the draw. I assumed from this letter which you will find herewith, that no men had then been taken on, and instructed the trackmaster to make the section men attend to the draw until further advised, and he referred the papers to you. I learned a day or two afterwards, that the men usually employed, had been taken on on

the 1st of July by Trackmaster Maxwell and that he had dropped them upon receiving my instructions, to have the section men attend to the draw until further advised. Upon the receipt of this information, with your approval, I instructed Maxwell to continue the men usually employed until further instructed.

That letter is referred to more than once but is not included in these papers. Then Mr. McDonald writes on July 27th, to Mr. Pottinger:

I have had no word as yet in regard to my recommendation of the men on the draw. As this is not a case of recommending a discharge, I think we should have heard about it before this, and would like to have my recommendation carried out.

Again on August 6th, Mr. McDonald writes:

I trust that the recommendation on the draw should be carried out.

Then, on August 6, Mr. Pottinger writes to Mr. McDonald:

I have heard from the Minister of Railways, and instructions have been given to employ Thomas and Arthur Fraser.

That letter I would ask the Minister also to kindly have brought down unless there is some strong reason to the contrary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It may have been verbal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It may have been, but I would ask the Minister's attention to it. On August 6, Mr. Pottinger writes to Mr. Archibald:

I presume the intention of the Minister is that the Frasers should have an allowance for a few days at the end of the season to make up for the time from the 1st of July, during which they were not employed.

If these instructions were not oral, the Minister might have that added. These are the main points. Without them it is impossible really to appreciate any of the grounds upon which these men were dismissed, or the official correspondence upon which the Minister made his statement. He could not have had in mind this particular series of letters, but a series which appears to be absent, and I would ask him to cause his officers to lay before him any further papers that exist relating to the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection whatever to having inquiries made as to whether there are any other letters in the department which could be produced, than those which have already been produced. A portion of the statement which the hon. member read as having been made by me the other day was based upon written and a portion of it upon verbal communication which took place between Mr. McDonald and myself. The verbal communication of course would not be produced. The written correspondence was entirely of a private and confidential character between us, and I think I have stated very frankly and very fully, both what Mr. McDonald stated to me, and what I in reply said to him. I really think that even if the confidential correspondence were produced, it would not shed any more light on the subject or help the hon. gentleman to any better understanding of the question; and as the correspondence between Mr. McDonald and myself was not official and not in the department, I do not feel called upon, at all events without considering the matter, to say at this moment that I would be justified or in duty bound to produce that correspondence. I do not say that I will not do it, but I will consider the matter, and let the hon. member know whether I ought to do so or not.

INQUIRY FOR A RETURN.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Postmaster General, or some of his colleagues on his behalf who may be in a position to answer, whether the papers asked for by me eleven days ago in the matter of the Morrison contract have been brought down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Postmaster General is not here this afternoon. I will call his attention to the matter when he comes in.

PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if anything has been done towards the payment of those employees in the Printing Bureau. They are very much in need.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We have not been in a position to do anything, possibly because of the particular point which was given to the criticism of that item in the Governor General's warrant, by hon. gentlemen opposite, including, I believe, the hon. member from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). It was argued that whatever might be said in justification of other items, that one was open to objection. I have had intimation, however, from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that the Estimates would make more rapid progress if we simply proceeded with the general Estimates without taking a vote for a special credit. That intimation being given, I have withdrawn the notice I gave for that purpose, and I hope that by to-morrow evening such progress may be made with the Estimates that I shall be able to get a Bill through, so that those people may be paid.

Mr. McNEILL. While I objected to the Government having taken possession of this money under Governor General's warrants, I thought, as they had the money in hand, and as these men were in great need of

money now, though they were not in need of it at all when the money was taken, that some arrangement might be made across the House whereby they might be paid.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is aware that an assurance was given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that though that item appeared in the Governor General's warrant, we should not act upon it. In the face of that, we have not felt it proper to make the expenditure.

Mr. McNEILL. I am merely referring to an arrangement made across the floor of the House.

SUPPLY—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committe of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to say a few words about a matter that concerns the dignity of this House. We can have no doubt that it concerns the dignity of the House, because we have the high authority of the Toronto "Globe," in the conclusion of an article, that the subject of which it calls attention affects the dignity of Parliament. In the Toronto "Globe" of Saturday last there appears an article headed "The Salary Grab." I do not know how it would be possible to use language strong enough to characterize the injustice of that article. It sets out by declaring that now—that is, on the 19th of September—we may give up all hope of concluding this session within 30 days, and it proceeds to say that the session might have been concluded within 30 days. It accuses the Opposition of being at fault. It lays the sin, if sin it be, that the session was not concluded within 30 days, at the door of the Opposition; and feeling that it was in a position somewhat untenable, it then says:

> It may be asked, and we have no desire to evade the question, why lay the blame on the Opposition instead of on Parliament as a whole? In the first place, the duration of a session is not one of those matters in which the majority rule prevails.

Well, Sir, it was hardly necessary, with recent experience in men's minds, to have laid that down:

> There is no means of applying the cloture in our Parliament, and if 150 men desired a short session, 50 could thwart them.
>
> In the second place, the Government—we speak advisedly and with a knowledge of the exact state of affairs—earnestly desired that the business of the session should be transacted within two weeks. In the third place——

And I call the attention of the House to this, because it contains an admission that vitiates the position taken up by the writer, that destroys the whole force of the article and robs it of all cogency.

> In the third place they——

The Government——

> —had the assent of the mass of their followers to that course.

It does not say that the Government had the assent of their followers to a man to that course, and in fact it dares make no such statement with the history of this Parliament before it. So far as I myself am concerned I do not feel called upon to defend from any personal point of view Parliament, or any portion of Parliament, against a charge like this. I had an important motion on the Notice paper in regard to the policy of the Government, and, undoubtedly, one of the reasons that I did not propose that motion on going into committee before, was this—that I knew that that sort of criticism is liable to proceed from that sort of critic, and I wanted to be in a position to say that for my part I had not contributed to the prolongation of the session. But, Sir, what is the history of this Parliament so far as this matter is concerned? Without going into the merits of the question at all the sin is more completely at the door of the majority of the members supporting the First Minister than it is at the door of the Opposition. After all the great questions brought before this Parliament had been discussed, after we had discussed the Governor General's warrants, after we had discussed various important questions, there was still time enough to have made progress in committee and to have done what this writer seems to think would have been of enormous value to the country—to have concluded the session within thirty days. But the fear of that arose in the breasts of certain gentlemen opposite that the Opposition, after all, was going to confine its criticism within such bounds as to enable the House to get through its work within four weeks. And what did we see on the floor of this House? When the item for the support of the High Commissioner in London was brought forward, whence did the opposition come, whence did the hot shot pour into the proposal for that vote? It came from the ranks of gentlemen opposite. The member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke and he gave us some of the sweetness and light that comes from the coal oil regions of Canada. That hon. gentleman in his swashbuckler style opposed a vote that the Government of which he was a supporter proposed for the High Commissioner. He actually rose and made a speech attacking the office, and, above all, attacking the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Though he was supporting the vote.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course. We have had several instances of that sort of support that the present Government enjoy. Well, what result could there be but one? I need hardly say that the hon. gentleman who

leads the Opposition was bound to defend himself, and others were bound to get up and criticise so important a vote and also say something in defence of other hon. gentlemen who were either directly or by implication assailed. Then we had an edifying spectacle. It appears that two leading members of the Government had gone and put their arms around the neck of the hon. member for West Lambton, and had brought him to a repentant frame of mind. I have seen men eat leeks before, but I have never seen one eat so long a leek as that hon. gentleman ate—and with such an edifying air of repentance too. All this took up time. On subsequent occasions we had speeches from hon. gentlemen which put it out of the question that Parliament should conclude its business within the desired time. This writer then goes on to say :

> But the end and object of this criticism ought to be the saving of public money ; in the present case it means the waste of public money. There has, in fact, been no pretense of protecting the taxpayer's pocket. The discussions forced by the Opposition have not been carried on with that view at all. Criticism of the Estimates occupied a very small proportion of the month that has now elapsed. The Opposition ranged over the whole field of politics, wanted to know why the policy of the Government on this question and that was not carried out immediately, and wasted the time of the House by reading long newspaper reports of ministerial utterances and asking to have them confirmed.

One of the great functions of Parliament is to protect the public pocket, but it is not its sole function. Parliament is practically the Government of the country and everything connected with the Government—the position of the Government, the character of the Ministers and their utterances on public platforms to the criticism of which this writer objects—all these things concern the public. Take, for instance, one thing that has retarded business, that prevented us bringing forward business of importance to the country—the vacancy in the portfolio of the Interior. There were many things in connection with the North-west, questions of irrigation, questions of reservoirs, questions of administration that we wished to bring forward. But, it was of no use, as those of us who have had experience know, to bring these things forward when you had to deal with an amateur Minister for the time being who could not commit his department to any policy whatever. But, Sir, it was especially necessary in my opinion that questions should be asked and this writer objects to that being done. He objects to questions being asked, forsooth. Here was a new Government come into power, and they come here with a Speech from the Throne in which nothing whatever is offered, and they ask us to give them all the money they want. Why, Sir, the only thing you can compare it to is the tramp who meets you on the highway and demands of you your purse and your silence about the robbery. But, there was a peculiarity about the campaign that made it necessary that we should put these questions in order to have some idea of what was the policy of the Government. Why, Sir, now

> The oracles are dumb,
> No voice or hideous hum,
> Runs through the arched roof——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the "Oh, oh" about. I will repeat the lines :

> The oracles are dumb,
> No voice or hideous hum
> Runs through the arched roof——

Nor through the rest of Canada. What is the "Oh, oh," about ? I hear my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) saying "Oh, oh." I have known gentlemen of his profession who were supposed to have some knowledge of literature, especially of that literature from which this is quoted. But, Sir, he probably will be surprised when I tell him that these lines are from the greatest poem in our language. "The Ode on the Nativity, by Milton." Where does the "Oh, oh," come in ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think he is sorry the orator is not dumb.

Mr. DAVIN. The oracles are dumb. The only oracle that is not dumb is my hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) and he is an intermittent fountain that plays occasionally for our edification. But before Parliament met we had statements made by various members of the Government, and especially from the First Minister, year after year, that this country was in a very serious state. In 1893, in this very city, at the Rideau Rink, the First Minister told the greatest meeting of Liberals, as he himself described it, that had ever taken place in Canada, that the ills of Canada were not constitutional but economic. He described Canada as in a very serious position. His own words pronounced the session before that from this desk, were still ringing in his ears, words spoken in supporting a motion of my hon. friend from Simcoe to condemn the Government because they were carrying on an inquiry with a view to tariff reform. In that speech the hon. gentleman said that we should at once do what the member for Simcoe asked. But the hon. First Minister is in no position, and therefore his party, and therefore his organ, are in no position whatever to condemn hon. gentlemen on this side for asking that action should immediately be taken. What did he himself say in this very speech delivered at the Rideau Rink ? He was referring to a speech of Sir John Thompson in the beginning of that year, and he complained that two months after Sir John Thompson's speech, the Thompson Government did not carry out the promise made by the head of the Government. If what is sauce for the

goose is sauce for the gander, and if the hon. gentleman was in a position to criticise the Government of Sir John Thompson for not carrying out Sir John Thompson's promise made two months previously, surely we are in a position to expect that the hon. gentleman should carry out the promise he has made going over three years. Now, let me read what the hon. gentleman said in that address in the Rideau Rink, on the 20th June :

Look at what took place a few months ago. Sir John Thompson, at the Board of Trade banquet in Toronto, told a large audience that the Government would be prepared next session to lop off some mouldering branches. When we came to the session we were fully prepared to see the Government lop off these mouldering branches ; but we found that the Government had changed their view, and what were mouldering branches in January, like the rod of Moses, became flowering boughs in March. They had no alteration to make. Gentlemen, you have nothing to expect from them. Apart from the logics of events, you have the word of Mr. Foster himself, who has declared again and again within the last few weeks that tariff reform would consist in this, that there might be a few changes here and there, but that the principle of protection in the National Policy would be maintained. This simply means that the Government are going to scratch off the paint, and put on a new coat of varnish, and call it tariff reform.

Now, what I want to call attention to is the complaint made by the hon. member for Quebec East in regard to the Thompson Government. He complained that the Thompson Government did not, within two months, implement the promise made by the head of that Government, and he complained that the ex-Minister of Finance had used language that, according to his construction of it, seemed to indicate that the Government would not go as far as Sir John Thompson indicated when he said that the mouldering branches would be taken off. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had from the hon. gentleman himself statements that sounded as if he was going to do the very thing that he accused the Conservative party of having been urged to do, namely, to put on the clothes of his opponents. Are we not then, with his example before us, doubly justified in coming here and asking for something definite ? Are we not justified in coming here and saying : We want to know what is your policy, and if your policy is such as can be carried out this session, we certainly want you to carry it out ? Now, Sir, I want to give an instance of how necessary it was to catechise—if I may without impropriety use such a word—to catechise the hon. gentleman ; because I put a question on the paper in regard to what he said at Moose Jaw respecting freight rates in the North-west Territories, and the answer the hon. gentleman gave me was that he would so change the tariff that the results would affect freight rates ; and he indicated clearly enough this session that he had no intention whatever of bringing in direct legislation dealing with freight rates. Now, Sir, I will give you, and I will give the First Minister, some idea of how completely he was misunderstood at Moose Jaw. Here is an extract from an article from the pen of a gentleman who signed the strongest agreement that could be signed, and who got value for it ; who signed an agreement to give his paper for three years as an organ of the Conservative party, and to support me for three years, and he got solid consideration for it. That gentleman, Sir,—inspired by whom ? By somebody up there, no doubt ; guaranteed by whom ? By somebody up there, no doubt ; and on the eve of an election, three weeks before the election, he left me without an organ, turned my own guns against me ; and this is the way that he speaks on the 30th July, in regard to the First Minister :

The Regina "Leader,"

Thursday, evening, July 30, 1896.

We have a considerable measure of confidence in Mr. Laurier's good intentions towards the west. The attitude of the "Globe," the most authoritative Liberal newspaper, leads us to believe that the new Government is seized of the fact that no Canadian policy will be successful, of which the main feature does not look energetically towards development of Canada's chief inheritance. Of late years the North-west has not been making satisfactory progress. And why ? Various causes might be assigned for the unsatisfactory fact, for our lack of advancement has been due to no single cause ; but of those causes undoubtedly one of the chief has been the burdensome railway rates. We say advisedly that no satisfactory advancement will be made by these Territories so long as the rates prevail which at present affect all points between Brandon and Vancouver especially. We would like to be able to din it into the ears of the new Government that railway rates amelioration is vital to the well-being of this country. How it may best be accomplished we do not pretend to know. That it can be accomplished, we are prepared to prove out of Mr. Laurier's own mouth. Speaking at Moose Jaw on 28th September, 1894, Hon. Mr. Laurier said :—"I understand the freight rates you have to pay are outrageous. This condition must have a solution. I speak here as an honest man, and any pledge I make to you will be carried out to the letter. There must be competition,—there must be a solution for this unbearable condition; and I promise and pledge myself that at the proper time the solution and remedy shall be applied."

Now, here are oracular words, here are words that would lead any plain man hearing them to conclude that the First Minister would deal by legislation with railway rates if he came into power. That was Mr. Laurier's promise. Here is what a friendly critic says :

The time for fulfilment has come. In those sentences the hon. gentleman put into language a sentiment which the majority of our farmers felt and still feel with intensity, that "there must be a solution for this unbearable condition." Sir Donald Smith is not a man well calculated to assist in applying the solution and remedy.

That is an extract from what is now one of his strongest organs in the North-west Territories. When I asked the hon. gentleman what he meant by those words which were quoted in the North-west as a proof that the railway rates would be dealt with, what was the answer which the hon. gentleman gave me? The answer given me by the hon. gentleman was that he did not mean to legislate in regard to railway rates, but what he would do was to legislate in regard to the tariff, and the result of that legislation would be to lower the freight rates.

I now want to deal with the merits of this question. Sir, it would be a wrong thing wantonly to protract any session, and with the history of the past session and of previous sessions before us, the country will be able to judge whether hon. gentlemen opposite are in a position to criticise hon. members on this side of the House in reference to wantonly protracting any session. But will any man say that it was in the interest of the people of Canada that we should allow millions of money to have been got by Governor General's warrants without discussing them? The only thing that makes it tolerable, that makes it bearable for one minute, that places the Government in a position to hold up its head in the face of Canada is that in this House we are able to criticise the issue of those Governor Generad's warrants, to point out the danger of that course, and by doing so to take all the steps in our power to prevent its being carried into a precedent. Then take the dismissals of civil servants. What were we doing in criticising the wrongful dismissal of civil servants? Were we simply trying to save a friend here and there? Not at all. We were doing something far more important. We were doing something compared with which the saving of a man or a friend here and there sinks into insignificance. What we were doing was this, we were vindicating the freedom of the franchise to the electors throughout the country, and we were calling public attention and criticism to our aid to prevent hon. gentlemen opposite doing what some of them the moment it was held up before them in this House were ready to proclaim they could not think of doing. We were pointing out that gentlemen having the franchise and possessing as good a right to use that franchise as any elector in the country should, not because they voted and because they behaved as free citizens should behave, be driven out on the streets and deprived of their bread. Sir, the result of that discussion has been most beneficial, because although we had most extraordinary doctrine propounded some nights ago by the Minister of Railways, which however he appeared to retract afterwards in a kind of way, still we had from some other hon. gentlemen the enunciation of the true principle, for instance from the Controller of Inland Revenue and also from——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. DAVIN. I only refer to it by way of illustration.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I will pass away from that point. I think, in stating what we had done, I was within the rule enabling me to use that as an illustration. It is impossible to properly treat this question without doing so. Now, I take the school question, in which we in the North-west are very much interested. The editor of the "Globe," who is a most able man, was in this city last week, and he told hon. gentlemen friends of mine—at all events, he told several gentlemen, that the school question was settled, and we have a confirmation of that statement in an article which appeared in the same "Globe." That article declares that the question is settled, and it makes reference to Archbishop Langevin in a way I do not understand. It says:

> Archbishop Langevin is a Tory politician. We are told that he has been at Rome and has consulted the Pope, and that the Holy Father justifies his position and that of the bishops of Quebec on the school question. It is not too much to say that Archbishop Langevin and his associates attempted to set up the theocracy in Canada, and that it is this conspiracy against constitutional government that the Archbishop seeks to have approved at Rome. All this meets with no word of censure from the Conservative papers, but the mere hint that some Liberal or some friend of Mr. Laurier's may go to Rome to protest against the exercise of ecclesiastical tyranny in Quebec sends the organs into hysterics. Immediately Mr. Laurier and his followers became "vassals of Rome," the Queen's majesty is outraged, and all across the country there is nothing but ashes and saw-dust.

I want to make a criticism on that statement as bearing on the politics of this country, and as dealing with a question in which we are greatly interested in the North-west. I do not know whether Archbishop Langevin is a Tory politician or not. Whether he is or not is a matter with which the Conservative party is in no way concerned, and I suppose the Conservative party had nothing to do with sending him to Rome. But if the First Minister sent officially a prelate or ecclesiastic to Rome, this House should know something of it. If the hon. gentleman sent an ecclesiastic only to represent him in his private capacity, for instance to tell His Holiness that the Prime Minister had made a settlement with Mr. Sifton which might not meet with the approval of His Holiness, and that he wanted his personal absolution, we have no concern with that. But if he sent anybody to Rome

to represent this Government, officially or unofficially, it is a matter which this House is concerned, and it ought to know about it. This very paper states that the school question has been settled. Here is what it says :

We made that statement in good faith ; it was accurate, and it remains accurate. Our contemporaries who are now snarling at the Government and manufacturing deadlocks and crises will probably not have long to wait for convincing evidence of the truth of the "Globe's" statement. There will be no coercion under Laurier.

If that means anything, it means that the school question has been settled, that an arrangement has been entered into with Mr. Sifton, that that agreement is complete ; and if it is complete, is it a proper thing that the editor of a newspaper should be informed of it before this Parliament is made aware of the fact ? If so, it is an important matter that regarding this question, in which the whole of the North-west and Manitoba are interested, is declared to be settled, and this confidence given to the editor of a newspaper, and kept from this Parliament which represents the people ; this is a grave crime and misdemeanour against parliamentary government and constitutional precedent, and it is an act of which we have a right to complain. The idea that Parliament should assemble here, and that a number of gentlemen perfectly new to it should come here and say : we want all this money and we want to muzzle you and put on this Parliament a drag ; we have just come into power, after being eighteen years out, and we have brought a lot of new men into the Government, who have never been in the Dominion Parliament before, but anything we do you must not criticise. That reason given by the "Globe" is a very good reason why we should rather criticise them and try to get out of them what their views are. There appeared in the "Globe" a little more than a week ago a letter entitled : "The new Cabinet in Parliament—a glance to the right and left of the Speaker." And in that letter we had a sketch of the new Ministry. Well, Mr. Speaker, there used to be a time when the hon. First Minister was wont to refer to the Conservative Ministers as the gods upon Olympus. Now, I suppose the hon. gentleman himself and his colleagues are the gods upon Olympus ; but if they are, I do not think we can congratulate them on lighting up with their smiles that peak where no winds blow. Brief as is their elevation to the heights of Olympus, they have some premonition of storms in that placid region. Well, they are all wise and all hon. gentlemen, but this is what their own correspondent, who, I believe, sits up aloft and looks down with scorn on the Opposition as utterly lacking in strength, said about the Ministers, which made it necessary for us to put some questions. He says : "They know how to be silent. That, in fact, promises to be the great characteristic of the Government." No doubt, they consider it best to keep all the information they possibly can from us, but it is our duty, as representing the public, to press for information. The public are entitled to know what is the exact meaning of some of the utterances of those hon. gentlemen. Why, we have had a most extraordinary spectacle exhibited by the First Minister himself. We have had him taking the newspaper reporters into his confidence and declaring to them his policy on most important questions, when this Parliament sought in vain to obtain from him any such information. Therefore, when we are told that the Ministers know how to be silent, it is the more important that we should do our best to learn from them what they are evidently determined to conceal. But the correspondent goes on to say :

It is whispered that, at the Liberal caucus, Sir Oliver Mowat was very warmly received.

That was not, Mr. Speaker, the caucus held on Friday, but the one held a short time before. Now, it is not, Mr. Speaker, a proper thing, in my opinion, to refer of one's own motion, to what took place at a caucus; but if the members of any party refer to it in order to strengthen themselves, then it is open to anybody to say what has leaked out, and what does so often leak out, of the proceedings in caucus. I heard something of what took place. I believe that Sir Oliver Mowat was very warmly received. He got up and urged the members of the Government party to so act that they would conclude the business of the House in thirty days, and he was warmly received by the rank and file of the party, who told him that they did not want any such advice. Regarding what this writer says concerning the weakness of the Opposition, I may say also that I heard that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who used not to be very complimentary to the poor Tories, told his followers in this caucus that the present Opposition was the strongest that ever existed in Canada, and that the members of the Liberal party would have to be in their seats and support their leaders, or else the Opposition would get away with them. When what takes place in a Liberal caucus is referred to by the Liberal newspapers, we are perfectly free to comment on it. But there is another reason why we are bound to question the Government. I am greatly surprised that the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) did not explain to the House the principles on which he formed his Cabinet. That he should have done so, if he followed precedent, is palpable, but there is a reason given by this correspondent why he should have done so. This correspondent says :

Clear away all the members of the Government, and you would yet have on the ministerial

benches to-day a stronger lot of men than are to be found in Opposition. To the right of the Speaker there are such men as Mr. Charlton, Mr. Lister, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Lount, Mr. Langelier, Mr. Bain, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Somerville, Mr. Russell, of Halifax, Mr. Britton, of Kingston, Dr. Landerkin, Mr. McMillan, Dr. McDonald and Mr. Oliver, of Alberta, and men of such solid business worth and weight as Mr. Wood, of Hamilton.

Here are seventeen men that are put forward as great men on the Government side, and most of them were in the last Parliament, and when we have the leading organ of the Government in Toronto telling us of those great men, who are all outside the present Government, and when we find the leader of the Government passing over these men and bringing in four or five men from the outside, I say that he was bound, in justice to the Reform party and to this House and to the whole country, to explain how it was that he ignored the claims of those bright and shining lights, those meteors in the sky of Liberalism, who had so ably held up his standard in this Parliament, and brought in new and untried men from the outside darkness. I think that under the circumstances, now that we have had this instructive letter from Ottawa and that I have brought it to the attention of the First Minister, we should have the long delayed explanation. I cannot refer to any past debate. You, Mr. Speaker, would be a lion in my path if I attempted to comment on anything that has been said previously this session, and consequently I must go to other sessions in times long past. We have it on record from a gentleman whom the present First Minister has often declared to have been one of the noblest and grandest characters that any country ever produced, and I am not going to differ with him in that—I refer to the late Alexander Mackenzie—who made the memorable statement that in order to save the treasury from his own friends, in order to protect it against those spotless Liberals, whom the Hon. Mr. Jones, of Halifax, declared at the Rideau Rink in 1893—I would like to have seen him as he made the statement and can well imagine his winking the other eye as he did so—would invariably leave office rather than sacrifice one of their principles —we had it from the late Hon. Alex. Mackenzie that he had to lie on his arms like a soldier in order to watch and save the treasury from these Liberals when he was in power. Are we to be told that the leopard has so completely changed his spots and the Ethiopian his skin, that there is such a wonderful transformation in the Reform party that the Opposition must not criticise them, without being taunted with the charge that our sole aim was to prolong the session beyond thirty days? For my part, though I refrained from pressing that motion of mine, anticipating such a criticism as this, I say that I would share any responsibility that might attach to extending the session, when I consider that if we were to take the propositions of that article—and what gives them importance is that the Government would fain impress them upon the public mind of Canada—if we were to take the propositions in that article, and if they were allowed to obtain, what condition of things would you have? We do not need to have the light of Mr. Mackenzie's language in our minds at all, because we know it from the history of government. If we were to adopt the principle of that article, if we were to muzzle the watch-dog of Parliament, if we were to stop parliamentary criticism on the actions of the Government, if we were to allow them to get millions of money, as they thought they should get it, while we sat silent and with folded hands; if we did that, we would be untrue to the trust that our constituencies have reposed in us. What signifies three or four hundred thousand dollars; it is lighter than dust in the balance compared with the orgies of corruption we might expect in consequence of the unwatched license which hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would have. Why, Mr. Speaker, no sooner had the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald was driven—no, never driven from power, for Sir John resigned himself—no sooner had power passed into the hands of the opponents of Sir John A. Macdonald, than the Liberal Government of that day was rotten before it was ripe, and we had the Foster scandal, and dozens of others that the history of Parliament is quite familiar with. All this shows what we might expect, if we did not show these gentlemen opposite that they have an argus eye of criticism on them from this side of the House. And, Sir, I say here, that the people of Canada would be the most mistaken people—ah, there is no danger that they would be so mistaken as that—I say that a sensible people like the people of Canada are not likely to weigh in the balance, as of any consequence whatever, a few hundred thousand dollars, compared with the value of having a Parliament that will search carefully into whatever is done by the Government, and that will apply criticism to whatever is done by the Ministry of the day—I do not care whether it be Tory or whether it be Grit, or Conservative or Liberal. Any expense of Parliament is, I say, lighter than dust, compared with the value of the criticism of which I speak.

Let me say here, in passing, Mr. Speaker, that the language of some of the newspapers at the present time would seem to indicate that hon. gentlemen opposite do not intend to carry out their pledges. I say for myself and for the constituency I represent, that we shall not be content unless some of these pledges are carried out, and we will hold the Government to a strict account in regard to these pledges. We will hold these pledges before them, as a glass, wherein they may see the face they held up to the country. We have been only a little over

a month in this House ; we have had no programme whatever from the Ministry, and yet, Sir, in no session that I am acquainted with, since I have been observing politics in Canada, has a Government lost so much ground as this Government has lost. Mr. Speaker, I felt it necessary to bring this matter to the attention of the House. When I came back from the country to-day and saw that paper, I felt astonished that a paper of the standing of the "Globe" should have written such an article, and the only way I can account for it would be this: that already the Government feels that it has lost ground, and it feels compelled, not to justify itself, but to attack the Opposition. As I said at the commencement, for myself, I am in no way concerned—my withers are unwrung—to regard it as a thing to defend myself from, but I am forward to say that I would be ready to take any responsibility in connection with it, though I refused to bring forward my motion in consequence of that being in the air. I say, Sir, that that article is unjust. It is untrue to fact. It is against the dignity of the very Parliament whose dignity it professes to be anxious for, and it reveals the weakness of the Government. It is an article that could not have been allowed to go without protest. So far as its statements regarding the conduct of the business of this session, and as regards the school question are concerned, it seems to me that it places the Government in a position that calls for explanation, and especially so, if the statement made is true, that the school question has been settled and that that confidence has been given away to a private individual, whilst it is withheld from this Parliament.

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

(In the Committee.)

Customs $899,380

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend if he proposes to have any vote for his department in the Supplementary Estimates ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Yes. I would like the two items—salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of courts and travelling expenses of other officers on inspection, $21,150, and Board of Customs and outside special service, $23,000—bracketed, so as to make them one vote.

Mr. FOSTER. What is my hon. friend's reason for that ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. To give myself a little more latitude.

Mr. FOSTER. They are two quite different items, as my hon. friend will see. The votes are nearly equal, and if they are bracketed, he will have a chance of diverting one or the other. I think my hon. friend ought to estimate fairly closely for each one, and allow the items to go as they have gone in previous years. At any rate I do not see that we can bracket them now, as they have come down to the House in this itemized form.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think we can do it if the hon. gentleman assents. My main object is with reference to the second item, which includes the outside special service. I have felt that we ought to have a little closer and more frequent inspection of our ports ; and as these special officers are sometimes not very busy, I thought I might be able to utilize their services at times in doing inspectors' work at different ports. My hon. friend might trust me with this arrangement this year, and if I abuse the trust, then he can call me to account.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend does not mean to use that vote for the appointment of other special officers particularly, besides those at present existing.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Simply to use them on inspection work ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Simply in order that the Auditor General may not take exception to the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we will trust the hon. gentleman on the assurance he gives.

Mr. GIBSON. I understand that the $800 given to the Commissioner of Customs as Chairman of the Board of Customs was given to him on the ground that his salary was not large enough. I believe his salary is now $4,000, and I do not see that this $800 should be paid to him any longer as Chairman of the Board.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There has been no increase so far as I know.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the proposal of the Controller of Customs to put these two votes together is a reasonable proposal, and one which the committee will not very seriously object to ; but I would like to ask him why he takes the votes for the salaries and expenses of all the provinces and puts them in one item, whereas in former years each province was assigned a specific amount for a specific purpose. Why does he take a lump sum for all the provinces and the North-west Territories ? And it is a very large sum, $814,180.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It is done for the same purpose, to give myself a little more latitude. It would be more convenient, I think. I do not know exactly what reductions may be made, or what expenses may be incurred in the different provinces. While the amount is not increased, I think it will be better for me to have a

free hand in that respect. For instance, in British Columbia there is a large development going on; and in the course of the year I may find it necessary, in the interest of the revenue, to increase the expenditure there—I do not know to what extent; while at the same time I may be able to make corresponding savings in some of the other provinces which I could apply towards it. I dare say my hon. friend will recognize that it would have been more convenient for him in the department if he had had the latitude I ask.

Mr. WALLACE. I notice that for 1895-96 the estimate was $874,000. The hon. gentleman has increased that by $25,000; and this increase is very largely in this item. I think the other items are pretty nearly the same.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That is without the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. WALLACE. When I was Controller, we did not expect that any Supplementaries would be required.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did the hon. gentleman adhere to that to the end?

Mr. WALLACE. We adhered to it while I was there. I was not there till the end.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Controller of Customs proposes a very radical departure from the custom that has been followed in voting these Estimates. Hitherto all the provinces have been specified, and the sum to be spent in each is mentioned. The hon. gentleman has suggested to the committee that he may make some reductions, and that in consequence of a reorganization of the staff it may be necessary for him—I do not differ very much from him in that view—to have a free hand. The hon. gentleman must recognize at once that Parliament has an interest in having as many details as possible given in the Estimates and in having the votes given for specific purposes. If we give the hon. gentleman this free hand, the Government cannot take it as a precedent, or else next year, after the reorganization has taken place, we will again be asked to vote lump sums. It is very essential, especially for purposes of criticism, that we should have the sum divided.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It really is the one service. I will have to make certain increases in British Columbia, and I cannot estimate just now what I shall require, but I desire to be able, out of the savings in some other provinces, to pay any increase that may be required in British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. This is going a long way. The whole point of the criticism for several years—and, I think, a perfectly proper criticism—was to induce Ministers to make their estimates with precision, and indicate to Parliament, not only that they intended to spend a certain sum, say for customs, but how much they intended to spend on each branch of the service, and in what sections of the country they proposed to spend it. I did not notice, at first, that my hon. friend had made a total change in the disposal of some $800,000, and left it entirely open as to whether he would spend that in Quebec, or Ontario, or any other province. I am not making the least approach to a charge that my hon. friend intends to do anything wrong; but, if we allow this to my hon. friend, every other Minister might just as well come down and ask the same thing. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries might ask us to vote $900,000, and the Controller of Inland Revenue might ask us to vote half a million dollars, and give us no items at all. My hon. friend has wiped out everything which indicates in what province he proposes to spend the amount he asks, and asks us to vote a lump sum of $800,000. It is a convenient way of making up the Estimates but is opposed to the proper traditions of the House, and no one ought to bear me out more strongly in that position than the hon. gentleman now in the Chair (Mr. Casey), because that was a most persistent criticism of his and also of the ex-member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. TISDALE. Does the only change consist in putting it altogether, instead of by provinces? Are the details given just the same?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. If the details are there, I do not see that that would make such a difference this year; but, of course, if the hon. gentleman had left out the details, it would make an important difference.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The next page shows all the details. The case is a little different from that of Railways and Canals, because, in the latter, a specific sum would be voted for each object in every branch of the service. But, in this case, it is really the one item, providing for the one service in the different ports, and we must keep the public service going. The Auditor General wishes it done in this way. Otherwise, if there was a saving made in one province, he would not allow it to be used for any other province; but, if I put the amount in bulk and make a saving in the one province, I may apply it to another. I do not think there will be any necessity to do so, except in the case of British Columbia. In that province, owing to the great impetus being given to its development, some expenditure will be required, chiefly in consequence of new ports being opened, for which we cannot at present estimate with any accuracy. I only ask that what I can save in any one province, without impairing the efficiency of the public service in that province, might be expended in an-

other province ; and I put it in this way to get over the objection of the Auditor General, who, if a special sum were stipulated for each province, would not allow that to be exceeded. All the details are given, and the public service cannot suffer in any way.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the province of British Columbia is one for which the Controller would be justified in asking an increased appropriation, and I am sure that such increased appropriation would be readily granted. I went over these estimates very carefully, and came to the conclusion that the sum of $874,000 was quite sufficient to carry on the affairs of the Customs Department. I went over the items in detail, and found out what reductions could be made, and I made a reduction of $50,000 from the previous year ; and I am convinced that, had I continued in the position the hon. gentleman occupies, we could have cut the expenditure down to the amount voted by Parliament, $874,000, without asking for any Supplementary Estimates. The hon. gentleman is asking for $25,000 more. The only province which would require an increase over last year is British Columbia, but, as years go on and superannuations take place, without the positions vacated being filled, the expenditure of the Customs Department could be decreased, rather than increased.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It appears to me, when I come to look at this, that it is another departure from what has been the tendency of Parliament, especially under the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they sat on this side. The whole tendency of Parliament, ever since I have had the honour of a seat here, has been towards insisting on the Government being specific in their demands for money. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates of 1897, which were brought down by the late Government, he will find that the way is specified in which every dollar is to be used. What the hon. gentleman does is to ask us to give him a free hand to use this $874,000. I have no doubt he will not attempt to use it improperly, and that is not the point in my criticism at all. My point is, whether we should allow the Government, in so important a matter, to depart from what has been accepted as a well understood principle, namely, that if there are to be any changes in the mode by which money is voted by Parliament, these changes should be rather in the way of giving more specific information than of giving general grants. If we allow this item to go, there is no reason why we should not have the Minister of Inland Revenue coming down and requesting a lump sum, without giving any details ; and, if we grant his request, no doubt we shall have the Minister of Marine coming down with a similar one. He does not indicate whether he is going to spend the money in Nova Scotia, Ontario or any other province. In making the change that is thus suggested, we should actually be recognizing a principle that might cause Parliament to depart entirely from the mode of voting money which was adopted years ago and which has worked so well. Now the hon. gentleman says that probably he may require to spend more money in British Columbia. I would suggest that he should give the amount which he feels it necessary to spend in the several provinces, and, if he cannot for the moment estimate correctly or even approximately what may be required in British Columbia, let him add a clause to the effect that any sum not used in any other province may be used in British Columbia. That will give him practically a free hand, but it does not have exactly the effect of appropriating $814,000 in a lump sum instead of a total amount made up of special sums voted for expenditures in each province.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to point out to the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that this vote may easily be arranged so as to give him all the liberty he requires. He says he does not know what British Columbia may need, that they are opening up there new branches of trade, that new towns are springing up and that probably a number of new officers will have to be appointed. But there is always this to be considered in a case of that kind—the hon. Minister is always at liberty to come down with his supplementary estimates. It would be something like a complete revolution which, between now and the next session of the House would require such expenditures as to absorb the whole vote for the year. Practically, that cannot happen. But anything required to make up for unexpected expenditures can be covered in the Supplementary Estimates—and that is what they are for. If he lumps so large a sum as $800,000 or $900,000, it gives him a tremendous advantage in one respect and puts him at great disadvantage in another. If he estimates closely, as a Minister should, what is required for each province, he avoids one great difficulty. Every Minister knows—the hon. gentleman himself is probably aware by this time—what pressure is brought to bear upon him to make new appointments or increase salaries. But if he has made a fair estimate based upon what he feels he actually requires, he is able to answer these applications by the statement that he has no money available for the purpose and so cannot grant the request. But if he has $900,000 that he can apply as he pleases to the city of Montreal or the city of Toronto, or any other place, he will see that he is making his own position a very difficult one indeed and adding weight to that pressure which is heavy enough upon a Minister even at the best. Another thing I desire to point out. He has brought down a lump sum of $800,000, and he has brought down also some details of what is to be expended in each province. Which is he going to

bind himself by, the details or the lump sum? He must evidently bind himself by the details. If he is going to be bound by the detailed items, as Ministers have felt themselves to be, that is a reason for giving the details so that Parliament may have a general knowledge of what the expenditures are to be; and it would be going against the implied but real contract with Parliament if he departed from the detailed items of expenditure. So I think the hon. gentleman had better stick to the details as they are here. If he will say that that is his intention, I would have no objection to the lump sum going as it is without reprinting the Estimates. Then my hon. friend at the next session of the House, which will be a few months hence, will have supplementary estimates, and Parliament will meet any fair requirements for British Columbia. I am not saying this in any partisan sense, but simply in the line of our keeping our proceedings in accordance with established usage. If he will take the estimates of the last six years he will see that I have been spreading out the details. That is the case of the Militia and other departments as well so that, as far as possible, Parliament might control the expenditures of the succeeding year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The details are there, and they must govern largely.

Mr. FOSTER. They must govern altogether.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, not absolutely. Really, Mr. Chairman, this is as it has always been, except that we are endeavouring to do in a legal, open and sanctioned way what has been done as a matter of fact before. It has always been the practice hitherto—and I can be set right if I am wrong—if there was a saving in one province to use it for any requisite expenditure in another province.

Mr. FOSTER. No; that cannot be so.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is the information that is given to me.

Mr. FOSTER. That used to be, but it has not been so for the last four or five years. The Auditor General raised that point and we have closely followed the rule.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is my information. The Auditor General now insists upon this rule, but he did not insist upon it before and it has not been observed. The report of my officers is that where there has been a saving in one province it has often been used as the public service required, in another province without the sanction of a separate vote. But the Auditor General says that must cease, that if there is a saving in one province he will not allow the saving to be spent in another province. What I want to do, is to do legally and above-board what has been the practice in the past.

Mr. WALLACE. The only item used in that way was an item of $5,000 voted each year to cover unforeseen expenses. The law provides that in cases where an expenditure is unforeseen or unprovided for, it can be met out of this vote, but where they can be foreseen or provided for they must be met out of the separate sums provided by Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure there is no person on this side of the House who has not perfect confidence in the honesty and integrity of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, and would not be disposed to give him any latitude necessary in the public service. We very cheerfully agreed to lumping the two first items he brought under the notice of the committee because there was an obvious convenience in it. But we have a British parliamentary system, and we endeavour to follow the model as closely as we can; and, as my hon. friend knows, the tendency in England is altogether in the other direction, that is, to have the most specific detail of all the expenditure of public money. In fact, parties who have been obliged to pay attention to this subject, are surprised at the rigour with which this rule is carried out, for the whole Imperial Government cannot change in any shape or form an appropriation from the specific object for which it was designed. I am sure, under these circumstances, that my hon. friend will at once see that granting en bloc an appropriation approaching a million dollars, to be used at discretion, would be entirely at variance with the system we have always pursued, and which, I think, we may with great advantage continue.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is of somewhat unpleasant augury that at this early stage in the history of the new Government a special kind of vote has to be brought down to get over the Auditor General's objections.

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask my hon. friend's consideration to the important suggestion I have made, and I am sorry that he refuses to accept it. Either he proposes to abide by the details, or, if he does not, why does he give us details? Why are details brought down here, saying that so much shall be applied to Ontario and so much to each of the other provinces? Then, is my hon. friend going to go behind Parliament, after he votes these details, and expend it as he pleases? The hon. gentleman cannot do that. Then, if he is not going to do that, he wants a lump sum of $814,000, which he can apply in the various provinces. It is evident that he must modify his resolution so as to say "notwithstanding the details which are hereunto annexed." I would propose to allow him to take this lump vote, adding, after "Territories," the words "ac-

cording to details annexed." Then there would be no doubt at all as to the details.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That would make it worse than it was before.

Mr. FOSTER. That would make it just what it has been. I do not care what the officers of this department say; there is scarcely a department in which there cannot be, and has not been, some expenditure shoved in in some way or other that the most argus eye of the Auditor General cannot always see. But I know precisely the plan of action of the Auditor General for the last five years, and I know we have been keeping strictly to the details, and, on one occasion, where there were no details, and where the Auditor General found, by conversation across the floor on these Estimates, that it was the impression that the expenditure was to be made in such and such a way, he has adhered to that expression of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That last observation makes it necessary that I should offer my opinion as to the erroneous view that I think the Auditor General entertains in regard to the Supply Bill. Once or twice, the Auditor General has attached undue importance to observations in committee, and the Controller of Customs has intimated this afternoon the manner in which he proposed to use this vote, if we passed it in the shape now submitted. Well, with all deference, I venture to say that no observations that are made in this House can in any way assist the Auditor General in the interpretation of the Act. The advice ultimately will come from the law department on any question, either between the Auditor General and the Customs, or between him and other departments. I think the suggestion of the member for York would prevent the Controller of Customs from carrying out the plan that he frankly says he has in view in the expenditure of these items, because the details are given here, if they are not altogether dropped in the Supply Bill; and the Supply Bill is framed according to this estimate, giving a lump sum, with the details over the page. His action would be controlled, and he could not transfer a service from one province to another, simply because he had made this observation in Parliament. The Auditor General might not raise an objection, because, as I say, he has assumed, and, I think, improperly, that observations made, either by a Minister or by a private member, may indicate the intention of Parliament. I think the law department would not support that view, and that the guide for that department, as well as ultimately for all the departments, is the Act itself. I rose merely to call the attention of the Controller to the fact that, if the Supply Bill takes the shape of this estimate, and if the detail is given in the Supply Bill as it appears here, he will not have the latitude that he desires. I am informed just now, however, that these details would not appear in the statutes, and that they are here merely for the information of the committee; so that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for York would be necessary to limit that expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I suggest to my hon. friend that, in order not to crowd the Supply Bill, he should make his estimate on the lines of the provinces, as it was before; otherwise, we shall have to crowd the Supply Bill with the whole of these pages of details.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Of course, if hon. gentlemen object, I will have to fall back on the plan of dividing it into provinces. I do not see myself where there is any danger to the public service. The work has to be carried on: is one item, carrying on the work of the Customs. But, if hon. gentlemen insist that we shall just assign a sum to the various provinces, I will consent to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend can just extend that first vote by cutting out the previous estimates for the provinces and making them part of his resolution.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Page 63 of the previous Estimates will give the details.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Then I propose this substitute to the latter part of the first item in the resolution: In Nova Scotia, $108,285; New Brunswick, $88,545; Prince Edward Island, $17,075; Quebec, $206,250; Ontario, $289,475; Manitoba, $30,400; North-west Territories, $9,050; British Columbia, $64,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to ask the Controller of Customs if the vacancy of the collector at the port of Wallaceburg has been filled?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It has not been filled yet.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give me the reason. A gentleman by the name of Little was recommended for the position, and an Order in Council for his appointment was passed, but his commission is not yet issued.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. With respect to filling these vacancies, I have not taken the question up during the few weeks I have been in office. During the recess I shall make myself fully acquainted with the department and its details. I am not in a position to say anything further at the present time, than that I believe the work at the port is being carried on by the acting officer, and if I find it absolutely necessary, we will, of course, have to appoint an officer.

Mr. CLANCY. Wallaceburg is an important office, and the work is now being done by a substitute.

Mr. WALLACE. Has an appointment to the collectorship at Berlin been made ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No ; but an appointment will have to be made very soon, because the relieving officer is very anxious to return to his home.

Mr. MONTAGUE. These positions stand on a somewhat different basis from that which the remarks of the hon. gentleman would lead the committee to believe. I think in the case of Wallaceburg and Berlin appointments were recommended by a former Controller of Customs, and an Order in Council was passed approving of those recommendations. It may very fairly be asked, before this vote is passed, how the Government propose to deal with this question. These are not cases of ordinary vacancies. It is not whether the duties are being performed but it is a question of policy. I now ask what the Government propose to do ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not exactly understand the question asked by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought there was some little difficulty among members of the Government as to what their policy would be ; but I understand now from the First Minister that he did not understand my question. The question was raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) that a vacancy had taken place in the position of collector of customs at Wallaceburg. Attention was also called to the fact that there was a vacancy in the customs in Berlin, and the Controller of Customs was asked whether appointments had been made to fill these vacancies, and his answer was, no, not yet. What I stated for the information of the committee was this, that to my knowledge appointments had been made, on the recommendation of the previous Controller of Customs, and an Order in Council approving these recommendations had been passed, and I desire to know whether the policy of the Government was to repeal the Orders in Council.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot speak specifically as to the position at Berlin or any other port. The hon. gentleman is aware that certain recommendations were made by the late Administration after 23rd June to His Excellency, and he is aware that all those recommendations were approved by His Excellency except three categories ; that His Excellency refused to ratify appointments to new offices, or to offices which had been vacant for more than twelve months. If the vacancy at Berlin had not exceeded that time, then the appointment made is permanent and the present Administration has not disturbed it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then if those appointments do not come within those classes specifically stated by the Governor General, they stand?

Mr. CLANCY.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Unless the present Government for any reason do not wish to continue them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Either officer or office ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Either one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We should like to know who is Premier and who is Finance Minister, who is leader of the Government and in a position to answer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be delighted to answer both questions if necessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I trust the hon. gentleman will not be nearly so impertinent to me as he has been to his leader.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my leader is to be protected from impertinence, I take it that he is quite able to defend himself. I do not think he will ask the hon. gentleman opposite to protect him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The leader of the Government, speaking as Premier, has stated that appointments not coming within the categories which the Governor General made an exception, will be continued.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They stand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is, that the men appointed will go on with their work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They stand like every other appointee, until removed for cause.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was not the statement of the Finance Minister. He said, unless members of the Government thought differently.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say so again.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman thinks that he is in agreement with his leader, I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not quite clear in regard to the statement made by the First Minister. There seems to be at least some little misunderstanding. What I want to learn is if any officer performing those duties now, in regard to whom an Order in Council was passed making his appointment sometime ago, and it does not come within the limit of twelve months, he is considered to be the officer holding the appointment until some change is made. If that is the case, I shall have to ask another question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why have not those gentlemen been notified ? It is extraordinary in regard to the announcement made by the leader of the Government that those gentlemen properly appointed by Order in Council, to positions at Wallaceburg and

Berlin, have not been notified. There is at present no collector at Wallaceburg, but simply a substitute to do the work.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a matter very easy to explain. There was a batch of four or five hundred Orders in Council sent to His Excellency, and afterwards, two weeks or so were occupied in making a classification as between those appointed and those not appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see by the documents laid on the Table that there were just two classifications; that those were made a long time ago, and that the Governor General signed every one of those Orders which did not come under the first category stated by my hon. friend the leader of the House, in regard to which he withheld his consent. As regards all other officers who did not fall under the first schedule, he signed the Orders in Council embodying the report of the Treasury Board—at least that so appears on the face of the papers brought down. That was done some time ago, because those papers had been some time on the Table, and that act was, of course, done some time before they were brought down. So all the officers who did not fall within that schedule became by the sign manual of the Governor General to the report of Council bona fide officers. Where have they been all the time since this? Have they simply been not notified, and has, therefore, the report of Council and the signature of the Governor General gone for nothing?

The PRIME MINISTER. The thing is very easily understood. On the 7th and 8th of July some 400 or 500 recommendations were sent by the late Administration to His Excellency.

Mr. FOSTER. How many?

The PRIME MINISTER. Some four or five hundred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Recommendations?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Of appointments?

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say of appointments. I said the Treasury Board made recommendations of different kinds. I think there were six or seven reports of the Treasury Board.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) will allow me; these general orders do not go to the Treasury Board.

The PRIME MINISTER. I speak of six or seven reports of the Treasury Board embodying, if my memory serves me aright, some four of five hundred.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not over seventy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Much more than seventy.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, we will not dispute that. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is aware, some of these recommendations were approved by His Excellency, except those which came within three categories, that is to say: Appointments to new offices were not approved of; all appointments to offices which had been vacant for more than twelve months were not approved of; all superannuations which did not come within certain regulations of the law were not approved of, and the consequent appointments upon these superannuations were not approved of. It took weeks and weeks of labour for the different heads of the departments to come to an understanding and it is only within the last four or five days that we have been able to see which came within the categories mentioned. As to the case referred to we could not say if it came within the category. If it was not a new office; if it was not an office which had been vacant for more than twelve months; if it was not consequent upon a superannuation (which of course this was not), then the office has been approved by His Excellency.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is it the intention of the Government, now that they have gone over these recommendations and have decided on those which should become effective, to see that the appointments will be promptly made to the offices which do not come within the categories mentioned?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is for the different heads of the departments to do that in the course of their ordinary duties.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose that these offices are not intended to remain vacant after the Government has decided that the appointments are to stand. I suppose that measures will be taken to notify them of their appointments.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would beg my hon. friend to remember that the Government have decided nothing. It was the late Government which decided and His Excellency the Governor General approved. We had nothing to do but the pure ministerial duty of ascertaining whether or not certain offices came within the category laid down by His Excellency. It was a work of arduous labour to ascertain that, and now that the thing is done it will be for the different heads of the departments to act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the Government appointed a successor to Mr. Blackwood as appraiser of hardware?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask my hon. friend to allow that to stand, because I believe it is the intention of the Government to move that the committee

rise and ask leave to sit again ; in order to go into Supply again at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—THE CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise, Sir, to endeavour to discharge the most painful duty that has ever fallen to my lot during a somewhat lengthened parliamentary career. I need not tell you, Sir, that in my judgment nothing is so vitally important to Canada as the maintenance of the great privileges which we enjoy under the British constitutional system that has been adopted for this country ; and when I speak of the British constitutional system, I speak of a system which, after a long struggle from time immemorial between the Crown and the people, was adopted in Great Britain, a system which has made that country, I think I may venture safely to say, the envy of nations and the admiration of the world. There is no question, Sir, that under that system of parliamentary government England has attained a position in which she must be admitted to be the grandest and mightiest Empire in the world. I need not remind this House that Robert Baldwin, Lafontaine and other great Reformers of old Canada struggled and fought persistently to obtain that same system of parliamentary government for Canada ; that in 1841 the great and long-continued efforts of the old Reform party were crowned with abundant success; and that from that time down to the present, I may say, all the provinces of which British North America is composed have enjoyed to the fullest extent the system of parliamentary government that prevails in England. The advantage of that system of government is most striking in one great particular. Under a republican system of government, such as we see in the great republic to the south of us, the executive head of the nation is not looked up to by all classes and all parties as a great and impartial representative of the whole people, but he is the head of a great party from the hour of his election to that high and important position down to the end of the period for which he has been elected. The result is that very often quite one-half of the people of the United States of America are engaged from the hour of his election down to the close of the period for which he is elected in denouncing, decrying, attacking and assailing the executive head. That, Sir, I regard as a great misfortune, and I think that the contrast to that system which England presents is one of the most striking and favourable contrasts it is possible to conceive. There you have the Queen of this great Empire holding her position as the executive head of the nation, and preserving throughout her reign the entire confidence, respect and support of all classes and all parties under her sway. However fiercely the contests may wage between the two great parties in the state, no person ever fails in according to Her Majesty the most profound respect, reverence and continued support. Under our system of parliamentary government, we enjoy—we ought to enjoy—the same advantage. Under that system we stand in precisely the same position as England. The representative of Her Majesty in Canada, as the executive head of the country, enjoys the confidence, the respect and the support of all parties in the state ; and however keen the struggles may be between different parties, all alike are ready to give to the representative of Her Majesty that same respect, confidence and support that Her Majesty herself receives throughout this great Empire, and from all classes and parties in Great Britain.

Now, Sir, I must take for granted that the gentlemen who form the present Government of Canada are necessarily responsible for every act that the Governor General of Canada has committed ; and that relieves me at once from the disagreeable necessity of uttering a single word in disparagement of His Excellency ; because, under the form of government we possess, my hon. friend the First Minister and his colleagues, on assuming office, were necessarily and naturally obliged to assume all responsibility for every act of His Excellency from the time of what I may call the crisis which ensued on the general election. The position that Canada occupies in this respect was very distinctly stated by the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald in the confederation debates. On February 6th, 1865, Attorney General Macdonald said :

> In the constitution we propose to continue the system of responsible government, which has existed in this province since 1841, and which has long obtained in the mother country. This is a feature of our constitution as we have it now, and as we shall have it in the federation, in which, I think, we avoid one of the great defects in the constitution of the United States. There the President, during his term of office, is in a great measure a despot, a one-man power, with the command of the naval and military forces—with an immense amount of patronage as head of executive, and with the veto power as a branch of the legislature, perfectly uncontrolled by responsible advisers, his cabinet being departmental officers merely, whom he is not obliged by the constitution to consult with, unless he chooses to do so. With us the Sovereign, or in this country the representative of the Sovereign, can act only

on the advice of his Ministers, those Ministers being responsible to the people through Parliament.

Todd, in his "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," at page 817, lays down the same principle in the following words:

Upon a change of Ministry it is essential that the gentlemen who may be invited by the Governor to form a new Administration shall be unreservedly informed by him of the circumstances which led to the resignation or dismissal of their predecessors in office; and that they shall be willing to accept entire responsibility to the local Parliament for any acts of the Governor which have been instrumental in occasioning the resignation or effecting the dismissal of the outgoing Ministry. For it is an undoubted principle of English law, that no prerogative of the Crown can be constitutionally exercised unless some Minister of State is ready to assume responsibility for the same. Hence the authority remains inviolate, however the propriety of its exercise may be questioned, or its use condemned. The authority of the Crown, in the hands of the Queen's representative, must invariably be respected; and no one subordinate to the Governor should attribute to him personally any act of misgovernment, his Minister being always answerable for his acts to the local Parliament and to the constituent body.

This was further emphasized in a discussion which took place in this House on the 1st of March, 1877, when Sir John Macdonald said:

I concur with the hon. gentleman that he cannot be responsible for the speech of another individual when he does not know of it. He is, however, responsible for every utterance of the Governor General, except when that illustrious individual expressly states that what he states he says as an Imperial officer by Imperial command. It is important that the principle should be laid down if we are to be a free country. If responsible government is to be maintained, this principle should be strictly upheld, and I am surprised to hear an hon. gentleman, occupying the position of Premier of this Dominion, who boasts that not only is the country under responsible government, but that its constitution is moulded after the same plan and on the same line as the British constitution, should aver that he is not responsible for the language of the illustrious individual who so worthily represents the Crown in this country.

I may say that that remark had reference to a statement of Mr. Mackenzie, in the discussion which arose as to the speech made by His Excellency the Governor General in British Columbia. I drew attention to the fact that an obvious error had occurred in the report of that speech, and Mr. Mackenzie said that, of course as it was obvious, he was not responsible for any error of that kind.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Will the hon. gentleman state the date and place from which he takes this quotation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a quotation from "Hansard" of 10th March, 1877, page 373. I do not quote the whole of the discussion, but in the debate, I drew the attention of the House to an obvious error that had occurred in the report of His Excellency's Speech, in connection with the point in regard to the creation of a number of senators. He continued:

I remember when the doctrine was propounded long ago by the old Tories of Upper Canada, it was denounced by the whole of the Liberal party of Lower Canada, and it was after a long and severe battle fought by the Baldwin Reformers of those days that constitutional and responsible government was obtained. There have been a great many fights between the old Tory party before it took the name of Conservative, and the Reform party comprising the Liberals of Upper Canada, as to which deserved most merit for very many great reforms and changes; but there is one question in which the old Tory party has no right to claim any share, viz., the victory won by the Baldwin Reformers over the Crown Colony system. That victory was consummated under Lord Sydenham, in September, 1841, when it was decided that thereafter the Government of Canada was to be a responsible government, and that everything connected with the public welfare, whether legislative or administrative, should be done only on the advice of responsible ministers and advisers. This is the first occasion since 1841 that I have heard this doctrine denied and repudiated by the leader of what was the great Reform party. The representative of the Crown can have no more rights in Canada than the Crown itself, and the Crown could not make any utterances on public affairs for which some minister would not be responsible. Some minister must be responsible for every announcement, every statement, every opinion expressed by the Sovereign, and, if that principle is once abandoned, then we shall return to the old system so much decried and for which the old official party, both in Upper and Lower Canada, were attacked, and properly attacked.

Mr. Mackenzie, after explaining his inability to be responsible for an inaccuracy in reporting the speech of His Excellency the Governor General, assumed responsibility for every word he uttered. He said:

The ministers are responsible for everything that affects the conduct of public affairs just as the hon. member for Kingston was responsible for every despatch he brought down by order of His Excellency. It was the duty of the hon. gentleman to bring the despatches down, and, if he thought they should not be brought down to Parliament, he should have resigned rather than have done so.

I think that puts in a clear and emphatic light the fact that we have a system of parliamentary government, carried out in precisely the same manner and to the same extent as it is in England. Todd again says, in his Government of the Colonies, page 324:

In the absence of definite instructions, or positive law, it is the duty of a constitutional Governor to be guided upon all questions that may arise, or matters that may be submitted to him in his official capacity, by the usage of the Crown in the mother country; which he should endeavour to ascertain and to imitate, so far as

may be consistent with his position and responsibility as a colonial Governor.

I trouble the House with these extracts because it is important that we should start wih correct premises. It is important, in discussing the correspondence which took place between His Excellency the Governor General and myself, that I should be free to make animadversions on what I regard as a departure from the principles of parliamentary government which we enjoy in this country, without being open to the charge of, in the least degree, personally assailing the representative of the Sovereign; and when I make any remarks that may reflect upon the course pursued by His Excellency, I beg the House to understand that I am presenting that as a matter, not in question between His Excellency and myself at present, but between hon. gentlemen opposite, who have accepted full responsibility of all the statements of His Excellency, and who are here to answer any criticism that may be offered with regard to them.

It is known to the House that, shortly after the opening of the last session of Parliament, my hon. friend, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, then Prime Minister of Canada, did me the honour of inviting me to accept the position of Secretary of State and leader of the House of Commons, under his Government. I endeavoured to discharge that duty to the best of my ability; and although I am conscious of a great many shortcomings, as might naturally be expected under such circumstances, I accepted, as you are aware, Sir, that arduous responsibility, in the face of the fact that the great party to which I had the honour to belong, and which that Government represented, were divided in this House upon a very serious and important question, on which they held very strongly antagonistic views. But notwithstanding a large portion of very able and distinguished members of the House of Commons did not agree with the Government on that question, the fact remains that I had the honour of receiving the support of a majority on every occasion. With the single exception to which I have reference, hon. gentlemen opposite know that, during that session, I was at the head of a very large majority of this House.

The House was dissolved; my hon. colleague, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, accepted a very important mission to England and tendered his resignation, as leader of the Government, and His Excellency did me the great honour of calling upon me to form an Administration, which duty I undertook. An Administration was formed, and a general election was held as promptly as it was possible, under the circumstances. The House is also aware that before Parliament prorogued, in answer to a question of my hon. friend who now occupies the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), I stated the date on which Parliament would be called together. I gave the date very closely, if not the exact period. The House is also aware that the Government fixed, not only as early a day as they could for the purpose of holding an appeal to the country, but as early a day as possible for this legislature to assemble. Well, the fates of war were against us. After a sharp and short struggle, the result was that the Government were not in a position to claim a majority of supporters in this Parliament. So soon as it was convenient for His Excellency to return from the city of Quebec, where he had some engagements that made it very difficult for him to come for a considerable time, I did myself the honour of waiting on him and conferring with him on the position. What took place on that occasion will be brought to the attention of the House by a memorandum which is on the Table and which I submitted in response to a memorandum received from His Excellency. In this memorandum I said:

> So soon as Your Excellency had returned to the capital, the 2nd inst., I had the honour of waiting upon you and discussing the present condition of affairs, caused by the general election which took place on the 23rd June. At that time I submitted a memo. of the precedents indicating the practice followed in England and Canada on the defeat of a government.

I may say, Sir, that the memorandum of His Excellency and my reply thereto being in the hands of hon. members, I shall not feel it necessary to go into this question as I should otherwise be obliged to do. But, Sir, I submit, and I am sure the recollection of every hon. gentleman in the House will sustain me, that perhaps there never has been an occasion in Canada when it was found so difficult for a number of days, for a considerable period, to arrive at anything like accurate conclusions as to who had been and who had not been elected. Many of these constituencies were not easily accessible and, from a variety of causes, as every hon. gentleman knows, in a number of cases the papers printed one day the election of certain gentlemen only to contradict their own statement next day and say that others had been elected. So, while there was not a very large margin, the state of affairs made a very material element of uncertainty as to what had actually taken place. Then, as I have stated before, the question of recounts was one that might, under existing circumstances, affect the relative position of the parties; and His Excellency at once, as I have stated, assented to the reasonableness of awaiting the recounts, and the course of the Ministry to be taken up in the light of the facts as far as it was possible to obtain them. I need not repeat, I have already expressed, the pain and surprise with which I received on the 6th of July a communication from the Governor General dated the 4th, but not placed in my hand until the 6th, involving a grave and most important departure from all parliamentary usage known

in England and in Canada. And it is necessary to bear in mind the fact, though bearing date of the 4th, this communication did not reach my hands until the 6th, it has a material bearing upon a number of papers brought down in which the dates appear to be a little conflicting. I may say frankly to the House that the Government in the discharge of what they conceived to be their duty to the country and to the constitutional practice that had prevailed here and in England down to this period, felt it necessary to close all business and make a number of recommendations to His Excellency. But from the moment that paper was placed in my hand, no recommendation whatever was made by the Government of which I had the honour to be the head, because I felt that it was impossible that any gentlemen could read the memorandum His Excellency placed in my hands without arriving at the conclusion that the Government did not possess the confidence of His Excellency; and under these circumstances I felt it would be as derogatory to my colleagues and myself as it would be injurious to the public service to attempt to make any recommendation or ask any consideration of any appointment whatever. I mention this more particularly because the dates are confusing and would lead to a contrary conclusion unless this fact were stated. Now, as I have said, the British parliamentary system has been placed beyond all dispute. And I will draw the attention of the House for a few minutes to the statement with which His Excellency commenced his communication. After referring to the arrangement of the 7th July, he says:

> After taking every means in my power to inform myself, it is impossible for me to ignore the probability that, in the event of your decision to meet Parliament the present Administration will fail to secure the confidence of the House of Commons.

I contend that the position taken there is utterly unknown to the British constitution, to the English parliamentary system, and to the system that prevails in Canada. I say there are no means by which His Excellency without violating the constitution of the country, could take to inform himself with reference to the position in which his Government stood. I take the ground, Sir, that under that glorious constitution, that under that system of parliamentary government for which Baldwin and the reformers who stood with him fought so successfully and established as the birthright and inheritance of the people of this country, the Governor General like Her Majesty had no means of informing himself except by his constitutional advisers and the voice of Parliament. "Todd, in his Government in the British Colonies," says in clear and emphatic terms:

> In the absence of definite instructions, or positive law, it is the duty of a constitutional Governor to be guided upon all questions that may arise, or matters that may be submitted to him in his official capacity, by the usage of the Crown in the mother country, which he should endeavour to ascertain and to imitate, so far as may be consistent with his position and responsibility as a colonial Governor.

Lord Dufferin, one of the most eminent, most able, and most constitutional Governors General that Canada has had, stated that principle in clear and emphatic words in his address at Halifax on the 8th August, 1873, when he said:

> My only guiding star in the conduct and maintenance of my official relations with your public is the Parliament of Canada.

On a very important occasion, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, when a very large minority of the House of Commons memoralized His Excellency and endeavoured to give him advice at a crisis which occurred, His Excellency refused to accept that advice, and acted upon the advice of his constitutional advisers. So high an authority as Mr. Asquith, one of the members of Mr. Gladstone's last Government, and of Lord Rosebery's Government, said, in emphatic terms, as found in the English "Hansard," vol. 7, 1892, 97:

> Parliament renders effective the considered judgment of the country.

And Todd, in his "Parliamentary Government in England," page 1852, says:

> Parliament is the voice of the people. The House of Commons is the legitimate organ of the people.

Lord John Russell, in his "Life of Fox," says, as found in Todd's "Parliamentary Government in England," vol. II., page 512:

> The verdict of the country having been pronounced against ministers at a general election, it is nevertheless competent for them to remain in office until a new Parliament has met and given a definitive decision upon the merits, for the House of Commons is the legitimate organ of the people whose opinions cannot be constitutionally ascertained except through their representative in Parliament. It is necessary, however, according to precedents, that under such circumstances the new Parliament should be called together without delay.

I have already reminded the House that that question did not arise, because the day of the assembling of the new Parliament was then fixed, and, under that arrangement, the House was to meet in a few days, so as to place that beyond doubt. Now, in 1852, Lord Derby was called upon to accept office when he was in a minority in the House of Commons. The new Ministers were defeated by 234 to 146, and the House dissolved on 1st July, 1852. They were defeated at the elections, but summoned Parliament in November, and did not resign. They were defeated by 305 to 286 on the Budget. Again, in 1859, Lord Derby dissolved Parliament on 19th April. The Ministers met Parliament on the 31st May, and did not resign until defeated by a majority

of 13. In 1892, Lord Salisbury dissolved the House, but the Opposition had previously voted the Estimates for the year to expedite public business—an example which certainly was not followed by hon. gentlemen opposite on a comparatively recent occasion. He was defeated by a majority of 40, but did not resign until he was defeated by a direct vote of want of confidence, 350 to 316. Now, Sir, Mr. Gladstone, who will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by parliamentarians all over the world, as a very high authority, gave his opinions with reference to the duty of meeting Parliament after a defeat. Mr. Gladstone, in the English "Hansard," vol. 218, pages 128 and 129, in 1874, says:

It should be known and remembered that in former times it has been the practice of a government that has not succeeded in obtaining a majority at a general election to refer the decision to the arbitrament of Parliament. And I will not disguise from myself that although no practical dangers could happen in the instances which have lately occurred, yet it is conceivable that a government that had been guilty of serious malversation might seek, by the immediate surrender of office, to avoid the judgment or to weaken the force of the judgment which it might have to anticipate from an adverse House of Commons.

* * * * * * * *

After what had happened these were the considerations which led us to the course we adopted, although it is a course which was justified by the circumstances, it is one which ought not to be adopted in the absence of strong justifying circumstances.

Mr. Gladstone, in point of fact, apologized for having established the precedent of resigning without meeting Parliament, when beaten at the polls. Mr. Balfour says, as to the right of the Government, after defeat, to meet Parliament, "Hansard," vol. VIII., 1892, page 220:

In meeting Parliament we are strictly following the best precedent.

The Government of which he was a member, had been defeated, yet they did not resign, but met Parliament and accepted judgment at the hands of Parliament.

We are following strictly the precedents of 1841, for example, and of 1859. We are not following the precedents of 1868-1874, 1880 or 1886. I quite admit that. I have two replies to that objection of the right hon. gentleman. My first reply is that the older precedents are precedents of far longer standing—that the older precedents have behind them a far longer concatenation of authorities to support them, and that the precedent of 1868 is an absolutely novel precedent. I have to remind him, in the second place, that the circumstances of the present time in no way resemble those which prevailed in the years 1868, 1874, or 1880. On these occasions the Opposition was returned by a majority absolutely overwhelming in its character and absolutely homogeneous in its character. The leader of the Opposition in those years came back to this House at the head of a majority on which he could absolutely rely to outvote not merely what is called the regular Opposition, but the regular Opposition in combination, or not in combination with any other section of the House.

I call the attention of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to the fact that on that occasion the majority was overwhelming in its character, and absolutely homogeneous. I have said enough to show the eminent English authorities, about which there must be no difference of opinion, in regard to the right of a defeated Government to receive a verdict of the people from the people's representatives on the floor of Parliament; and I will now come down to show that that was affirmed in the most clear and emphatic manner by the Canadian precedent established by the eminent leader of the Liberal Government, whose party was defeated in 1878. On 9th October, 1878, Mr. Mackenzie writes to Lord Dufferin as follows—"Life of Mackenzie," page 529:—

The protectionist principle undoubtedly obtained a victory at the polls. The knowledge of the wonderful success of Great Britain in developing her trade and commerce under the opposite system, and the sad results of the attempt by the United States to carry out a protectionist's policy, as exhibited in the ruinous state of their shipping and manufactures, and the growth of a communistic feeling, were alike disregarded. We felt, however, that it would be unpleasant to remain in office after ascertaining that there was no probability of the policy of the Government being sustained by the new House.

Mark this, Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. Gladstone apologized for having departed from the sound principle of a government receiving the verdict of the people on the floor of Parliament, so Mr. Mackenzie, although beaten by an overwhelming majority, and that of a homogeneous character, apologizes for having surrendered his trust without meeting Parliament. He goes on to say:

The other course would doubtless be the one in accordance with the English practice, but there are two precedents of a recent date in favour of a resignation before the meeting of Parliament, these precedents being made by the leaders of both political parties in England. Feeling that we are justified in pursuing that course, I have resolved, with the concurrence of my colleagues, to close up all business in the departments at the earliest possible moment.

"Close up," mark you, Mr. Speaker, not to abandon the departments by leaving them as they were, but to close up all the business, just as the late Government endeavoured to the best of their ability to close up the business that remained in their departments before resigning their trust.

With the view of enabling our successors to meet Parliament at an early day, with measures for carrying into effect the policy to which they committed themselves at the election.

Now, Sir, I think with the English precedents I have submitted, the overwhelming authorities I have submitted, backed and

sustained by so high an authority as the great leader of the then Liberal party in this country, I have established beyond question the right that myself and my colleagues were in a position and fairly entitled to meet Parliament at the early day at which it was called, if we so desired and wished. I do not mean to say that any intimation of that kind was given to His Excellency, I do not mean to say that that course would have been followed, but it would have been open to us to consider whether we might not promote the public business of the country in the condition it then was by meeting Parliament on the day for which it was summoned, and placing hon. gentlemen opposite, who would have had control of the House, in a position to elect a Speaker and to take a vote of credit from Parliament, previous even to the formation, if they desired it, of their Government and to have taken a vote of credit for the purpose of avoiding all the difficulties into which they were plunged by adopting a different course. I can only say that had that course been pursued, those hon. gentlemen would have found that we would not have adopted the very unpatriotic, unparliamentary and almost unconstitutional course of obstruction of which they set an example during the previous session. They would have found that with a desire to promote public business and to give effect at the earliest possible moment to the clearly understood wishes of the people as expressed on the floor of Parliament, that course might have been more eminently satisfactory than the one which was taken.

But I will now, Sir, give another authority almost as high in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite, and of the great Liberal party throughout this country as even the English authorities or the authority of Mr. Mackenzie himself, and that is the "Globe" newspaper. The "Globe," in 1878, said :

> It has, we are aware, been held by high authority that the vote of Parliament alone should determine the action of the administration officially. It is true, Mr. Mackenzie knows nothing of the strength of the respective parties until that be tested by a division of the House of Commons.

If Mr. Mackenzie knew nothing of the strength of parties when there was a majority of between 80 and 90 in the House of Commons elected opposed to him, I should like to know what His Excellency knew of the strength of parties and the state of parties in the House of Commons after the recent elections, and how he could ascertain the facts. I have already shown from the very highest authorities that His Excellency had no eyes to see, no ears to hear, except what was communicated to him by his responsible advisers or by the voice of Parliament itself. The "Globe" further says :

> He has the legal right to hold office until the usual time of the meeting of Parliament, to do all the acts that a ministry in possession of a majority could do.

Mark that, Mr. Speaker. Here is that great authority to which every Liberal in this country looks as a supreme authority in the press, declaring emphatically in the face of a majority of between 80 or 90 elected by the people of Canada in opposition to the Mackenzie Government, that the Government had a legal right to hold office until the usual time for the legislature to assemble, and to do all acts which a Ministry in possession of authority could do, and to disregard absolutely the popular manifestation at the late elections. I give that as an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite generally treat with great respect. The "Globe" still further says :

> We feel perfectly sure, too, that in the matter of appointments the Premier will have the fullest regard to the principle which should guide a retiring Cabinet. Any vacancies may properly be filled up, and all such appointments may be fittingly made as are necessary for the uninterrupted progress of the business of Government.

Under these circumstances I placed, for the reasons I have stated, in the hands of His Excellency a list of the precedents, English and Canadian, that bear on the question ; and at the same time and for the reasons I have stated, I intimated that a number of minutes sent to His Excellency had not been returned signed by His Excellency ; and I placed in his hands a statement of the appointments, some 92 in all, if my memory serves me, made by Mr. Mackenzie after this unmistakable verdict of the people so far as could be gathered from the popular voice or from the press, for consideration, and I left the matter open until His Excellency had an opportunity of seeing the papers when we could take up and discuss the position of the Administration in respect to those questions.

I need not detain the House long, I think, on that point, but I draw attention to the next statement in the memorandum from His Excellency the Governor General. He said :

> In the first place, the business to be transacted by Parliament, though foreseen——

I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this :

> ——And not in character exceptional, is urgent.

What do hon. gentlemen opposite think of going down to His Excellency the Governor General, who had put on record his declaration that the business of granting the supplies was foreseen and was not in character exceptional, and calling on His Excellency to sign a Governor General's warrant on the ground that it was unforeseen and exceptional ? I do not intend, although His Excellency was called upon, in the teeth of the statute, as admitted by hon. members on both sides of the House, to go in direct opposition to his own declaration, that it was

foreseen,—although that Act was one of a very strong character. I do not for a moment question the propriety of His Excellency appending his name to those Governor General's warrants. But the responsibility rests on hon. gentlemen opposite to justify the declaration of His Excellency that this absence of supplies was foreseen and was not exceptional, when at the same time they placed before His Excellency a report from the Minister of Justice, which although very halting and very lame, still was found sufficient to satisfy his colleagues that they were warranted in asking the Governor General, in violation of all he had intimated, to take an entirely different course. But His Excellency said :

> The supplies for the public service are already entirely exhausted. This contingency was in view when the date of Parliament was fixed.

So it was. His Excellency knew that his Government had fixed the date of the meeting of Parliament at the very earliest day that Parliament could meet, because there was an absence of Supply. He says :

> It is in the public interest that Parliament should meet at as early a day as possible, and be able to proceed to business forthwith.

I say that having left with His Excellency these precedents as to the practice in England and Canada ; having left for His Excellency's consideration the course adopted by so eminent and distinguished an authority as one of the most able and distinguished Governors Canada has ever had, Lord Dufferin, who was present on the occasion of two crises—the resignation of Sir John A. Macdonald's Government in 1873, and subsequently the defeat of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's Government in 1878—having drawn the attention of His Excellency to the course pursued and with the understanding that after he had time to peruse the papers, I would have an early opportunity of discussing these questions with His Excellency again ; what am I to think when hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to defend the placing in my hands of the declaration to which His Excellency the Governor General has committed himself in this memorandum.

Now, Sir, I will not comment further on that, but shall next draw attention to the following statement which is to be found in His Excellency's memorandum :

> The previous Administration (with Sir Mackenzie Bowell as Prime Minister), representing the views of the same political party and having a majority in both chambers, failed to pass its proposed legislation, and on he 25th of April Parliament expired by efflux of time without having granted supplies for the public service beyond the 30th June.

Now, Sir, there is no man unacquainted with the circumstances who could fail to be misled by that statement. The bald statement that Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government was unable to obtain supplies from this Parliament, made over the signature of His Excellency the Governor General, is, I say, unaccompanied by the knowledge of the facts, calculated to mislead entirely any person who reads it. Why, there is no question as to what it means. When a Government cannot obtain supplies from Parliament, the presumption is that they are powerless to do so because they have no majority. There is nothing that would indicate the impotency of a Government so completely as their not being able to obtain supplies, and yet His Excellency knew, what every gentleman opposite knows, that the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell had a large majority in this Parliament ready to vote supplies, and they know, too, that the Opposition were found, for the first time in Canada, unpatriotic enough to abuse the position which they found Parliament in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, Sir, I say, for the first time in the history of Canada, and I believe I may go further and say, for the first time in the history of any country in which parliamentary government exists, the Opposition, taking advantage of the unusual circumstance of the life of Parliament terminating on a certain day, adopted the unpatriotic course of sacrificing the best interests of the country and involving themselves in the most dire straits and difficulties, from which they were only extricated by following up a series of thoroughly unconstitutional and unparliamentary acts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That Opposition prevented those supplies being voted, when the Government of the day had a large, aye an overwhelming majority at their backs, ready to give supplies. But for that extraordinary circumstance of the life of Parliament terminating on a certain day, and placing the control of this Parliament in the hands of a few individuals who were ready to prevent supplies being voted ; supplies would have been voted at the last session. I therefore challenge that statement as one that ought not to go forth to the world unexplained, and unaccompanied by a statement of the facts which would relieve the statement itself of that weight which otherwise would attach to it, if it were true that Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government were in such a position that they were not able to get supplies voted by Parliament, or were overruled by a majority, which would be the only inference to draw from it. Well, Sir, the Governor General further says :

> Subsequently when no Parliament was or could be, under the circumstances, in existence, the present Administration was formed. So far, therefore, as these are dependent upon the subsequent approval of Parliament, the acts of the

present Administration are in an unusual degree provisional.

I deny that, Sir ; I say that there is no warrant for the statement that there was anything of a provisional character in the formation of the Government to which His Excellency alludes. Drawing his information from the only legitimate source from which he could draw it, namely, the voice of Parliament ; and having witnessed the position which I held in this House during the last session, His Excellency did me the honour to ask and to invite me to form an Administration. Why, Sir, did he do that ? It was because he had the best evidence that it was possible for a Governor General to have that I did enjoy the confidence of a large majority of Parliament, and, so far as His Excellency had any means of knowing, a large majority of the great party which I was invited to lead. I say, therefore, Sir, that there is no foundation for that. But let me call attention to what occurred. I referred to the case of Lord Derby in 1852. Lord Derby was called upon to accept office when he was in a minority in the House. He was in the face of an open and avowed majority against him on the floor of the House. He was beaten by that majority against him in the House. He dissolved the House in April, and he did not call that Parliament together until November 4th. He was beaten at the elections, and yet he called Parliament together on November 4th, and was defeated on the Budget by a vote of 305 to 286. Lord Derby did not resign, but continued from the time he formed that Government, representing a minority in the House of Commons, never having had a majority, being beaten at the polls ; he came back and discharged all the duties of Prime Minister of England and the control of this great Empire from the time of the dissolution when his Government was beaten down to November, when he resigned. For four months he performed all the duties in the fullest and most complete manner that any Prime Minister could perform them. Todd says, in the extracts which I have already read, that it is the duty of the Governor General to imitate as closely as he can the parliamentary system in England. And yet, with all this long line and array of parliamentary authorities which I placed in His Excellency's hands, he turned a deaf ear to it all. He addresses this memorandum, pointing out the reasons why he should withdraw his confidence from me and prevent me enjoying, and the Government of which I was at the head enjoying, that confidence which every authority, English and Canadian alike, said I should enjoy —and no man said it more strongly than the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie—sweeping away the illustrious precedents established by so distinguishd a man as Lord Dufferin ; and looking at this with eyes that I have no hesitation in saying the strongest partisan on the ministerial benches here could not surpass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am exceedingly reluctant to interfere in any way whatever in this debate, especially when the leader of the Government has frankly avowed entire responsibility for the acts of His Excellency the Governor General ; but I am inclined to think that the last observation of the hon. gentleman, practically accusing His Excellency of partisanship, transgresses the rule of this House which prevents any hon. member from speaking disrespectfully of His Excellency the Governor General. I am sure the hon. member does not desire to do so, and he will see that, if he has not infringed, he has very nearly infringed, this rule of this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I bow with all deference to your decision, and will endeavour to be as careful as possible to avoid anything that can infringe the well-known rule of this House that we must not speak disrespectfully of the Governor General ; but I am speaking of his representatives who are here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have already given you, Sir, the authority ; and the Prime Minister has frankly and openly, as he was bound to do, assumed the entire responsibility for every line, every word and every sentiment contained in this document.

The PRIME MINISTER. Speak of the First Minister, then.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I am afraid the hon. First Minister's shoulders are hardly broad enough to bear the weight of all this. When I refer to that, I do not charge His Excellency with being a partisan ; but I say that, if he had been a partisan, if this communication had been directed to the First Minister by the strongest partisan on that side of the House, he could not have expressed it in a stronger or more unjustifiable manner. Now, Sir, I say that, under the circumstances in which His Excellency did me the honour to call upon me to become his adviser, and with a knowledge of the position I occupied in this House and in the party, if His Excellency was not prepared to give me the fullest and most unqualified confidence until I ceased to be His Minister, he had no right to call upon me. Having been called upon, I maintain that I was entitled to the enjoyment of that confidence, and that a more fatal precedent cannot be established in this country than that the executive head of the country can go behind his Ministers and seek outside opinion. From the moment the administration of public affairs by outside opinion exists, a fatal precedent, in my judgment, is established, and one that, if followed up, will deprive Canada of those

glorious British institutions which it is our pride and happiness to possess. I, therefore, show that all English and all Canadian parliamentary precedent is diametrically opposed to the course His Excellency pursued. Sir, we have had a long and illustrious line of Governors General in Canada, considering the period during which we have been a confederation. We obtained, as I say, in all its fulness—as stated by the framers of the constitution and by the Imperial Acts which gave to Canada the charter we possess—we obtained, in all its fullness, British parliamentary practice; and the authorities lay it down in clear and emphatic terms, that the Governor General of Canada is bound, in administering the affairs of this country, to follow parliamentary practice. Now, Sir, what do you find in England? You find it stated in Todd's "Parliamentary Government in England," page 513:

For, notwithstanding their resignations, the outgoing Ministers are bound to conduct the ordinary business of Parliament and of the country so long as they retain the seals of office. They continue, moreover, in full possession of their official authority and functions and must meet and incur the full responsibility of all public transactions until their successors have kissed hands upon their acceptance of office.

Do hon. gentlemen opposite, the successors, at a very remote distance, of that great line of Reformers headed by Baldwin and Lafontaine—do these hon. gentlemen intend to rewrite the history of parliamentary government in England? Do they intend to give a new and different version of it? Do they undertake to say that the Governor General is not bound to follow that great illustrious precedent which is our birthright—the system of parliamentary government in England? Is it possible for hon. gentlemen opposite to agree that all these precedents, both in England and in our own country, shall be swept aside, and a new and different doctrine founded for the administration of public affairs in Canada? I cannot believe, Sir, that gentlemen still claiming to be Reformers, however little claim they may have to the title, can ever consent to adopt a course which is, not only fatal to all reform, but which is the first step to a return to a system of personal government, as opposed to that parliamentary government which has made England what she is, and which has hitherto been the birthright, the highly-prized birthright of Canada. Todd again says:

It was always the practice to fill up vacancies. Peerages promised by a Minister's predecessors in office had been granted, though no instrument had been signed or sealed on the subject.

So highly, so completely, and so perfectly, has this system of parliamentary government received the sanction of all these distinguished precedents for so long a period, and so clear and so emphatic are these precedents, that they even go the length of establishing that, where a Minister, on retiring from office, has not had time to confer peerages—the highest, the greatest, the most important office in its effects on the individual and on the country—his successors, in that spirit of honour, regard and respect for those great constitutional principles, have been bound to implement and carry out the unfulfilled determination of their predecessors. Well, Sir, these hon. gentlemen will have to look long and far before they will find any ground or any intimation that any Minister, however he had been placed in the position of First Minister, whatever defeats he had encountered, whatever the results of his appeals to the country were—they will search far and long before they will find the slightest precedent, either in that great country which is declared to be our great exemplar, or in Canada itself, for the course that is pursued. Todd further says:

In 1858, Lord Palmerston, after his tender of resignation, and before his successor was appointed, allotted three of the highest honours of the Crown—three Garters—which were then unappropriated, to three eminent noblemen, his friends and supporters. And in 1866, upon the dissolution of the second Russell Ministry, an office was filled up by that Government which did not become vacant until two days after their resignation had been tendered to Her Majesty.

Mark this, Mr. Speaker.

The interference of Parliament with the exercise of the prerogative under such circumstances has never taken place, and would only be justifiable under circumstances of a flagrant character.

Now, Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen if the Queen's representative in this country, bound, as the highest authorities tell us he is bound, to imitate the parliamentary practice of England and the course pursued under similar circumstances in that great country, if, I say, Sir, he has evidences so unqualified, so numerous, running over a long series of years, all tending to the same point, and confirmed by the principle adopted by the Governors General of Canada itself, I think these gentlemen will have great difficulty, though they may be able to convince this House of its duty to sustain them, in convincing the intelligent people of this country that they have been faithful to their principles, as guarding these inalienable rights of the people of Canada which were fought for and won by their predecessors in the ranks of reform. Sir Robert Peel took office when in a minority in November, 1834. Parliament was dissolved. His government was defeated at the general elections, and parliament met February 19th, 1835, and his administration governed Great Britain from November, 1834, until after February 19th, 1835, when his government was beaten on the election of Speaker. Here was another case in which a First Min-

ister, who never had a majority at his back, who took office when in a minority, who went to the people and was beaten, discharged all the functions and the duties of administering public affairs, as, according to all these authorities, the right if not the duty of a defeated ministry. Take Lord Melbourne's case. Parliament dissolved June 21st, 1841. Elections were over July 1st. The administration were beaten. Parliament met August 19th, and on August 30th, on a motion of want of confidence, government was beaten by a majority of 91.

The following are some of the appointments made by this Government, after defeat at the general elections and after an adverse vote in the House. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, the general elections had taken place, the Administration were beaten, and Parliament was called on the 19th of August, the elections having taken place on July 1st, resulting in a majority of 91 against the Government, yet during the period that the defeated Government held office after the elections, these are some of the appointments that were made. And some of these appointments were made after the defeat at the general elections in 1841, and others were made after an adverse vote in the House. So that you have, in this instance, a Prime Minister going to the country, being badly beaten, having a large majority against him, calling Parliament together, and yet, during that period he continued to exercise—not only up to the time of meeting the House, but after the House had defeated him by a vote of 91—all the duties of a Prime Minister as completely as any Minister could who had a majority at his back. I will give you a few of the appointments made by that government, some of which were made shortly after the general elections, and some after an adverse vote in the House:

Treasurer of H. M. Household, June 23rd.
Comptroller of H. M. Household, June 23rd.
Judge of the Supreme Court of Gibraltar.
Commissioner for the superintending the sale and settlement of waste Crown lands in the British Colonies, &c., July 19th.
Colonization Commissioners, July 19th.
Registrar of Deeds, July 20th.
Governor and Commander in Chief of certain islands, August 3rd.
Member of H. M. Privy Council, August 11th.
Peers, August 11th.
Chaplain to H. M., August 16th.
Secretary to a Legation.
Chief Superintendent of British trade in China.
British Consuls.
Consuls General, August 11th.
Baronets, August 24th.
Physician to Embassy, August 21st.
Governor and Commander in Chief over certain islands, August 24th.
Governor of St. Helena, August 24th.
Clerk of Exchequer Court in Barbadoes, August 24th.
Queen's Advocate in Sierra Leone, August 24th.
Knights Grand Cross of the Bath, August 27th.
Companion of the Bath, August 27th.
Queen's Advocate at Settlement on the Gambia, August 27th.
Clerk of the Legislative Council of the province of Canada, August 2th.
Deputy Inspector General of Public Accounts in the province of Canada, August 27th.
President of the Committee of the Executive Council in Canada, August 27th.
Surveyor General in Canada, August 27th.
Registrar of the province of Canada, August 27th.
Consuls, Knights, August 27th.
Lord Lieutenant of the Courts of Lincoln.
Chief Justice of British Guiana, August 30th.
Solicitor General, British Guiana, August 30th.
Governor of Sierra Leone, September 13th.
Governor of Gambia, September 13th.
Vice-Chancellor of the United Kingdom, September 20th.
Governor of Newfoundland, October 8th.
Lieutenant and Sheriff Principal of the Shire of Lanark, October 6th.
Knight Grand Cross of the Bath, October 11th.
Privy Councillor, October 16th.
Inspector of Schools, October 16th.
Chief Ranger, Keepers of Park, October 16th.
Treasurer for Island of, October 16th.
Lord Lieutenant for Southampton, November 10th.

These are some of the appointments made by a gentleman defeated in the House of Commons, beaten by a large majority at the polls, and yet continuing to hold office and to make these appointments as completely as he could have done, had he received the support of a large majority in the House.

I will give another and a very high and distinguished authority, that of a gentleman which has paid great attention to this question of constitutional precedence, and who is one of the highest authorities on public life in England—I mean Mr. Disraeli, afterwards Lord Beaconsfield. In the English Hansard, D. vol. 195, of 1869, page 733, I find Lord Beaconsfield, reported as saying:

I entirely deny the position taken up by the hon. gentleman, that because I had tendered my resignation to Her Majesty, and Her Majesty had provisionally accepted it, I had ceased to be the responsible Minister of the Crown. That I believe is a point upon which there is no controversy whatever.

* * * * * * * * *

It does not follow that, because a Minister tenders his resignation and the Sovereign accepts it that the Ministry will be changed. Under any circumstances a considerable time may elapse. There is an instance of a not very distant date when six weeks elapsed. During all that time the Minister whose resignation is contemplated is performing the highest duties of the state; he may be superintending negotiations upon which the peace of Europe may depend; may be providing for the successful conduct of public expeditions in which the honour of the country is involved; and when he is obliged to fulfil all these duties and discharge all these functions, could anything more absurd be maintained than that he should not feel himself authorized to recommend to Her Majesty those persons best qualified to represent the Sovereign? On this point there is no doubt whatever, and there has been no difficulty about it in practice.

There is not a function that a Prime Minister in England is called upon to discharge of a higher character than that of appointing a representative of the sovereign in India, Canada or any of the colonies. I do not know that I have a case under my hand, but I remember very well that the late Lord Mayo was named Governor General of India by a Prime Minister after his defeat, and I think after his resignation, and Lord Mayo went to India and discharged, until his untimely death there, the duties of Governor General.

Mr. Disraeli refers to the case in which three days after Lord Russell's resignation and its acceptance and after an adverse vote in the House, he recommended that a Lieutenant-Governor be appointed and the appointment was made and never questioned. Mr. Disraeli also refers to Lord Palmerston in 1858, when he resigned in consequence of a vote in the House—a vote of want of confidence :

He allotted, and I believe most constitutionally, those three great distinctions (three Garters) to three eminent noblemen, his friends and supporters. Therefore, Sir, in my opinion, as far as the constitutional principle is concerned, there can be no doubt—and I never heard there was a doubt—that until your successor has kissed hands and accepted the responsibility of office, the retiring Ministers must meet and incur the full responsibility of all public transactions. * * * * I have had the opportunity of ascertaining the opinion of two most eminent statesmen of the present day, representing the two great parties in the state, and once occupying the highest office, and they told me not only that it was the right of the Ministry to recommend to the Sovereign under such circumstances—of which there is, I believe, no doubt whatever—but that in their opinion it was his duty.

No stronger statement could be made than Lord Beaconsfield, formerly Mr. Disraeli, giving his opinion, which was of the highest value, and fortified with a statement that two eminent gentlemen who had held the office of Prime Minister, declared that, not only was it the undoubted right of a defeated Minister to discharge all the duties, without any qualification, and perform the highest functions that fall to a Minister, down to the period that his successor is appointed, but it was his duty. Well, Mr. Gladstone commented upon this—and this will be the more important, as hon. gentlemen will see, when they have these opinions of Mr. Disraeli endorsed by so eminent authority as Mr. Gladstone. At pages 750 and 751 of 195, Mr. Gladstone says :

Then we come to the third question, which is connected with the conduct of the Government in this matter, and I am bound to say without giving any strong opinion on that point, that the doctrine laid down by the right hon. gentleman with respect to the position of an outgoing Minister requires some qualification, because if we accept it in the terms in which it was delivered, it amounts to this—that during the period which elapses from the time when resignation is tendered to the time when a successor comes into power there is no change in the position of the outgoing Minister. That doctrine, in my opinion, is just as far from the truth as the unlimited proposition on the other side—that there was no capacity at all remaining in an outgoing Minister to transact public business. The truth, in fact, lies between the two statements. Much public business must be transacted by the outgoing Minister or the public interests would suffer ; but we all know that it is a familiar practice of outgoing Ministers to leave behind them a memorandum on this subject or on that, and stating that, on account of the position of the Government, they think it expedient to take no step in the matter, but they leave it to be dealt with by their successors. There is an intermediate region of cases, with respect to which it is in the option of an outgoing Minister to act, and that is in regard to filling up vacancies in offices. This is a matter difficult for the House of Commons to deal with. It must be left to the convictions and feelings of the gentlemen in power, and if there had been in the proceedings of the right hon. gentleman any matter of a flagrant character, that circumstance would have justified parliamentary interference.

But, Sir, such a thing as parliamentary interference with the exercise of the highest functions of the Prime Minister, after his defeat, has never been known down to the present hour. There was the case of the appointment of Mr. E. R. Wetherall as Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which is a life appointment. The late Government, on the eve of their resignation, accepted the resignation of Sir Thomas Larcom and appointed E. R. Wetherall. Mr. Chichester-Fortescue, speaking for the Government, said :

I think it would have been a wiser course, and one far more advantageous to the public service to have pursued, if the late Government had endeavoured to induce Sir Thomas Larcom to continue in his office a little longer, and had not exposed the new Government to the inevitable disadvantage of coming into office with a new Under Secretary, entirely unversed in the duties of his department. * * * * In the first place, the present Government are not responsible for the choice which was made by the late Government, who were, strictly speaking, entitled to fill up a vacancy which they had not created.

So that, even with reference to the appointment of an under-secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who is practically, you may say, a member of the Administration, this appointment by an outgoing Premier of a gentleman to hold that high and important and confidential position, was absolutely unquestioned in Parliament. On page 755, Colonel Wilson-Patten says :

It is, I believe, an invariable practice that all the vacancies which occur within a reasonable time before the resignation of a Government are filled up by that Government ; and I think that if my right hon. friend will only move for a return of the number of appointments so filled up within the three weeks before the last six or seven Governments have left office, he will find that he cannot support the imputation he has cast upon the late Government——

of having acted improperly in filling this appointment. Mr. Gladstone, at page 757, says :

I feel obliged, however, to demur to the pleas offered in justification by my right hon. friend opposite in the present instance. In the first place, he thinks that the objection taken by the Chief Secretary for Ireland is that no Government likely to go out of office ought to make any appointments whatever. My hon. friend did not lay down any proposition so absurd. It may be that it is very proper to make some appointments on the eve of quitting office. It may be that it is an error to make other appointments. The only question is—was this an appointment which it was wise for a Government to make on the very eve of quitting office ? It is not any general rule, but it is the specialty of these appointments on which the objection is founded. * * * * * I think my right hon. friend opposite overlooked this consideration—that in case the late Government had not gone out of office it would not have been any great inconvenience to them to have postponed the appointment for three or four weeks ; but in making it as they did, they made themselves the judges of who was a fit person to advise and support the new Lord Lieutenant and the new Chief Secretary ; they decided who was to be the prop, stay and adviser of these officers, and that at a time when it was well known that Irish policy was the cardinal point of public affairs, and when, consequently, it was of the utmost importance they should work with those with whom they enjoyed unbroken sympathy. That being the case, I do not think my right hon. friend on this side has overstated the matter—while rendering the freest acknowledgments to the late Government in the most important respects—in venturing to say he considers they have not exercised a sound discretion.

Now, I think I have given a sufficiently long line of illustrious precedents establishing the practice in England regarding this important matter, and I now come down to our own practice. I will quote from the course and opinions of Mr. Mackenzie, and their approval by Lord Dufferin. In the life of Mr. Mackenzie, pages 514 and 515, you will find this letter written to the Governor General, dated 19th September, 1878 :

Dear Lord Dufferin,—The elections are mostly over, and sufficiently so as to be conclusive as to the defeat of the Government. The protection fallacy has taken deeper root than we had thought, especially with the farming community. * * * * * * * * * *

I shall endeavour to get my colleagues here as soon as possible to finish up what business we have in hand, after which I propose to wait upon Your Excellency at Quebec to tender you my resignation. I shall not initiate any new business here, but I propose filling a few vacancies which occurred within the last few weeks. I propose also, dealing with several English despatches, which have been unattended to during the heat of the election contest, and were under discussion before.

On 17th September, Mr. Mackenzie wrote to the hon. gentleman who now presides over this House, the Hon. J. D. Edgar :

You advise that we should make no appointments. This, I think, we can hardly accept as sound advice. Ordinary vacancies should be filled up. Of these there are a number, some of them existing for weeks. I do think that we ought not to make any new appointments, or create vacancies by any process, in order to get our friends in offices.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not sorry to hear hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear" to the sound doctrine which Mr. Mackenzie laid down, that vacancies should not be created for the purpose of filling them, because hon. gentlemen will search in vain for any indication of a desire on the part of the late Government to create vacancies for the purpose of filling them. But I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman, who is a little premature, perhaps, in his enthusiastic endorsement of that statement, to the following sentence :—

I do not think we ought to make any new appointments or create vacancies. It is quite constitutional for us to do even that.

Therefore, the hon. gentleman will see that even had we proposed to create offices, or make vacancies by any process, the hon. gentleman sees that we would have had the support of so eminent an authority as the leader of the Liberal Government at that time.

But the ground I took in 1873-74 was that I did not object, even after a motion of no confidence was moved, to the Ministry filling vacancies required in the public interest.

I may say that the reason this return shows a very small number of appointments made by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald after his resignation, is the fact that a good deal of industry had been exercised, after the vote of want of confidence, in disposing of public business in the various departments. Now, I do not think it is necessary for me to labour that point more fully than I have done ; but I may say that a very strong corroboration of this policy, both in England and in Canada, is given by the Colonial Office in regard to what was done by the Governor of New Zealand in 1891, as set forth in the official returns of the Imperial House of Commons, referring to the recommendations of six members to the legislative council. Lord Onslow, a man of high standing, who filled the position of Governor of New Zealand, in a letter to Lord Knutsford, says :

It has, however, long been the practice in England for Ministers even after a vote of censure has been passed on them in Parliament, to advise the Crown to create a limited number of peerages, not only for the purpose of strengthening the Upper House, but admittedly as rewards to those who, being qualified for the position of Peers, have rendered political services to the defeated party.

Lord Knutsford, in replying to that despatch, says :

With regard to the appointments to the legislative council recommended by the late Govern-

ment, I am of opinion that in accepting the advice tendered to you by Your Lordship's responsible Ministers under the circumstances described in your despatches, you acted strictly in accordance with the constitution of the colony, but I do not desire to be understood to offer any opinion upon the action of your Ministers in tendering that advice.

So that even though Lord Knutsford may have disagreed with the action of the Government in nominating so large a proportion of the legislative council after they had ceased to have the confidence of Parliament, withholding his opinion on that point, he says that the Governor of the colony was acting in accordance with the constitution of the country in giving effect to that advice. Now, in view of these very strong and unqualified precedents to which I have drawn the attention of the House as briefly as I can, I may come to the next point, and that is the question of appointments. I will give what actually occurred. In 1873, as the papers on the Table of the House show, after the resignation of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, there were eight appointments made, including a judge of a county court. As I have already said, a judge of the Supreme Court, just previous to that resignation being tendered, had been appointed, a Lieutenant-Governor had been appointed, and a number of other important officers had been filled. Well, in 1878, as I have already said, Mr. Mackenzie went to the country; and if I remember correctly the first vote in the House of Commons showed him to be in a minority of 85. He was, therefore, defeated by the overwhelming majority of 80 to 90, yet he claimed the constitutional right, the undoubted right, to close up the business of the departments, and to fill all the vacancies that existed. I will not go over all these appointments, because it would take up too much time, but they are to be found in the papers in the hands of hon. members. By examining those papers they will find that every submission to Lord Dufferin by Mr. Mackenzie, after his overwhelming defeat, was approved by Lord Dufferin. Every submission to Lord Dufferin by the outgoing ministry made after their defeat of the 17th September, and, before the resignation of the Government in October, 1878, was approved by the Governor General. There were 116 appointments to office, and I think 17 promotions. There were ten cases of superannuation, there were cases of increase of salaries, county court judges appointed, a judge appointed to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, judges appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada, judges appointed to the Superior Court of Quebec, a Deputy Minister of the Interior, and an increase to Governor Laird's salary. I assume there had not been any provision of Parliament for that purpose, but it was a most proper increase. The outgoing Prime Minister felt that his old friend who had accepted the Governorship of the North-west, in connection with the management of Indian Affairs which would devolve upon him, was entitled to an increase of $1,000, and that was properly made. But I draw attention to the fact that every appointment, every nomination, every submission made, of which I think there were 180 in all, on various matters of public business, were approved. Hon. gentlemen will find on running their eyes over the submissions made by me, that scores were of the most insignificant character, but they related to public business which required to be dealt with by Order in Council. A large number of them were merely matters of routine, many of them acknowledgement of despatches and matters of that kind, but, as I shall show directly, no undue proportion of appointments. Now, from the mode in which these returns have been brought down, they are not very clear and distinct, and I have had to seek a good deal of personal information from my hon. friend in order to be able to understand them myself. As they are not very clear, I may not be strictly accurate, but so far as I can make out, between June 23 and July 11, 1896, 92 appointments to office were recommended in all. I do not refer to the appointment of Queen's Counsel, which is not an office but a distinction. I regret to say that the present Minister of Justice has dealt with great severity with the recommendations made by the late Minister, Mr. Dickey, but so far as I was informed a long time has elapsed since there had been a general list, and it was a distinction which barristers are very anxious to secure. There is no comparison at all between Queen's Counsel in this country and in England, as the present Minister of Justice would lead the people to suppose. It is a complete misapprehension to suppose that the slightest comparison can be made between the position of Queen's Counsel here and in England. Why are there so few in England? Here it is considered rather derogatory—I am not a lawyer, but gentleman at the bar will know that such is the case—for a lawyer to seek the office of Queen's Counsel, which is a position they like to have offered to them by the Government of the day as a mark of appreciation of the position they have attained. But in England it is quite the reverse. The office of Queen's Counsel is conferred on persons who seek and press their appointment, and they desire it as a most important step in their position at the bar, and hundreds of men who might otherwise be Queen's Counsel are not so because they cannot afford to take it. Instead of the office of Queen's Counsel being conferred merely as a distinction upon a barrister as is done in this country, in England it disqualifies him from the means of prosecuting certain branches of his profession, and the moment he has taken silk he is unable to go on and discharge the duties in which he had been professionally engaged. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries intimates by

his smile that I am getting into deep water in discussing a question of this kind; but the hon. gentleman will confirm my statement no doubt, if he has considered the question, that there are hundreds of men in England who refuse such compliment because they cannot afford it, and because it deprives them of following that branch of the profession in which they are most efficient and in which they desire to continue.

But apart from this distinction, which it was proposed to confer on a number of gentlemen, I think the appointments recommended between 23rd June and 11th July were 92, and of these recommendations, so far as I can make out, 66 were approved by His Excellency and 26 refused. That in general terms, is the statement. I confess I have been totally unable, giving the subject the closest attention I could, to arrive at the grounds on which the distinction has been drawn. These appointments were confirmed, His Excellency's approval being withheld from all recommendations which involved: 1. The creation of new offices or appointments. 2. The filling of vacancies for which no provision has been made by Parliament and which have existed for more than one clear fiscal year. 3. Superannuations, (and the consequential appointments) for which application has not been received. So far as superannuations were concerned, it was not desired that any superannuation that had not been called for by the party should be pressed upon His Excellency. The one case in which superannuation was asked was that of the surgeon of the penitentiary at Kingston, and I was not aware when it was submitted to His Excellency that an application had not been received before from the very old and highly respectable gentleman who held the office. My attention having been drawn to that, we found it was not in our power to make it. But so far as the creation of vacancies or anything of that kind is concerned, I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen will search in vain for any except legitimate vacancies which the Government had an undoubted right to fill.

But it is not a question whether these were proper appointments or not. I take the ground, and I take it most emphatically, and I put it to hon. gentlemen opposite, that they will do much to undermine the system of parliamentary government we now enjoy in Canada if they yield the point that a Governor General, in the teeth of all parliamentary precedents in England and in this country, can undertake to dictate to his constitutional advisers what they shall do and what they shall not do. I say there are no means by which such information can be obtained by the executive head of the country that are not entirely at variance with all constitutional doctrine, and it opens the door to that kind of influence to which no government under any circumstances can for a moment submit without yielding and surrendering the very birthright of the people of Canada. Why should the executive head, His Excellency undertake himself, of his own motion, to say to his responsible advisers that this appointment is a suitable and legal one and that is not. Where does he get his information? He has responsible Ministers. In the Ministry there is a Minister of Justice, and if he does what Her Majesty the Queen has always done, accept unquestionably and without hesitation every nomination made by an outgoing Ministry, which is responsible for it—for if a mistake is made Her Majesty is not responsible—no person dreams of raising the question as to whether the act is a proper one or not. It may be an unwise and even an improper act, but it is a part of the constitution of the country; and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot surrender it without giving up the birthright of the people of Canada, and taking a step towards that personal rule, that influence of the Crown in opposition to the people and to the Parliament of the country that led to great struggles not only in the mother country in times far gone by but in Canada down to a period within the recollection of persons within the sound of my voice, when there were bitter struggles, when the great reformers—and they were great reformers—struggled to secure free institutions for this country, and to whom our present free institutions are greatly due. Those institutions would have been obtained no doubt at a later period, but those men hastened the advent of a system of British parliamentary rule under which Canada has enjoyed so much peace, so much happiness and so much prosperity. Under these circumstances I say that any more dangerous principle cannot for a single moment be applied. If the Governor General is to make himself responsible, or to make the successors of his Ministry responsible for the action that he takes, where does he place himself? The Governor General of this country, holding the high and dignified social position that he does, so long as he preserves untarnished the constitution of the country, so long as he imitates the high position which his Sovereign, whom he represents, occupies in the motherland; if he is a man of ability and judgment and tact, he will possess—as every gentleman who has had anything to do with government knows—a very wide, a very broad and a very great influence in the management of the affairs of government. Like unto Her Majesty the Queen, who does not interfere with the advice of her constitutional advisers, the Governor General of Canada, as a great social and executive head, should wield an enormous influence. But, Sir, if the Governor General, instead of listening to his constitutional advisers and to the voice of Parliament, who alone are constitutionally in a position to instruct him; if he undertakes to pass upon these questions himself, he must get his information from outside of his advisers. What

does the Governor General know about an appointment to a small office that is brought under his notice? He knows nothing, Sir. If the Governor General adopts the position that he is responsible for the acts to which he signs his name, instead of throwing the responsibility—as he is entitled under the constitution to throw it upon the shoulders of his constitutional advisers, if he takes such a position, he is driven to that which would render good government utterly impracticable in Canada. He must go amongst strangers for his advice if he adopts such a course. He does not know the people, and he has no means of judging of their wants. He must go outside and obtain information from sources that are secret and hidden, and are therefore utterly at variance with the principles of constitutional government.

I will give you an illustration of that in the next point that comes under consideration. I refer to the question of the Senate and the judges of Canada. What does the Governor General know about the Senate? He has the voice of Parliament to guide him, and if he wants to know what the character of the Senate of Canada is, let me invite him to read the able speech (although it contains a slight inaccuracy) delivered a few days ago by Sir Oliver Mowat, the Minister of Justice. Does Sir Oliver Mowat say that the Senate of Canada is a partisan Senate? Does he confirm the statement to which His Excellency has unreservedly committed himself, "that it is said, that I have been told, there are only five Liberals in the Senate of Canada." Sir Oliver Mowat paid a high and a well deserved compliment to the patriotism and high character and impartiality of the Senate of Canada. But while paying them this compliment, he made the mistake of saying that there was no Parliament in the world, he believed, in which there was so great a disproportion between one party and the other. But, Sir Oliver Mowat says, not that there are only five Liberals in the Senate of Canada as the Governor General says he was informed and acts upon that information; but Sir Oliver Mowat estimates the relative proportion as one-fifth and four-fifths. Why, Sir, the informant of His Excellency did not even know how many Senators there are. There are eighty-one Senators, but His Excellency's informant supposed there were only seventy-eight, and that of that number only five were Liberals. Sir Oliver Mowat tells him that there are sixteen Liberals or thereabouts in the Senate to-day. You cannot have a better illustration (except the next one I will give you) of the utter unwisdom of a gentleman in the position of the executive head of this country undertaking to inform himself in reference to public questions otherwise than through the legitimate channels which the constitution of our own country, and the practice of our own country affirms is the only safe channel through which the Governor General should seek advice. Mr. Mowat—Sir Oliver Mowat, I beg his pardon for calling him "Mr.," for he wears his title with great credit to himself and with the very hearty approval, I believe, of the people of this country. Sir Oliver Mowat says:

> I feel the great difficulty that there may be in dealing with all these questions by a Liberal Government, because the Liberal party has so few followers here. Probably such a state of things never existed in any county before with representative institutions, that four-fifths of the number in one Chamber belong to one party and that the remaining fifth, or less than a fifth belong to the other party. I have felt that difficulty, and every one must have felt it, but I would not have consented to come into this House, I would not have felt it right to avail myself of the honour to have a seat in this House, and I feel it to be an honour, if I did not believe that the House would be found to be workable, even with a Liberal Government.

Now, Sir, that relieves at once the stigma of partisanship placed upon the Senate. I may say, Sir, that when in Quebec we were considering the question of a second chamber, a very remarkable thing occurred. More than thirty representatives of all the provinces of Canada, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, were present on that important occasion. When the question of the constitution of the upper chamber of the Canadian legislature was taken up, as I have said, a very remarkable thing occurred. It is well known that for many years previously Canada enjoyed the representative system in the Upper House, and a number of very able and distinguished men had been elected to the legislative council of old Canada. It must be remembered that the representatives present at the Quebec conference were of both political parties. The Government of Canada was a coalition Government of Liberals and Conservatives. The delegates from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick represented both Liberals and Conservatives, and the same applied to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. Among the representatives of both these parties from all these provinces, there was not one single voice but was unanimously in favour of a nominated Senate for life, except Sir Oliver Mowat and the Hon. Wm. McDougall. One of the ablest men at that conference, the Hon. George Brown—as will be found by a reference to his subsequent speeches—was one of the strongest supporters of a Senate nominated for life in opposition to an elective Senate. I say that the eulogium passed by Sir Oliver Mowat upon the Canadian Senate is well deserved. I say that from the day it was created, from the day that appointments were made and gentlemen went into that chamber to discharge the duties of an upper chamber for the Parliament of Canada; from that day down to this hour, their conduct has evidenced great ability in dealing

with public affairs. They are worthy representatives of the wealth, the intelligence, the intellect and the patriotism of Canada. Many of them are men of great experience who have previously served in the Parliament of their country. I can give no better evidence of this than to remind the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—who remembers it well, if the hon. First Minister does not—that the only occasions on which the Senate failed to give that support that was desired by Mr. Mackenzie, during his Administration, were occasions on which several of the foremost men of his own party walked out of this House rather than vote for the measures which the Senate rejected; and I myself heard Mr. Mackenzie say, at a later day, as I have no doubt many others did, admit that on those occasions on which the Senate differed from his Government, the Senate was right, and he was wrong. I say, therefore, so far as the character of that body is concerned, that they certainly are not entitled to be called Liberals and Conservatives, from a party standpoint. They have never exhibited partisanship. I have no hesitation in saying that it would be impossible to find any deliberative legislative assembly in the world that has exhibited through its whole career a more independent and impartial spirit, entirely irrespective of what party was in power. There have been occasions—I confess I did not think the Senate was right at the moment—on which the Liberal-Conservative party, with which I was connected, were treated by the Senate in regard to important measures with the same independent spirit that they exhibited on those two or three occasions during Mr. Mackenzie's régime. Any one who knows that great body, knows that it may be fairly looked upon in the light of a chamber of revision; and its services to this country on many occasions have been of the most important character. Whether the measures have been sent up by Mr. Mackenzie's Government or by Sir John Macdonald's Government, the revision they have undergone in the Senate has been of great value. But, when Sir Oliver Mowat says, as he says here, that he doubts whether any country in the world possesses a similar disparity, what does he say of the House of Lords? The House of Lords consists of 557 members; and it is a well-known fact that Lord Rosebery, when Prime Minister, estimated his entire support in that House at 64, or a little less than one-ninth, instead of one-fifth, the proportion in which the Liberal party is said to be represented in the Senate of Canada. And yet, Sir, with this great disparity, what did Her Majesty say, when Lord Derby, taking office in a minority, went to the country, and being badly beaten and compelled to resign, asked Her Majesty to increase that great disparity? Did she say: "You have got too many Conservatives in this House; the Liberal party have only one-ninth of the whole House, and I cannot accept these nominations"? Her Majesty knew too well what the constitution of the country requires at her hands; and she has ever shown, from the hour she ascended the throne down to this moment, that she has no eyes to see and no ears to be guided by any statement in opposition to that of her constitutional advisers and the Parliament of her country.

Then, Sir, what was the character of these appointments? In the case of Mr. Angers and Mr. Desjardins, the nominations that were submitted to His Excellency, had those gentlemen no claim? Having adorned, as they did for years, seats in this House, they went to the Senate, and they were recognized by every man in that Chamber as worthy of the positions they filled. They were recognized as men of high character, of independence, and of thorough knowledge of the wants of the country, and they never failed in discharging their duty. Why did they leave those positions? Sir, they left them at the invitation of the Crown; and came down and placed themselves in the hands of the people; and, having met with a reverse at the hands of the people, having failed to obtain the support of the country, I say that they had an indefeasible claim to be restored to the positions which, at the invitation of the Crown, they had surrendered. Had those appointments been made, they would have vindicated the choice in the future, as they had vindicated it in the past, and would have shown that they were worthily placed to do their country a service.

I will not detain the House further with that; but I come to the question of the judges. The informant, the adviser of His Excellency, whoever he was, and upon whose advice His Excellency relied, ventured to say, and to convince the Governor General, that there was not one Liberal judge on the bench in Canada. I say that distinctly, that the declaration on which His Excellency rested, was a declaration that there was not a Liberal judge on the bench in Canada. I say so, too. I say there is not a Liberal judge on the bench. I say there is not a Conservative judge on the bench. If there is anything of which this Parliament and this country have reason to be proud, it is the character of the judiciary of Canada. I say, Sir, there is no country in the world—not even the great mother country, England—that presents a judiciary which deservedly commands to a greater extent the confidence of every man, every party and every class of people in the country than does the judiciary of Canada. But, Sir, with regard to the imputation that no man had been a Liberal when he went on the bench, it gave me no trouble—and I have no doubt that I have overlooked a great many cases—to give His Excellency at once, from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada down to the judges of the Super-

ior Courts and County Courts in all the provinces, the names of no less than thirty judges who, when they went on the bench, were men of avowed Liberal proclivities. I give that as another evidence of the great danger—of the impossibility, Sir—of the government of this country being carried on under a system that enables persons holding no position of responsibility, secretly, unknown to the country, unknown to Parliament, unknown to the Government of the country, to obtain the ear of the Governor General of Canada. In this manner His Excellency placed reliance upon statements that are found, upon the most cursory examination——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is making an imputation against the Governor General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not the slightest. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will give you His Excellency's own language on the subject, and you will find that he says he has been told, he has been informed. Not by me—not by a responsible adviser. Therefore, I am commenting, and, in so doing, am not making any reflection upon His Excellency, on the question of responsibility assumed by the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman spoke all along of the secret informants of His Excellency. He has used that expression three or four times.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that I had no knowledge of His Excellency's informants.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman implies something certainly disrespectful to His Excellency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment he is, and I am sure he does not want, in the judgment of the Speaker of this House, to be considered disrespectful.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say, Sir, that I am afraid, if you will permit me to say so, that the imputation comes from the Chair, because I have not charged any disrespect.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow that from any hon. member of this House. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to say that the imputation comes from the Chair. The decisions which I make on questions so exceedingly delicate as this is, may be right or may be wrong. In my judgment, they are right and not unfair to either party of the House, and I am sure both sides of the House desire to maintain the rule which I quoted before, that, in this Chamber, the Governor General must not be spoken of disrespectfully. I quite appreciate the difficulty of making a distinction between His Excellency and the responsibility his advisers have assumed, but at the same time I think that can be done without casting any slur upon His Excellency.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I bow with great deference to your ruling, and I am quite certain that it does not arise from the slightest desire to limit my statements on this occasion any further than you feel obliged to do. I fully recognize that, and if I refer to these matters, it is because I want to place before the House the gravity of the position of opening the door to a course of conduct that, in my judgment, will be found fatal to all constitutional government in this country. I am glad to know that my remarks have nearly approached a conclusion, but there are one or two matters here that I scarcely know how to deal with. This communication from His Excellency says:

> There is a recommendation of a refund of money which requires the sanction of Parliament. Such recommendations will have to be placed before Parliament by the Ministers of the day, and you may perhaps consider that they may be left to be dealt with by these Ministers.

Will the House believe me when I say that this involved a paltry sum of $400, not a cent of which could be touched until Parliament had voted it, and yet the First Minister of Canada is told by the Governor General, on a question on which nothing can be done except Parliament gives its sanction, that the advice of His Excellency's constitutional advisers must be rejected.

I do not intend to deal with Mr. Payne's case, and I will tell my hon. friends opposite why. I have reason to believe—in fact I should be doing a great injustice to the First Minister if I did not say that I do believe—that under the peculiar circumstances, he will do all he can to consider Mr. Payne's position, and that is a matter of very great importance to him. But I simply draw his attention to this very briefly. Mr. Payne filled the position of private secretary to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and after Sir Mackenzie Bowell went to England, he became my private secretary, and I can only say that I found him a very faithful and a very able and a very well informed man. In fact, he is a man of very considerable ability. Before Sir Mackenzie Bowell left the Government, the Council, of which he was the head, recommended that Mr. Payne should succeed to the position rendered vacant by Mr. Pope when he became Under Secretary of State, namely, the position of Assistant Clerk of the Privy Council. Well, I can only say that that recommendation was made subject to Mr. Payne's passing the promotion examination. When the time came for that examination, he failed; but although he failed, according to the report of the examiner, I found that he had passed a most excellent examination. I found that in every fair and legitimate test of his ability

to fill the position for which he was appointed, instead of getting 70 he obtained over 90 per cent of the marks. Then my attention was drawn to the fact that the questions prepared by the Clerk of the Council were of a very difficult character, to say the least of it, and I think that any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble to peruse these questions, as they are found on the Table, will come to the same conclusion. I am inclined to think that most of the members of this House would have been rejected on an examination of this kind. I have had a good deal to do with public matters myself during forty years, but I would not like to be examined on those questions myself, and certainly would not have liked to have my tenure of office depend on my answering them; but be that as it may, the Governor General in Council are the persons who arrange what the examination shall be. The examination is not held under statute, but under regulations made and altered from time to time by the Governor General in Council, and that being the case, if the Governor in Council believed that the examination had been well passed and that the party was entitled to his promotion under it, and that these questions which were not answered, were all of too technical and far-fetched a character to give a fair chance to the candidate, there was nothing to prevent the Governor General in Council, which has the responsibility of the whole thing in their hand, modifying those regulations in such a way as to apply to that examination. On that ground the Council asked the Governor General to give the promotion on the ground that a thoroughly good and satisfactory examination had been passed by Mr. Payne. The question of legality was raised, but, if I may be allowed to say so, that is not a question for His Excellency, but for the Minister of Justice, and if the Minister of Justice reports, as he did, that it was all legal, and if there was precedent after precedent to be found for exactly that same thing in other departments, I do not see why the advice of the responsible Ministers is to be ignored and set aside.

An hon. MEMBER. What did you do with Mr. Mackenzie's secretary?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall answer that frankly. Mr. Buckingham was appointed by virtue of the power that Lord Dufferin permitted Mr. Mackenzie to exercise. Mr. Buckingham had only been a short time in the service, and he was appointed before Mr. Mackenzie went out a Deputy Minister. He had been very rapidly advanced to a very high position, with a large salary, in the Department of Railways and Canals. He was a man, I believe, of great ability, and would no doubt have made a very able Deputy Minister. As is well known to hon. gentlemen familiar with these matters, private secretaries to Prime Ministers are considered entitled to exceptionally favoured treatment, and the outgoing Prime Minister is always anxious, as far as he can, to provide for his private secretary. Mr. Mackenzie was animated by that sentiment, and was only in the exercise of his right when he appointed Mr. Buckingham to the high position of Deputy Minister. But Sir John A. Macdonald was going to be the Minister of that department—the Department of the Interior, and the Governor General approved of the appointment to this high office of a man who had been only a short time in the service and made him a deputy minister. Sir John A. Macdonald did not cancel, but he modified this by relegating Mr. Buckingham back to the Department of Public Works, where he was in receipt of a very good salary for the time he had been in the service. Now, I am dealing with the question whether I may say that had Mr. Payne been appointed to the position, had his appointment been confirmed to the position of assistant in the Privy Council office, I could quite understand that it is just possible that my hon. friend taking the position of the President of the Privy Council—and I had no knowledge at the time that he would take that position, for I preferred the portfolio, as Premier, of Secretary of State—but that is a matter of opinion—might have preferred some person in more confidential relations with himself and translated Mr. Payne to some other position. But we are not dealing with that. I am dealing with the question whether a Governor General in Canada shall undertake to obtain opinion from any outside source and overrule and override the advice given him by his constitutional advisers. That the Governor General is entitled to the fullest and most complete information in regard to everything that comes before him I quite admit. But I believe the proper practice was that the information was sought in a legitimate source of the Prime Minister, and the Governor General discussing with his Prime Minister any point that presented itself for his consideration, the question was solved by considerations presented and a conclusion arrived at satisfactory to both. But I say that under the circumstances I do not intend to go into it further than to give this brief statement of the position, hoping and trusting and sincerely desiring that my hon. friend will take some measure to do justice to the fair and legitimate claims of Mr. Payne. I do not wish to bribe the hon. gentleman, but I can only say that if the time should come when he will have to make a similar appeal to me in regard to his private secretary it will receive my most favourable consideration.

Now I am glad to be able to say that I must conclude these somewhat lengthy and tedious observations. But the point is an important one. We have been very fortunate in the Governors General we have had. Lord Monck, Lord Lisgar, Lord Dufferin, Lord Lorne, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Stanley.

And I never had greater pleasure in my life than I had in attending the banquet which was given to Lord Dufferin. I have said that until Mr. Mackenzie retired from office Lord Dufferin gave him his fullest confidence and fullest support. Mr. Mackenzie was beaten, as I have said, by an overwhelming majority, yet Lord Dufferin accepted every nomination he made, appointing judges of the Supreme Court, judges of the Superior Court, county judges—in fact, accepting every nomination, without hesitation of qualification. And Lord Dufferin left this country, as every person knows, after a very brilliant administration with the hearty approval and affectionate regard of every person regardless of party. He was here on the occasion of two very important political crises. Yet when I had the pleasure of attending the banquet in the city of London given to him when he returned from his Governorship, side by side with me sat Mr. Mackenzie; and it was a great source of pleasure to Lord Dufferin and to his friends to hear from the lips of both Mr. Mackenzie and myself the declaration that Lord Dufferin then enjoyed the hearty confidence and kindly feeling of every inhabitant of Canada of every party and every class. Now, Sir, that has been a condition with regard to every Governor General we have from confederation down to the present hour, and there is no gentlemen on either side of politics but will feel it to be of great importance that that should continue. No greater misfortune could happen to Canada in my opinion than that the time should come when anybody would feel that the Governor-General of this great Dominion represented not his sovereign who reigns in the hearts of the whole people but a party in the state. In this we should lose one of the great distinctions that give British institutions, in my opinion, such great superiority over republican institutions. And I can only say, as I said in rising that I have never been called upon to discharge so painful a duty in my life as to animadvert in the slightest degree upon the floor of Parliament upon the executive action of the executive head of the country.

I do not intend to conclude with a motion, and I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) frankly why. It is because I felt that it would intensify the difficulty if a majority in this House were to affix, by a solemn vote, their approval to what has taken place. I say I should regret that as intensifying the unpleasant nature of a position which nobody deplores more than I do. What I have said in relation to this matter has not been tinged with personal feeling. So far as I am personally concerned, I make no complaint. So far as the great party I have the honour to lead in this country is concerned, I make no complaint. But I feel that there are some things above and beyond party, and one of these is the maintenance of these great parliamentary institutions that have enabled England to become what she is and which have been adopted and copied down to the present time by Canada and have enabled all classes and all parties in this country to look to the Executive head of Canada with the same respect and confidence that the people of the whole Empire look to Her Majesty the Queen.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has rested the case which he has drawn to the attention of the House largely upon principles which no one disputes, upon principles which have come to us from men whose names will ever be dear to all shades of Liberals and Reformers. But when it came to the application of these principles, the hon. gentleman once more showed that when an ingrained Tory, if I may so speak of him, or a Liberal-Conservative, as I suppose he would prefer to be called, undertakes to apply Liberal principles, he is always apt to fall into sad and lamentable error. It may not be uninteresting, at the outset of this controversy, to review the facts and the arguments which constitute the head and front of the hon. gentleman's speech, in the light of events which are now matters of history. When, on the 9th July, the telegraphic wires spread the news throughout the country that the Administration of the hon. gentleman had surrendered the seals of office into the hands of His Excellency the Governor General, the impression was general throughout the country that he and his colleagues had at last loyally accepted their defeat, that they were loyally obeying the mandate they had received from the people, commanding them, in no uncertain tones, to vacate their offices and to give them up to men in whom the people had declared their confidence. But this impression, natural as it was, was erroneous; this impression, honourable as it was on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, gave them a measure of credit to which they were not entitled; because we have it to-day from the mouth of the hon. gentleman himself, we have it in these papers which have been laid on the Table of the House for some time, and to-day we have it confirmed by the hon. gentleman himself, that, if they surrendered the seals of office, it was not in obedience to the mandate of the people, but it was because, although they still presumed, to offer advice to His Excellency, His Excellency would no longer accept the advice of men whom the people had rejected. If His Excellency had accepted the advice of those hon. gentlemen, defeated though they were, they would have remained to govern the country until, as the hon. gentleman has said himself, they had been kicked once more by the representatives of the people. Now, such is a plain statement of the facts, and under such circumstances the hon. gentleman comes here and has the boldness—I might perhaps use a stronger word—to ask Parliament, impli-

edly, not actually, to censure His Excellency for the course which he adopted on that occasion. Well, Sir, here is my answer to the hon. gentleman: The Governor General has committed no wrong against the people of Canada. His Excellency has done what he had received a command from Her Majesty the Queen to do, he has made himself the custodian and the champion of the rights of the people of Canada. I do not hesitate to say more: if the conduct of His Excellency the Governor General has been the means of compelling the hon. gentleman and his colleagues to abide by the verdict of the people, which otherwise they would have disobeyed, I say here, that the name of Aberdeen, like the name of Elgin, will ever be reverenced by the people of this country who cherish constitutional and popular government. There is something, I will not exactly say comical, but verging on the comical, in this sudden, new-born zeal and respect of the hon. gentleman for the constitution. They are not in their element. They are reactionary, and, whenever reactionary people attempt to become Liberal, they are very apt to become revolutionary. It is only two weeks ago since the hon. gentleman who sits beside my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and whom I regret not to see in his seat to-day, the member for York (Mr. Foster)—it is only two weeks ago that he confided to us, in dolorous tones, that, since sitting in the cold shades of Opposition, his poor soul was harrowed with doubts and scruples from which it was quite free when sitting on this side of the House. When sitting on this side, he never hesitated to use and abuse special warrants in order to cover expenditures more or less questionable; but, sitting there, in the cold shades of Opposition, the hon. gentleman confessed to us that his soul was tortured because, forsooth, this Government had used special warrants in order to pay the wages and salaries of men who are giving their daily toil to the service of the country. To-day, we have the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition coming here and telling us that the constitution has been outraged because he was not allowed, under the circumstances of the case, to fill the Senate with his followers, and to fill the public service with his creatures. Now, let us look at the case, such as it is, let us examine it closely. What is the line of cleavage between the attitude taken by His Excellency the Governor General and the attitude maintained by the present leader of the Opposition? There was an election on the 23rd of June, as we all know, and that election did not result as the hon. leader of the Opposition had expected. He had indulged a good deal in the line of prophecy. He had told the admiring crowds of office-seekers that he was sure to sweep the country; he was sure to sweep the maritime provinces, he was sure to sweep the western section of Ontario, he was sure to sweep all Canada with the cry of religious passion which his followers were raising. It was expected that the Liberals would be snowed under for ever. But, Sir, events did not turn out that way, and, as soon as he found out that the Government had been defeated, my hon. friend and his colleagues were equal to the occasion. They set their hearts and hands at once to the task of filling the public service, from the Senate Chamber to the messengers' room, filling every hole, every nook, and corner, and crevice, with their appointments, so that the new Administration would have been forced to live, if that system had been carried out, in an atmosphere saturated with Toryism; and for years, perhaps, they would have been paralyzed by the conditions imposed upon them. The hon. gentleman, when under the strain of defeat, undertook to advise His Excellency to appoint Senators, to appoint custom-house officers, to appoint inland revenue officers, to appoint messengers and light-house keepers, and to fill the civil service in every grade. But His Excellency took the ground that, under the peculiar circumstances in which the hon. gentlemen were offering their advice, he could not appoint the Senators, neither would he appoint civil servants unless they belonged to a certain category. He would not make life appointments, and appointments involving the creation of new offices, or fill appointments for which no provision had been made by Parliament. Recommendations to that class of appointments His Excellency would not sanction. Now, Sir, here is another grievance of my hon. friend. I think I put the case just as he puts it, when he asked what information had the Governor General of the defeat of the Government. What right had he to make any distinction between one appointment and another? How did he know that the Government were defeated? He could only know that from the Prime Minister. Those were the questions the hon. gentleman put; this was the answer he gave. Again I ask, How could he know whether, on the 23rd of June, the Government was defeated? Who could have told him?. How did he know? He knew from his adviser, the Prime Minister, Sir Charles Tupper. He it was who had acquainted His Excellency with that fact. Sir, on the 25th June, two days after the election, there appeared in the Montreal "Gazette," the organ of the hon. gentlemen, the following despatch from Ottawa:—

Ottawa has not yet recovered from the surprise and astonishment caused by the defeat of the Conservative party yesterday. As far as this city is concerned the blow came like thunder from a clear sky, for although it was admitted that owing to the split in the Conservative ranks here one seat and possibly two would be lost in Ottawa, still the greatest confidence was felt that the party would be sustained by a majority throughout the Dominion. As to the causes of the defeat, there are a thousand and

one theories, but probably no one comes so near to the real cause as does Sir Charles Tupper in an interview which your correspondent has just had with him. Sir Charles attributes the disaster—

Sir Charles Tupper knew the disaster, then.

—to the fatal mistake which had been made of refusing to dissolve Parliament after the adoption of the remedial order and the calling of a session to deal with the Remedial Bill when the life of Parliament expired on a fixed date.

Sir, from this statement, it is clear that the leader of the Opposition knew quite well, two days after the election, that a disaster had overtaken his party. Then, the following day, the Montreal "Star" had the following despatch from Ottawa :—

It is understood that Sir Charles Tupper has received from London a large number of telegrams extending sympathy on his defeat.

Why, even in London they knew the hon. gentleman was defeated. Telegrams of sympathy were being sent him ; and it is only at Rideau Hall where it is supposed that nobody knew.

It was long after five o'clock last evening when the Ministers came out of Council. Sir Charles Tupper came almost last and walked briskly around his room in the Secretary of State's Department talking on the outcome of the elections.

"There is nothing for you to say," he said to a correspondent, "except this, that as soon as Council can conclude the routine business now before it, so soon will the Ministry resign. I can give you no date at present, but probably in a few days."

Not two hours ago the hon. leader of the Opposition asked the House, how could His Excellency know of the defeat of his Government ? Will the hon. gentleman pretend here that he would not treat His Excellency with the same respect as he treated the correspondent of a newspaper ? Will he pretend here that when he said to a newspaper correspondent that his party had been defeated, that he was prepared to vacate office as soon as the routine business was closed, he would have us believe that he was so disrespectful to His Excellency as not to give him the same advice ? Is the hon. gentleman prepared to have this House believe that he had so little respect for his duty and obligation to the representative of the Sovereign not to tell His Excellency the same fact which he had told the newspaper correspondent ? Now, what is there left of the case presented by the hon. gentleman, when the whole case is rested on the assumption that His Excellency could not act except upon the advice of his Ministry ? There is nothing left of the hon. gentleman's case, because the hon. gentleman cannot come here and tell this House that what he stated to the newspaper correspondent he did not state to His Excellency. What then did the hon. gentleman state to His Excellency ? He wrote to Quebec possibly, or when His Excellency came here, he said : My Lord, there is nothing now to do except that as soon as ever Council can conclude the routine business now before it, the Ministry will resign. That is the language which the hon. gentleman must have used to His Excellency—he could not have used any other language. So His Excellency in just two days after the elections learned that his Ministers had been defeated, and from that moment His Excellency was within his right, not only within his right, but within his duty when he kept the hon. gentleman strictly to the advice he had given—that is to say, that he was prepared to resign after he had completed matters of routine, but he would not go beyond that. That is the case as it is at the present time. My hon. friend spoke with his usual vigour on the British constitution, and if we are to believe him in the speech he delivered this evening, he had nothing in view but respect for the British constitution. If I understood him aright, Government is responsible to Parliament but not responsible to the people, and the voice of the people, can only be heard through the voice of Parliament and the voice of the people, as spoken by the people, is not to be taken into consideration. I do not say that there is not something in that argument. But that is not the modern doctrine, which is, that the Government is not only responsible to Parliament but to the people in whose behalf Parliament speaks. The theory propounded by the hon. gentleman is a hundred years old. The hon. gentleman well knows that the British constitution is not a cut and dried instrument. If there is one characteristic which distinguishes the British constitution more than another it is its elasticity. It has been found applicable as statute has followed statute and precedent followed precedent, and it has adapted itself to new eras of development as they have progressed from age to age. It has been applied without effort, wrench or hindrance from the time of the personal absolutism of the early Plantagenet kings down to the Democratic Government of Queen Victoria. Responsible government was the greatest conquest achieved by the British people under the constitution. In early days government was responsible to Parliament. But it could hardly be said that Parliament represented the people—it represented the classes and the privileged classes, but not the people ; and the great Reform Bill of 1832, followed as it has been by successive instalments and extensions, brought the Parliament of Great Britain and the Parliament of Canada to be expressions of the direct voice of the people. This is a new doctrine, which is new in operation,—that as soon as the voice of the people has been heard, immediately the Ministers of the Crown shall take advice as to whether they have been supported or not by the people. The first statesman to deal with this question and to take this view was Mr. Disraeli after the great Reform Bill of 1868. Mr. Disraeli appealed to the

country. He was defeated, and on being defeated, immediately he sent his resignation to the Crown. It was a novel step, a step not possible in the last century, but a step not only necessary but advisable under the new development of the British constitution. And this is the reason given by Mr. Disraeli for his action :

> Although the general election has elicited, in the decision of numerous and vast constituencies, an expression of feeling which, in a remarkable degree, has justified their anticipations, and which in dealing with the question in controversy, no wise statesman would disregard. It is now clear that the present Administration cannot expect to command the confidence of the newly-elected House of Commons. Under these circumstances, Her Majesty's Ministers have felt it due to their own honour, and to the policy they support, not to retain office unnecessarily for a single day.

This is the first precedent. Six years afterwards Mr. Gladstone, who had been in office during that time, went to the country and was defeated, and forthwith he sent in his resignation. That was in 1874. Then Mr. Disraeli came back into power. In 1880 general elections took place, and resulted in the defeat of Mr. Disraeli's Government. Forthwith Mr. Disraeli forwarded his resignation to the Queen. Six years afterwards at the general elections the Government of Mr. Gladstone was defeated, and again on that occasion Mr. Gladstone, without waiting to meet Parliament, sent his resignation to the Queen. At the last elections, 1892, Lord Salisbury was defeated, but instead of sending his resignation to the Queen, he chose to meet Parliament, and to be defeated on the debate on the Address. The reason which induced Lord Salisbury to meet Parliament was that a majority was not apparent, and that the Liberal strength was made up of a heterogeneous combination, including Radicals, Home Rulers and labour representatives, whose opinions could not be obtained except by a vote in the House. We have it clearly set forth that this was the reason why Lord Salisbury did not resign at once. But this argument cannot apply in the present case. We have had the words of the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Tupper) that two days after the elections he said he knew he had been defeated. Well, Sir, if he knew he had been defeated, in the view of the precedents I have quoted, he had only one course to take, and that was, to discharge all routine business, then take his cane, gloves and hat and walk out and make place for another. This is the only view in my estimation which the question can admit of. This is the view which His Excellency took, and this is the view which the advisers of His Excellency are prepared to maintain not only on the floor of Parliament, but to maintain also with great confidence of success all over the country. It is the view which is in consonance with the rights of the people such as we understand them at the present time. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) made another point. He stated that although defeated the outgoing Administration had the right to appoint Senators, because, as he says, it is acknowledged in England that the outgoing administration has the right to appoint peers. But, Sir, there is a qualification upon this. Does the right of the outgoing Administration in England go so far as the hon. gentleman has stated ? Does the rights of the outgoing administration in England go to the extent without qualification of appointing peers ? It does not as I understand it. Let me quote an authority upon this subject. Todd says :

> The moment it was proved that those peerages had really been agreed to by the outgoing Minister, he having taken the pleasure of the Crown on the point, that moment the Ministers in power agreed to confirm the grant, and thus respected the engagements of their predecessors.

Sir, I can understand that. If the outgoing administration before the election had taken the precaution, or had advised the Crown, of nominating Mr. so and so to the House of Lords, and if the Crown had agreed to that, I could well understand that the honour of the Crown under such circumstances was pledged ; and that it was the duty of the new ministry to fulfil these obligations, since the honour of the Crown was pledged to them. But, does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) pretend that he had obtained the sanction of the Crown to the appointment of Mr. Angers or of Mr. Desjardins or of Mr. Nat White or of Mr. Gooderham. He cannot pretend anything of the kind. If the hon. gentleman had told His Excellency before the election : I have advised Mr. Angers to resign in the Senate, but I warn Your Excellency that if he is defeated by the people, I shall claim the privilege of re-appointing him to the Senate ; and if His Excellency had agreed to such an extraordinary bargain as that—because it would be nothing short of a bargain—then I can understand that the hon. gentleman would have some ground to stand upon. But, he pretends nothing of the kind, and his argument therefore is untenable. There is another point of difference, and what is it ? I am glad for my part that we should be able to compare the Canadian Senate to the House of Lords, but, Sir, there is an immense difference between them as the hon. gentleman knows. The number of the Senators is limited, and therefore if the Senate is crammed with one party the incoming administration might find it an absolute impossibility to carry on its legislation. On the other hand, the House of Lords is not limited in number and if the outgoing administration were to make appointments which would be embarrassing to the incoming administration, then the incoming administration has the right of suggesting and making other appointments. There is no similar feature in the Senate here.

But there is something more. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is strong

upon the constitution. I charge here against him and against his party, that in so far as the Senate of Canada is concerned, they have all along for the last eighteen years disregarded the constitution of Canada in the nature of the appointments which they made to that branch of the legislature. It was one of the well understood principles at confederation—and the hon. gentleman referred a moment ago to the debates of the Quebec convention—it was one of the well understood principles then, that if the Senate was not elective, and if it was to be appointed by the Crown, then both political parties should be equally represented on the floor of the Senate. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that rule in practice although it cannot have escaped his memory. He quoted a moment ago the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat who at that early date was against a nominative Senate and in favour of an elective Senate. Certainly, Sir, the practice of late years has shown that at that time as now, Sir Oliver Mowat possessed the same sagacity which has distinguished all his political career. That very same question came up for debate in this House some twenty-two years ago. In 1872, Mr. Mackenzie had made some attack upon the constitution of the Senate (the very point which we have before us at the present time), and Sir John Macdonald who was the leader of the Government resented the attack with great vehemence. This is how Sir John Macdonald spoke:

> With regard to the provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada, a full selection was made without reference to political principles. In the province of Upper Canada a fair arrangement was made between himself and the Hon. George Brown, then and now the leader of the party of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) is a member, and although Mr. Brown retired from the Government before the selection was made, he (Sir John) felt that still the arrangement was obligatory, and he asked his hon. friend from North Lanark, and the present Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, the representatives of the Reform party in the Government of the day to sit down with him and select the twenty-four men for the Senate. He (Sir John) wrote a name, choosing from his own party, and they selected their man, and the consequence was twelve Reformers and twelve Conservatives were elected to sit in that Chamber, and no one knew better than his hon. friend that it was a fair understanding that the claims of members of the legislative council of old Canada to seats in the Senate should be considered as vacancies might take place, and that had been faithfully carried out.

This was the pledge which was taken by all the members who sat at the Table to frame the confederation resolutions. Has that pledge been kept by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) and his party? No, for the hon. gentleman and his friends saw to it that no appointments were made to the Senate but those of their own partisans. The hon. gentleman spoke a moment ago of the high character of the Senate. I have nothing to say derogatory of the character of the Senate. Let it be ever so able a body, does the hon. gentleman pretend that it has that character of fairness which was expected of it when the Senate was created to be nominative and not elective. Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knows very well that His Excellency had a fair case in hand when he pointed out to the hon. gentleman, that if four new Senators of the Conservative persuasion were appointed it would be a source of embarrassment to the incoming administration. At that time the hon. gentleman was defeated. He knew that he had to resign for he had stated so himself, and he knew there must be a new Liberal Administration. How would the case have stood? There were four vacancies in the Senate including one from the province of Ontario, which the hon. gentleman proposed to fill. It had been stated throughout the whole country during the election campaign that Sir Oliver Mowat was to enter the Administration as leader of the Liberal Government in the Senate, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knew it. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) had had his wish; if he had been able to fill the only vacancy which then existed in the province of Ontario, the Liberal Administration, the Government of to-day, would have been placed in a position of almost superhuman difficulty in that respect. Sir, the hon. gentleman, under such circumstances, does not hesitate to blame His Excellency for the course he took. Every man in this House or out of the House who has the instinct of justice in his bosom will approve the course of His Excellency upon that occasion.

Then, Sir, what about the judges? I do not see much importance in discussing the question of the judges upon this occasion, because the matter came up simply hypothetically. But, Since the hon. gentleman has alluded to it let me refer to the subject. This is what His Excellency said with regard to the judges, and I submit, Sir, that the statement of the hon. gentleman a moment ago was not only most disrespectful in tone and words, but it was most unfair to His Excellency as well. This was the simple remark made by His Excellency:

> In the case of judges, I will only add that, bearing in mind the ordinary length of their tenure of office and also the long political predominance of one political party in the Dominion Parliament, the current deduction as to the complexion of the political opinions represented upon the bench, whether baseless or well founded is not unnatural.

Sir, the hon. gentleman finds fault with that. The hon. gentleman knows the condition of things in this country. I have nothing to say against the bench. I am prepared to admit everything he said in honour of it. But, Sir, judges are men like all other men; and the hon. gentleman knows very well that whatever may have been the practice before 1878, since that time all appointments

to the bench have been made not so much for judicial fitness as for the reward of political service. I am sorry to have to speak in that way; but, Sir, I speak the truth as it is known to every man in this country. That there are men whose political services were not ignored when they were appointed to the bench, but who are a credit to the bench, I admit; but suppose every man appointed to the bench were ever so free from partisanship, we have all had sufficient experience of life to know that unconsciously, whether Liberals or Conservatives, we grow into one groove of opinion; and happy is the man who can say that he is never biased by the opinions of his life. Judges on the bench continue to be human. I do not impugn their motives or their good intentions; and fortunately at this moment it is not necessary for me to do so. But, Sir, who can say, when a case arises, especially one of a political nature, that the judge on the bench is not biassed by the political opinions he has held during his life? If I went through my own country, I might find instances of that. I prefer not to do it; but let me go to another country; let me go to the republic to the south of us. The Supreme Court of the United States, as is well known, has been long regarded as one of the great judicial tribunals of the world. It has earned the praise of de Tocqueville and other great thinkers; and certainly all praise bestowed upon it was well deserved. But we know that on a famous occasion, after the presidential election of 1876, when the question was referred to a commission in which that great court was represented, whether Mr. Hayes or Mr. Tilden had a majority of the electoral vote, the judges of that court who sat in the commission divided on every question upon party lines. Does the hon. gentleman presume to say that Canada is better than other countries in that respect? Canadian judges are liable to all the passions of mankind; and in view of the fact that every man appointed to the bench for the last eighteen years had been taken from the ranks of the Conservative party, it was not unnatural for His Excellency to think that perhaps it would be in the interest of the country if judges were now taken from the other side of politics. Not, Sir, I am sure, that His Excellency wanted to convey the impression that judges carried their politics with them on the bench; but simply because His Excellency could not be blind to the fact that judges are weak and human like all other mortals.

As to the case of Mr. Payne I do not care to say much, and I would not have referred to it had the hon. gentleman not introduced it. I think it is a very small thing to be brought into this debate. Mr. Payne was the private secretary of the hon. gentleman, and my hon. friend before he left office wanted to have him appointed to one of the most important offices in the civil service, that of deputy clerk of the Privy Council. Mr. Payne, in order to qualify for that position, had to pass an examination. He passed the general examination creditably, but he failed in the technical examination. The hon. gentleman a few days ago—I hope I shall be pardoned if I refer to it—was most unfair to Mr. McGee when he stated that he could not obtain the questions from Mr. McGee. Why should Mr. McGee have concealed those questions? Mr. McGee has assured me that the hon. gentleman in this respect must have been in error, because he was not conscious of having refused those questions. But why, in the name of common sense, should Mr. McGee refuse those questions when they were prepared with the sanction of Mr. Angers, then President of the Council, and approved by the Governor in Council? Mr. Payne, having failed in that examination, was not qualified for the office; and when under these circumstances the hon. gentleman advised His Excellency to appoint Mr. Payne to that office, he advised His Excellency to commit an illegality, and under those circumstances His Excellency was not bound to accept the advice of his adviser.

Now, Sir, I come to a reproach which I was not a little astonished to find in the mouth of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman quoted from a state paper of His Excellency the following sentence, in which His Excellency deals with what took place here during last session:

> The previous Administration (with Sir Mackenzie Bowell as Prime Minister), representing the views of the same political party, and having a majority in both chambers, failed to pass its proposed legislation, and on the 25th April Parliament expired by effiux of time, without having granted supplies for the public service beyond the 30th of June.

The hon. gentleman challenged that statement of His Excellency. He said that there was an innuendo here, which was not borne out by the facts—that His Excellency conveyed thereby the impression that supplies had been refused by Parliament to the then existing Government, which the hon. gentleman characterized in strong and severe language as most unwarrantable, and as conveying a false impression to any man who did not know the exact state of the facts. Sir, I invite the attention of the hon. gentleman to a motion which was moved in this House by his neighbour the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), for which he spoke and for which he voted. Here it is:

> That on the 28th of January the House was asked to go into Committee of the Whole for granting supply, and to consider first the appropriations for departmental salaries and contingencies.
>
> That neither then, nor on the several occasions thereafter when the House was asked to grant supply did the Opposition agree thereto.
>
> That appeals were made by the Government setting forth the urgent necessity for making provision for the ordinary and regular expenditures for the approaching fiscal year, or in view of the impending dissolution and of the fact that

the new Parliament could not possibly assemble before July 1st and would probably meet shortly thereafter, for a part thereof.

That despite these representations and although the circumstances were well-known and there was ample time at the disposal of the House, supplies for the year 1896-97 were refused and Parliament rose on the 23rd April without these supplies being granted.

Sir, the statement which the hon. gentleman characterized a moment ago as conveying to the public a false impression, is not half so strong as the statement for which he spoke and voted less than two weeks ago. Here we have the statement, not by innuendo but positively made, that Parliament deliberately refused to grant supplies to the outgoing Administration; and, Sir, in the face of that condition of things, when the late Government could not obtain supplies from Parliament, when it was resting under the strongest censure that could be passed by Parliament, the hon. gentleman dares to complain that he was treated with severity. I say, Sir, that he was treated with great leniency, because under such circumstances he had not the right even to appoint a messenger or to spend a single dollar. The hon. gentleman to-day comes before Parliament—for what? To vindicate the constitution? No, Sir. The complaint of my hon. friend is the last wail of the disappointed office-grabber. All this quibbling and equivocating, and pettifogging, and hair-splitting is absolutely meaningless, unless there were behind it some moral wrong. But moral wrong there is none. His Excellency committed no harm to anybody, and conferred a great benefit on this nation, because he showed that, in this nineteenth century, under the British Crown, and by the aid of the British Crown, the people shall have government of the people by the people and for the people, and for this all true Canadians will revere the name of Aberdeen for ever and for ever.

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

(In the Committee.)

Clothing and necessaries, ordinary vote.. $90,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand that this item was reserved in order to give an opportunity for general discussion, and I believe the late Minister of Militia wishes to discuss it. As he is not in the House now, I would ask the hon. gentleman to let it stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it was understood that this should stand for the purpose of general discussion. I should like to ask the Minister of Militia if he would kindly lay upon the Table the letter I asked for.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I will lay it on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We will let that item stand.

Tidal service, Tide gauges, instruments and staff.. .. ..$15,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman explain this increase of $5,000?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). These Estimates are in exact conformity with those brought down last session. I have not made any alteration whatever. I find that the vote for 1895-96 was $10,000, and the expenditure within a few dollars of that sum. In the Estimates submitted for last year $15,000 was asked, and I assume that it was for some expenses of the service. But Mr. Dawson has not returned from his labours, and I have had no opportunity to consult with him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am glad to see the additional amount here. This service is a very important one, and I have always been afraid that we were going a little too slowly, for the result of the survey in connection with the currents of the St. Lawrence and approaches to it are becoming of greater importance every day. We began on a small scale, and gradually increased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not wish to mislead the House into believing that I have formed an opinion as to the desirability of expending this extra $5,000. Until I see Mr. Dawson's report, and have an opportunity of consulting with him, I cannot form an opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You will find you need all the money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I keep an open mind on the subject. So far, I have only adopted the estimate of my predecessor.

Removal of obstruction in navigable rivers $3,000

Mr. CLANCY. If my memory serves me well, some discussion took place in this House last session as to whether the removal of obstructions in rivers should come under the head of Public Works or Marine and Fisheries. Will the hon. gentleman say what service this $3,000 is intended for? Of course, the amount is small.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is largely a nominal vote. Last year the expenditure was only $453. It is only for emergencies.

Winter mail service $6,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is the hon. Minister able to state what decision the Government have arrived at in connection with the service between Portland and St. John, N.B.? The hon. gentleman is aware that the late Government arrived at the conclusion

that it was very important to have a winter port in Canada.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to suggest that that subject could be discussed better on the vote for mail subsidies. This relates to Prince Edward Island alone.

Mr. HACKETT. I see there is a decrease in this vote. Is it the intention to reduce the service, or will the Government keep the steamer "Stanley" and the boats running?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We shall not only keep the steamer "Stanley" and the boats as usual, but I hope to be able to make a proposition for the increased efficiency of the service in the Supplementary Estimates. The vote last year was $5,000, but $7,000 was expended, and the late Ministry proposed the vote as a tentative proposition. I just adopted this, but, if my colleagues approve of it, I hope to submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) a proposition for improving the service, for which I hope I shall have his support.

Salaries and allowances of lightkeepers.. $205,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the reason of the increase in this vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The vote last year was $201,600, and the expenditure the same, within a few dollars. There is always an increase in the salaries, and some new lights are to be established.

Maintenance and repair to lights..... $230,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it is only fair to congratulate the department on its ability to keep this item so well in hand. It is remarkable that, notwithstanding new lights established, the maintenance charge is kept almost at the same figure.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And the department, last year, did not spend quite so much as the House voted.

Construction, &c., of lights .....$ 20,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose the increase is due to the building of new lights.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes—lights at the entrance to Ship's Harbour, Great Bras D'Or Lake, the East Gap of the Toronto Bay, and other places.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention to rebuild the light near Point Claire, which was burned?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; I answered the hon. gentleman's question, of which notice was given. It is the intention of the Government to rebuild the light referred to.

Hydrographical survey .....$ 16,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman say where these surveys are being carried on?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot say off-hand.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They were at Lake Erie, and I desired to know if they had entered, or were about to enter, other waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have been discussing with Colonel Anderson the necessity of extending the surveys. I have not seen the officer in charge. He will not be back until the autumn.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are still at Lake Erie. They have not completed that work yet.

Salaries and disbursements of fishery overseers and fishery guardians..... $100,000

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is his intention to make a wholesale dismissal of the fishery overseers through the province of Ontario simply for having voted at the late election. I am in receipt to-night of a letter from one of the fishery officers, who is drawing a salary, I think, of $30 a year. He writes me that he simply voted in the late election, but he has received a letter from the Minister which reads as follows:

Ottawa, Sept. 18th, 1896.

Sir,—Information has been laid in this department of a very reliable character to the effect that at the late election you were a prominent and active canvasser and worker in favour of Mr. George Taylor, the Conservative candidate for the riding, and that your conduct was that of an open partisan. I have to call upon you to state immediately whether you acknowledge or whether you are prepared to deny having taken a prominent part in the late election on behalf of Mr. Taylor.

I know as a matter of fact that this young man simply voted, took no active part at all in the election, but there is a complaint in. If that is going to be the course pursued by the Minister, and if these officers are all to be dismissed, I do not see any need for this vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am not going to be as hard as he imagines. I fancy if the facts turn out to be as he states them, his friend will not be in any serious peril; but if the facts turn out to be as the information alleges they were, I should imagine that he would hardly expect him to be retained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries really intends to adopt the policy that a fishery officer at $30 a year, is to be prevented from voting and canvassing at

an election ? That merely having been an active canvasser is going to deprive him of his office ? It seems to me that is a frightful doctrine to apply to persons in receipt of $30 a year. I can quite understand that this policy would be adopted toward a man who had been an offensive partisan ; but if he merely takes an energetic part in favour of the party he believes to be right, without being offensive, I do not think my hon. friend should dismiss him.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this is small potato business, that a man who is getting a salary of $30 a year is to be precluded from taking an active part in politics. Some years ago the president of the Reform Association for our county, and who was postmaster of a very important village, during an election campaign, took an active part against me, yet no effort was ever made to disturb him, because he had the right, and I recognized he had the right, to do what he did. I never made any complaint. Is the Minister going to adopt the American system of putting new men into every post ? That would be straight work, but to adopt the policy of asking a man receiving $30 a year, either to affirm or deny the statement that he had taken an active part in the election, is something that cannot be tolerated.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would like to contrast the conduct which has been pursued by the Minister in this case, with the action taken by friends of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. A few years ago an election took place in my county, in which I was elected. About a week after the election took place, a fishery overseer in my constituency receiving a little more than the friend of the hon. member opposite —I believe he had $50 a year, received a letter from the defeated candidate telling him that in consequence of his active support of my candidature, he would be dismissed. He received no intimation of the purpose of the Government to dismiss him, and was given no opportunity for explanation or defence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope we shall not get into a wrangle over this vexed question. I have taken the step that I thought hon. gentlemen desired should be taken. Charges were made that this fishery officer was an active and prominent canvasser.

Mr. WALLACE. Not that he was taking an offensive part.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will see when we get the evidence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The letter does not use the word offensive.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it is necessary to say offensive, because offensive does not convey a much stronger idea than the language I used. One gentleman will deem it offensive if a fishery officer goes round from house to house canvassing ; it depends very much upon the facts of each case. I am not acting in a ruthless way, or hastily. I do not think there has been a fishery officer dismissed in the whole of Ontario. But information having been laid against this man, I thought it was fair to take this step, which the House seemed to think ought to be taken.

Mr. TAYLOR. He says he did nothing but vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he did nothing but vote, he has fallen into very good hands, so far as I am concerned. But I have laid down the rule that every man has an unqualified right to vote for whom he pleases without being called into question. I am the last man in the world to seek to put a limitation upon that right. But I understood we had reached an agreement in the House that neutrality was to be the price of permanency, and that if gentlemen wanted to remain permanently in the civil service, they were to remain neutral so far as offensive and active participation in party politics was concerned. Nothing is farther from my mind than the introduction of the spoils system.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am glad to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say that a man who votes in an election has nothing to fear. I may say when I entered the House in 1878, nearly every official in my county was a Liberal and took an active part in endeavouring to secure my defeat. Some of those men acted very offensively. I made several appeals to the Prime Minister and to the Minister at the head of the department for an examination to be made, and if the parties were guilty of the charge alleged, they should be dismissed. But I was asked to be silent on the matter, and the opinion was expressed that it would be most unfair to deprive men of their liberty of action at the time elections were held. Consequently I had to submit to the inevitable, and allow those parties to remain in their positions. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will exercise the same discretion, and will follow the example so worthily set by the previous Government.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to detain the committee as this question has been pretty well threshed out ; but the Minister must see that it is very difficult to draw the line by which reasonable action can be taken. If any voter is charged with taking an active part in an election only, and is not charged with taking an offensive part, then it is very doubtful if he should be put on the gridiron. An offensive part is not only offensive to a party, but it is against public morals ; but if the offence is only one of taking an active part in an election, it is one

only against a political party and is not one against public morals or the public interest. I suggest to the hon. Minister, who is a lawyer, that it is a rather singular proceeding to call upon a man to establish his own innocence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are difficulties, no doubt.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the first intimation I have received that this course is to be pursued. If so, I wish the Government to make a clean slate. In my county I could point to a postmaster in particular who was secretary of the Reform Association, who managed the campaign in that part of the constituency, who took the platform and was more than active, even very offensive in his remarks to me on the platform, and at meetings where I was not present as well as at meetings where I was present. If the axe is to be applied to the heads of Conservatives, I want the Government to go through the list and decapitate gentlemen who took the other side as well as those who fought for the Conservative party. I think it is right for every man to advocate the claims of the party to which he belongs, notwithstanding the fact that he holds a paltry office appointment and draws $100, $200, or $300 a year. Here is a case of a fishery officer who draws, I think, $30 a year, who is an innocent man and simply casts his vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If that is true, he will come to no harm.

Mr. TAYLOR. He had written asking in regard to his position.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let him write to the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. He may be treated in the manner indicated by the Minister of Railways and Canals—his head may be cut off without trial.

Building and maintenance of fish breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries $40,000

Mr. GILLIES. Can the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state whether it is proposed to place new fish breeding establishments ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. With the exception of one small establishment, the construction of which the commissioner is contemplating, there will be no new establishments. This amount is for maintenance.

Mr. GILLIES. A very strong application was made to the department last year for the establishment of a lobster hatchery on the Cape Breton coast. The application was strongly pressed by experts in fish breeding, and the then Minister contemplated acting on the application. I wish to press this matter on the attention of the Minister, and if the proposition has merits, I trust he will seek, if possible, to give effect to the wishes of the applicants.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to ask the Minister if he does not consider money to be well expended in establishing fish hatcheries on various points in the maritime provinces, more particularly at fishing centres. The county I represent is the largest fishing county on the whole coast. I am repeatedly urged to secure the establishment of hatcheries there, and I ask the Minister to make a note of this matter, and see if the wishes of the people cannot be complied with.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will make a note of it. I think, however, the experiments have reached that stage when no Minister would be justified in stopping the work that is being done, or would be justified in stating that the results are such as to afford positive conclusions on the subject. Commissioner Prince has published a report showing the work that has been done, and what results he thinks have been accomplished. I do not profess to have come to any conclusion on the matter. I have on this and other points an open mind, and it is my intention to give it some attention if I remain in the department.

Fishery protection service..... $100,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a reduction of $7,392. Is it because it is proposed to decrease the amount afforded for the protection of fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $100,000 were voted last year, and a much larger sum was spent owing to $20,000 being transferred from customs on account of the steamer "Constance" acting as a revenue cutter. Last year a new vessel was built, and she was launched four weeks ago at Shelburne harbour, the crew of the "Vigilant" being transferred to her. We have received a letter from Commander Spain, saying she is a good ship.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will ask the attention of the Minister (Mr. Davies) to the matter of the distribution of the fishery bounty. In my time, we adopted a plan that, I think, was best calculated for an expeditious distribution of the bounty. We gave an additional amount to officers in the department, over and above their salaries, to work after hours and prepare all the papers and cheques under the direction of the officer in charge in that branch. The officer in charge selected such officers from the department as he considered efficient, and they managed to have the bounty distributed at the earliest time it had ever been distributed before. I believe that last year they went back to the old plan of employing outside men to do this work. My objection to that is in the interests of the fishermen. No matter how intelligent outside men may be, they cannot possibly do the work as rapidly as trained officers in the department,

who have had great experience in the work. The bounty, when it is distributed, is not much to each fisherman, but it is worth twice as much when he gets it promptly, so that I hope the hon. gentleman will consider this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My attention was called, the other day, to the necessity of commencing this work without delay. They are sending out the papers now and getting in the claims, and about the 1st of November they will prepare the cheques, when the claims are returned. I realize the importance of promptness, and I will consider carefully the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DIMOCK. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fish-way at Waugh's River, in the county of Colchester, which was built by Messrs. McKay and Matheson. The fishery inspector informed them that the usual one-half the cost would be reimbursed by the Government. Mr. Patterson, the late representative of the county, has written to the department more than once about the matter, but the money has not yet been paid. I would ask the Minister to look into it, and have a cheque sent to these gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall look into the matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. While the Minister is doing that, I wish he would also look into a similar case at Caledonia.

Mr. GIBSON. I understand the hon. member (Mr. Montague) wanted the fishery overseer to pay the whole of that, instead of the parties who were getting the benefit of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to know where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) got his information, because he is speaking quite wide of the mark. These gentlemen are not, in the first place, political friends of mine, but are staunch Liberals and friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. The fishery officer instructed them to build a fish-way, and, as I think the affidavits establish, he informed them that, if they did so, half the expense would be paid by the department. Afterwards the fishery officer said he did not make that statement, and there was a dispute as to whether the department should pay half the expense or not. I think the department should pay half the expense, and I was merely asking the Minister to make a note of it. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) knows nothing about the matter at all.

Mr. GIBSON. I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) the information I speak from, to-morrow.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have stated the facts correctly, and I trust the hon. gentleman will do me the honour of believing that I did so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will make a note of the case of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague). With respect to the matter which the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Dimock) speaks of, I understand there was a dispute between the department and the claimants as to the amount, and the department offered $40, which I understand the claimants have agreed to accept. In that case the matter will be disposed of.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have a similar case in my county on the Mush a Mush River. An arrangement was made by the fishery officer with the mill-owner that the Government would defray half the cost of putting up the fish weir. The work was done and representation made to the department, but the mill-owner has never received one cent for his outlay. Will the Minister kindly make a note of the case?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will inquire about that case also.

Resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES—TRANSLATORS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that the second report of the Debates Committee be concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask what is the subject-matter of that report?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The report speaks for itself, it is printed, and is before the House. The report recommends the dismissal of Messrs. Joseph Bouchard, Peter McLeod and J. B. Vanasse from the staff of the translators of the Debates.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that if he is anxious, as I understand he is, to do some necessary work in Supply, if this motion gets prece-

dence, it will probably take a day or two to finish it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If I could have my hon. friend's assurance that nothing else would intervene to prevent us going into Supply, I should join with him and agree to let the matter stand. But I understand the hon. gentleman himself had something to bring up.

Mr. FOSTER. I was informed it was the intention of the hon. gentleman to take concurrence and move a Supply Bill for the Estimates which have already been granted in committee, and which I believe cover the whole civil service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I had in contemplation was that, assuming that to-day would be spent in Supply, we should take concurrence to-morrow. I was not aware until just now that the hon. gentleman had proposed bringing up some other matters this afternoon. I would like him to consider whether that could not be done, and whether we could not take concurrence to-morrow, and only take such items to-day as might be agreed upon, so that the Supply Bill might go through to-morrow without any question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not think there will be any debate on this question.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend the Finance Minister will see that he has the most urgent of his supplies already. I imagine it would disturb our arrangements here to put off for a long time the motion I am going to make. But I should like to expedite in every way possible concurrence in what has passed, and I think we can so arrange as to put through the Supply Bill without delay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the motion of the hon. gentleman for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) is going to lead to a protracted debate, I will concur in the suggestion of the hon. member for York.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not see why it should cause a debate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We cannot help it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I only ask the House to concur in the report, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must recollect that he is but one of 213 members, and he can scarcely impose his will on the House.

Mr. DAVIN. The motion of my hon. friend could not possibly be dealt with in less than four or five hours.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I would advise my hon. friend to let his motion stand in order to set a good example, although it is an example, I fear, that is not going to be followed on the other side.

Motion withdrawn.

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. ROGERS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 29) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain.

Mr. ROGERS. The Bill is to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, and I wish the subject could have been handled by some hon. member who is more accustomed to addressing the House than I am. It is quite evident that railway corporations have great powers in this country, and the people feel it. They consider, whether rightly or wrongly, that the mass of the people are under the power of railway corporations to a great extent. Those corporations are far-seeing business-like, bright and shrewd people, and they do not grant any favours to anybody for nothing. I think it impossible that the granting of passes should have any influence directly or indirectly, on hon. members, but I can assure this House that the belief is entertained outside that passes are granted to secure some ends for the railway companies, or they would not be given. We all know there are no corporations possessing so little soul as railway corporations. It is therefore obvious that the people of the country should not be under any compliment to railway corporations for favours. An enormous amount of aid has been given to the building of railways, aggregating in money and lands many millions of dollars. Moreover, enormous sums are received annually by those corporations for carrying the mails. We are aware that under the Election Act almost the slightest illegal act disqualifies a member, whether done directly or indirectly. The payment of even something like 75 cents will disqualify a member. Members of Parliament practically occupy the position of arbitrators between the people and these railway corporations. If in private life there is a matter in dispute and a man acts as arbitrator, and receives passes from a railway corporation which is one of the parties, the opinion would be expressed that he was violating his obligation. I have said that a strong feeling prevails throughout the country on this subject; I may add that there is no question before the country on which the press of both sides is so unanimous. It is held that Parliament should take some action on this matter. What action this Government should take, I leave for the members of the Government to decide; but I hold that there is no reason why the members of this House should receive mileage and at the same time hold free passes. I hope action will be taken on this line, and I have introduced this Bill in order to obtain the views of the Government, and

I trust in their own interest they will take such action as will satisfy the people.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

A. E. FORGET.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask my hon. friend who represents the Department of the Interior in this House whether he is aware that A. E. Forget, Commissioner of Indian Affairs at Regina, has sent around to all agents under his control a circular telling them only to deal with friends of the Government; and whether, if he has heard this report, this act has been taken by direction of the Government.

Mr. DOBELL. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that I have not received any information from the agent to whom the hon. gentleman has alluded.

FAST LINE OF STEAMERS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to call the attention of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) to a telegram which appeared in a rather long article, which I will not trouble the House with reading, in the "Citizen" this morning. The article animadverts to a great extent on the change of opinion manifested by the hon. member for Quebec West, more especially as regards the question of the fast line. This is a question, which, as the Government are aware, is attracting public attention.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Order. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make an argument. He can ask a question bringing up a subject of public importance, and the Government may reply to it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I merely wish to read a telegram that seems to have been sent to "L'Electeur" by the hon. member for Quebec West, as follows:—

> Ottawa, Sept. 18th.—You can assure my friends that fast line will be all right and that both Quebec and the country will gain by delay I am advising.—R. R. Dobell.

I wish to ask whether the telegram which I have just read was sent by the hon. gentleman, and whether it refers to a 17 or 20-knot line? After the hon. gentleman has given his answer, I shall ask the Government whether they will assume a policy following in the lines adopted by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DOBELL. I had no knowledge whatever of the telegram till I saw it in the papers.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). I beg to lay on the Table the letter asked for by the leader of the Opposition to be added to the papers on the Table relating to the Military College—a letter from General Cameron to myself, and my letter in reply thereto.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply, September 3, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 21, were read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY—TARIFF LEGISLATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the attention of the House for a short time, while I bring within its purview a matter of very considerable importance at any time, but a matter which, at the present time, seems to take on a greater degree of importance than usual. I refer to the tariff question, or the legislation with reference to the tariff question which, under a notice which has been given to the House and the country by the leader of the Government, is to be postponed until next year—that is, at least, definite action upon it is to be postponed until next year. I have said that the matter of tariff legislation, either as to the principle upon which it shall proceed, or the plan upon which it shall be worked out, is a most important question, probably one of the most important that can come before any country, and the importance of it is not at all diminished by the fact of the country being, as Canada is, a young, a growing and a developing country. I suppose there is nothing which comes within the range of governmental action, about which the people expect, and rightly expect, greater definiteness and clearness with reference to principle, and, if a change is impending, greater promptitude with reference to that change, than the matter of its tariff legislation. I do not think, if we look over the history of various countries, that we will find anything which will in the least contradict the statement which I have just made. I think it will be found out, from a review of the history of governments in civilized countries of modern date, that there never has been any long period of uncertainty with reference to the position that either party had assumed upon the question of the tariff, that is, that the issues are generally conceded to be sharp, defined and well understood by both parties and by the country who look at the policy of those parties. It is, therefore, what I think is a lack of clearness and of promptitude with reference to the principle on which the tariff should be revised and the time at which it should be revised, that

leads me to make some remarks this afternoon. But there is another reason which prompts me to make a review of the situation at the present time, and that is the somewhat widespread, though very quiet epidemic which has been raging amongst hon. gentlemen opposite, and which has particularly attacked, it seems, the heads of the party, the leaders of the Government, and the result of which has been a most extraordinary loss of memory by the leaders of the party and of the Government. Well understood lines of policy, which have been spoken to over and over again, in every section of the country, within the last five or six years, seem, under the influence of this quiet but prevalent epidemic, to have faded entirely from the memories of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is a duty which I have to perform this afternoon—and probably not an inconsiderable one—to endeavour by historical retrospect to bring out facts and figures which will set forth, as clearly and shortly as possible the position of hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to their tariff policies during the last five or six years.

The first part, then, of the remarks I shall have the pleasure of presenting to the House will be briefly to define what has been the attitude of the Liberal party for the last eighteen years on the tariff question. In the first place whatever we may say as to the positive lines upon which they have based any future action of their own when they should come into power, I think I may take it as fairly well agreed that there has been one line upon which these hon. gentlemen have been fairly consistent, which has for the last eighteen or for the last twenty-four years been continually running through their utterances and through their platforms and through their resolutions defining one phase of their attitude towards the fiscal policy of the country, and that line has been the line of consistent and uncompromising hostility to the principle and practice of protection as applied to the tariff and fiscal matters of the country. It is shown in the history of the party from 1874 to 1879, during which period it administered the affairs of this country. As soon as Sir John Macdonald and the party which he was leading put into shape and declared in resolutions their adherence to the principle of protection and their determination, if they gained power to put that principle into practice in relation to the fiscal affairs of the country—from that time forward there was developed a strain of consistent and uniform opposition on the part of gentlemen opposite to the principle and the practice of protection. It is, of course, true that, for a series of years at the first, certain recalcitrant members of their party had to be brought into line. It is true that the hon. leader of the Government of the present time, in the sessions of 1875, 1876 and 1877, avowed himself outside of this House, and avowed himself in this House as well, as a believer in the principle and in the practice of protection. It is true also that the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the present member for North Grey (Mr. Paterson)—not at that time the member for North Grey—held very strong views with reference to the principle of protection as applied to the tariff of the country, and that in their places on the floor of this House they repeatedly gave it their adhesion and made appeal to what was then their own government for a heightened tariff and for adopting to a large extent the principle of protection as applied to the industries of this country. Going no further, though that does not exhaust the list of those who, at that time, giving adhesion to the Liberal party, were in favour of protection, we find that party with its softening influence and the pressure of its moulding hand has had the effect of reducing these hon. gentlemen, including the present leader of the Government, from strong and ardent protectionists into believers that their early principles had been wrongly imbibed and that they must take the opposite view. But this is the view they adopted, and within a very few years after expression of their faith publicly on the floor of this House these gentlemen were found amongst the strongest and most rabid opponents of the principle of protection. From that time forward during the remainder of the Mackenzie administration, and during the early years of Sir John Macdonald's administration, and during every year from that period up to the present time, these hon. gentlemen and the party as a whole, so far as their action in this House was concerned, and so far as their party action outside this House was concerned, they have uncompromisingly put themselves on record as opposed to the principle of protection and as believers in the opposite doctrine, whatever, for the time being, that doctrine happened to be.

It is unnecessary for me, I think, at this stage to go into any long proof of the fact which I have just stated. I might bring up the resolutions which they moved in this House in 1879, in 1880, in 1881, in 1882 and later, putting in concrete form their opposition to the principle of protection as it had been applied to the tariff by the Liberal-Conservative Government and party. There is, however, a duty I think it necessary to perform at this time, although, as I said on the floor of this House, and in their strictly party or partisan capacity, hon. gentlemen on the other side have been a unit in their expression of uncompromising hostility to protection, yet, I find this phenomenon, viz., that in going through the different sections of the country I frequently meet men who fall in with the party faith and follow the party lead of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who say yet that whatever may be the statements their party has given,

yet when they come to frame a tariff, they will not be found to be adverse to the principle of protection. Some of the best adherents of hon. gentlemen opposite in different parts of the country, have gone so far as to state that manufacturers and producers need have nothing to fear, that despite all this formidable array of 24 years of expressed opposition to, and abhorrence of, the principle and practice of protection, when it comes to the revision of the tariff promised for next year, the country will find out that the present governing party of this country will not destroy the principle of protection, and will not eradicate the practice of protection from the statutes of this country. So it becomes necessary, I think, for me to ask the House to listen for a short time to these statements which have been made, not in the older period 24 years ago, not in the comparatively recent period of ten years ago, but which have gone on consistently up to the very present moment —statements so strong, statements so clear, statements so definite, that it is impossible for the country to read them and believe at the same time that they have been honestly made, without coming to the definite belief that whatever these hon. gentlemen may do when they come to revise the tariff, they cannot consistently and they will not allow the principle of protection to be applied in their tariff. Well, Sir, going back, not a very long distance, but keeping this more modern period in sight, we find that Sir Richard Cartwright, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, in 1890, declared :

I say our protective system was a huge mistake in so far as it was honest at all, and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. A small ring and clique of combiners and protected manufacturers who, as I have told you, have been permitted for years past to make a prey and plunder of the people of Canada have held sway.

In 1890, at Meaford, he said :

I stand by the declaration I have made, that protection is nothing more or less than deliberate, legalized and organized robbery ; and more than that, if you do not stamp it out, it is the very high road to political slavery first, and industrial slavery afterwards.

In 1891, a year later, at Chatham, he declared :

This is very largely due to a most vicious system of legislation under which the whole fiscal system of Canada has become an instrument of legalized robbery on a scale and to an extent absolutely unprecedented in the history of any other country as young as our own. The protective system of the new world is a different and much more dangerous thing than the protective system of the old world, and we all, farmers especially, are suffering accordingly. You have to deal with a gang of combines, highly paid and highly drilled mercenaries, who have enslaved you, and who mean to keep you enslaved if fraud and corruption can do it.

Mr. FOSTER.

Later still he declared, speaking for his party :

Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villainous system of protection by free trade, revenue tariff, or continental free trade.

And again, he says :

They demand our policy. Well, Sir, they shall have our policy, and here I believe I speak for my hon. friends beside me.

That was on the floor of this House.

Our policy is death to protection, and war to the knife to corruption. Sir, we strike and we will strike for liberty and freedom from this system of protective taxation ; and I tell hon. gentlemen that we will not rest until the slavery that has been imposed upon us has become a thing of the past, and until Canadians are as free as Canadians ought to be free, to make the most they can of the opportunity God has given them.

Coming down to 1883, in the House of Commons, Sir Richard Cartwright declared :

Our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villainous system of protection which has been grinding out the vitals of this country.

Well, Sir, the plank of the Liberal platform adopted by the convention held here in the city of Ottawa, in 1893, gave the collective idea of the party at that time with reference to this principle of protection, and what did that say :

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our convictions that any tariff changes based on that principle, must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours. This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await, with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electorate of Canada.

The leader of the Government at the present time, and then the leader of the Opposition, immediately proceeded on a tour through this country, expatiating upon, and expounding, the Liberal platform of 1893. At Newmarket, in the month of September, 1893, he declared :

I will not be satisfied until the last vestige of protection has been removed from the soil of Canada. Our great reform is to put away from the soil of Canada the last vestige of protection.

In Victoria, B.C., in 1894, he said :

If the Liberals were successful, they would cut off the head of protection at once, and trample on its body.

The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) at a later date, in this Parliament, declared :

We have been attacking this policy year by year. This is an accursed system, a system accursed of God and man.

In 1895, at the city of Toronto, the present leader of the Government, declared :

Call it protection, call it feudalism, call it slavery—I care not, it is the same thing. It differs only in degree, it is bondage.

And at Montreal, in the same year, he declared :

The system of protection has been the bane and the curse of Canada—the bane and the curse of Canada, I repeat.

And Sir Richard Cartwright, speaking at the city of Toronto, in 1895, after he had set forth the uncompromising opposition of the Liberal party in the past to the principles of protection, throws out a hint and a threat to his party at the same time. Drawing for example upon what he considered the unfortunate lack of the Democratic party in the United States, he declared :

There are two lessons which I think the Reformers of Canada should learn. One is presented for our example and warning in the fate that has befallen the Democratic party in the United States. It shows to all who chose to read the signs of the times that when a party places itself at the head of a great popular movement, if that party tenders the people a stone instead of bread, it is half-hearted in the prosecution of the great aim it sets before it, and will be deservedly swept out of power by the very people who have sustained and advanced it.

Sir, I think I need not go any further in bringing you down to the last year of grace 1895-96, in which these hon. gentlemen were putting forth the propaganda of their policy, by reading to the House these few selections from the multitude of strong statements made by their leaders and by the rank and file all through this country. I think I need go no further to maintain the fact I stated at first, namely, that from 1874 down to the present time, the Liberal party is on record, through the mouthpieces of its leaders, of its principal men, and of its convention, as determinedly opposed to the principle and the practice of protection. Now, Sir, it is not until 1887 that we first see signs in the Liberal party of a change with respect to their attitude in this matter. Mr. Edward Blake—undoubtedly an able man—was at that time leader of that party. Mr. Blake perceived in 1882, and gave voice to his perceptions, that when after a lengthened period of debate and discussion the country had accepted a great fiscal policy and had gone on to work out that policy in the business interests of the country, that after they had for years worked out the business interests of the country on the basis of that policy, it became the duty of an Opposition to consider very fully and very carefully whether or not it should not accept the will of the people as shown, accept the full force of the circumstances that had intervened in the aggregation of business and capital about the accepted policy, and should not, while attempting to improve and perhaps mitigate it, give its adherence to the wish and will of the people as embodied by the electoral vote and in the policy which supervened upon it, and not carry on from year to year and as it were from age to age an unreasoning and blind opposition to what the will of the people had set up as the fiscal policy of this country. And so in 1882, Mr. Blake, as is shown by his speeches in that campaign, rather tended towards a mitigation and reduction in certain points of what he considered to be the more extreme parts of the policy of protection than the abnegation and denial of the principle of protection entirely ; and his voice so carried his convictions to the country. But it was not until 1887, after the electoral vote of 1882 had supervened and had by the large and overwhelming voice of the people again substantiated the principle of protection as the basis of the fiscal policy of the country, that Mr. Blake's convictions took strong shape, and in his Malvern speech of 1887 he laid down, first his doubts of 1882, and what he thought might have been conceded by his party at that time to the principle of protection. He further said : Since 1882 five years have supervened ; the voice of the electorate has spoken the second time ; the aggregations of capital and trade have increased during the succeeding five years, and it is my steady conviction, which I share with my party—and he named, in order to show he was supported by the party's strength, Sir Richard Cartwright himself—that it is our duty not so much to press for free trade, which is impossible in this country, but to accept the principle of protection and to press for limited amendments at this later date, and propose to set aside or mitigate or soften what we consider are the points that bear most heavily under that tariff. That I may substantiate my statement by what Mr. Blake himself said, let me say that in 1882, supervening upon the resolution which had been framed and tried to be passed by the Opposition in this House, what Mr. Blake chiefly aimed was to have fuel and breadstuffs made free, to have the sugar duties adjusted so as to bear less heavily, as he said, upon the people, and to have a reduction of the duties on the lower grade of cotton and woollen goods, and on the large and varied articles of iron work. In 1882 he thought this might well have been done ; but in 1887 he declared that could no longer be done ; and in the end he reduced his criticism of the National Policy to simply this—reduction of duties upon wheat and coal and wheat flour, and to make free corn flour. What did he say in 1887 ? Let me quote :

We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of—we have a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet. And it is clearer than ever that a very huge scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any readjustments should be effected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase, "all concerned," I hope no one will object to my including as I do the general public. In any readjustment I main-

tain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes, to the lightening of taxes upon the prime necessaries of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich, to a taxation of luxuries just so high as will not thwart our object by greatly checking consumption, to the curbing of monopolies of protection in cases where by combination or otherwise the tariff allows an undue and exorbitant profit to be exacted from consumers, and to the effort—a most important point—to promote reciprocal trade with our neighbours to the south.

Later on he speaks as follows :—

For my part I have always declined to ignore existing facts. I freely acknowledge that the situation has been changed even by 1882 ; and I have as freely acknowledged that it has been changed far more since 1882 ; that many things then possible are now absolutely impossible and that a more permanent structure has been raised. Some may think it good ; some may think it evil, but so it is. To deny it will not subvert it, and we must face the facts as they are.

Later on he declares :

I have only to repeat in the most emphatic language my declaration that there is in my judgment no possibility of a change in that system of taxation which I have described the necessary effects of which is to give a large and ample advantage to the home manufacturer over his competitor abroad. Some may rejoice at this condition ; some may regret it ; but all candid and reasonable public men must admit that, after all, it is a condition and this is the vital question. Such being the condition, we have repeatedly declared that the real issue is on some of the details of the tariff, whether it be perfect, or defective and unjust. Such being the condition the aim of every man ought to be to make the best of the situation and to see that the tariff does as little harm or as much good as possible, is, as far as may be, fair and just, retards as little, or promotes as much as possible the general welfare.

Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to read more from the speech of the leader of the party then in Opposition in 1887 to prove that what the leader had in view was—as he said, with the expressed concurrence of the leaders of his party including Sir Richard Cartwright—to accept the situation as it was so far as protection was concerned, and simply to attempt minor mitigations of the tariff in some particular points in which he thought it bore unduly heavily on certain articles and certain portions of the country. Sir, the fight of 1887 was taken on that modified protection ground. But the people of the country thought it wiser to leave this matter in the hands of those who had been the true friends and supporters of this policy rather than in the hands of a party which had been for ten or twelve years determinedly opposed to it, but which in 1887 had apparently come to the determination to make the best of it. So hon. gentlemen opposite in the campaign of 1887 had to submit to a third condemnation of their public views with respect to the principle of protection, and the tariff policy of protection, and an endorsement of the view of 1878 and of the view of 1882. Sir, almost immediately after the defeat in 1887 and during the next succeeding years, the Liberal party commenced working out on a line to which they had been utter strangers from 1874 to 1887. They were no longer agreed to simply obstruct the principle and the policy of protection. They were no longer agreed simply to lead the Opposition against a certain policy in a negative sort of way, but they came to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary that they should get some positive policy of their own, which they could pit against the policy and practice of protection, in order to gain the popular view and to overthrow the system to which they had been so long and so consistently opposed. The divergence which was made by Mr. Blake himself, had, in a statesmanlike point of view, that same matter in regard, but he took the wiser course of bowing himself to the oft-expressed wish of the electorate, and making a necessity of what the majority of the people had decreed should be the policy in fiscal matters which should rule in this country. But, after 1887, the lesser leaders of the party taking the bit in their teeth, determined that they should have catch names, something brand new, which as a positive policy urged on their part would tend to make an instrument in their hands for breaking down the policy which they had so long opposed. and hereupon commenced that devious and winding search for theoretical policies, for names which would be attractive and for policies which would be catching, which they could put forward with an air of positive statement as an antidote, or as a substitute for the National Policy as embodied in the tariff of 1879. What were these substitute policies which hon. gentlemen opposite, from time to time, took up ?

First, there was the policy of commercial union with the United States. Now, it has been stated—and by some leading gentlemen on the other side—that the Liberal party as a party never took up the policy of commercial union, and that when we make that statement we are speaking beside the book. They are partly right and they are partly wrong. If it be true that a policy is not taken up by a party at all,—which probably is the case in the technical sense of the term—until by a convention or a resolution in Parliament the party bind themselves to it ; then I grant you that the party never took up the principle or the policy of commercial union. But, if it be the fact that the direction of the chief organs of a party, of a number of the principal men of a party and of a large proportion of the rank and file of a party, for month after month, upon a certain line of policy ; if it be true that that is an indication as to the search-

ing of the party mind for a policy that they might substitute for the one to which they are opposed, then the evidence is found on the page of almost every Liberal newspaper in Canada, and in the expressions of dozens of the principal men of the Liberal party; that commercial union for a period of six or eight months was looked upon as a panacea for the ills of Canada, and as a substitute for the National Policy. Almost before the election contest of 1887 was cold, Mr. Wiman had launched his propaganda in the United States and had followed it up by a series of meetings and conferences in different parts of Canada, for the application of the principle of commercial union to the fiscal and business affairs of this country. That policy of commercial union was adhered to by numbers of influential organs and of influential men in the Liberal party. In October, 1878, Sir Richard Cartwright, speaking at Ingersoll, used these words:

We have greatly misused our advantages. We have been foolish in our expenditures. We have no means of satisfying the just demand of large portions of the Dominion, except through such an arrangement as commercial union.

The London "Advertiser" declared:

Commercial union lies within the range of practical politics. In our opinion unrestricted reciprocity does not.

That is but a sample of many utterances in the London "Advertiser," the great exponent of the Liberal party in western Canada. The Halifax "Morning Chronicle," which is the exponent of the Liberal party in the province of Nova Scotia, declared:

That it received the news with great joy and with great delight. It is the most important movement made upon the political chess board since Confederation and is likely to revolutionize political controversy in this country. This is the first time that commercial union has been adopted by either of the great political parties. Henceforward it becomes the burning question of the day.

I ask hon. gentlemen to take the files of the "Globe" newspaper from April, 1887, until December of the same year, and scan the number of editorials strongly written in favour of commercial union as contrasted with unrestricted reciprocity or free trade. I will read one or two of these of August 1, 1887:

We cannot obtain the inestimable boon of free access to the States for our produce without accepting the closest approximation to the commercial position of a State of the Union. They will not favour us more than one another. Wise people do not refuse a good thing simply because it is not the best thing they can conceive of; they take all they can get. Unrestricted reciprocity without a customs union, is an unattainable boon; with a customs union, it would be very good and that we can probably obtain.

Sir, the leader of the Opposition at that time, so far as I can gather from his speeches as I find them in the papers, did not actually pronounce in favour of commercial union, but he was on the neutral ground between the two as to which was the better commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. He saw objections to both. He would not say that they were insuperable in the case of commercial union, but so far as I can find out, he never gave in his actual adhesion to the policy of commercial union. But, I find that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) speaking at a pic-nic at Cape Traverse, is reported as follows, in the Charlottetown "Patriot," the organ of the Liberal party in the province of Prince Edward Island of August 24, 1887:

The difference between reciprocity and commercial union is that the latter would do away with all customs-houses between the two countries, and they would have a uniform tariff against the rest of the world. Some have said that the United States tariff is double the Canadian. It is only 8 or 10 per cent higher.

Commercial union does not necessarily involve an increase of our tariff; on the contrary, it may lower it. In 1883 they decreased their tariff largely and will probably do so again. There is no annexation involved in the matter. Commercial union would settle the nasty questions arising respecting our fisheries.

And that word is a perfect seal to my mind, that these were really the words used by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies).

Commercial union would also settle the nasty questions arising respecting our fisheries. * * * The idea that we would be disloyal to the British flag under commercial union was humbug. He wanted to live under the flag as well as any one, but he wanted a flag under which he could live. The keynote should be struck in the banner province. Commercial union means a uniform tax from the North Pole to the Gulf of Mexico. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 he was prepared to accept, but he was afraid the Americans were unwilling to concede it. As commercial union seemed to be more easily attainable, he was prepared to support it, because he believed it would secure to us wealth, peace and happiness.

So far had the opinion prevailed that commercial union would be the policy that would be adopted by the party in 1888, when it formulated its resolutions in this House, that one of the then members (Mr. Armstrong) of the Opposition had not only prepared his resolution, but had given notice of it, and it reads as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House commercial union with the United States would be mutually advantageous to both countries, and it is therefore the duty of the Government to use all proper means to secure such union.

But, Sir, difficulties arose, and the present Speaker of the House, the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) at that time as at present, gave utterance to his opinions in those celebrated letters of his, in which he animadverted upon the unfortunate name that was given to the scheme for closer trade

relations with the United States. The word "union," and the discussion which had arisen about it, carried with it two things: one, that there were to be no custom-houses on the border between Canada and the United States; the other and more formidable, that it suggested a union politically, and that the objections against that amongst the loyal people of the country were strong and would militate against the adoption of the policy. These and other counsels in the same line ultimately prevailed; and so the party were driven to take a name a little different, unrestricted reciprocity, and to leave aside the name of commercial union, though at the first their advocacy of unrestricted reciprocity proceeded on exactly the same lines as had the advocacy of commercial union by the organs of the party.

Well, there was another policy, or rather the same policy dignified by another name—I suppose a more aristocratic name—which had a brief period of prominence in the country. That was the name of continental free trade. It was, as I have said, a more aristocratic denomination of the article. It was more theoretical; it caught certain classes of minds, as being a broader and grander thing; it was more high-sounding; it aimed at taking a wider scope, and enlarging the border of the different advantages to the country from a broadening of trade under any such policy; and so that term of continental free trade was very often used. I will, however, quote just a few who were prominent in using it. In 1889, the present leader of the Government, said:

> The Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they have finally triumphed and obtained continental freedom of trade. We will not be drawn away by this issue or that issue, and keeping our eyes upon the goal, will work till we accomplish our end. If the reformers of these days can accomplish what they have in view—the great principle of free trade in America—they will have done to their country and to the British race a service of which they will have reason to be proud.

Sir Richard Cartwright, at Oakville, declared:

> I desire to see free trade all over this continent.

Mr. Charlton declared, in his address to the Young Men's Liberal Club of Toronto:

> We want unrestricted and free access to the whole of North America with our produce and a great increase of wealth would follow; we wanted to pull down all customs barriers, to enjoy absolute free trade, to establish a mighty theatre of commerce extending over a vast continent—from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean.

Mr. Charlton again stated:

> We require continental free trade, and without continental free trade, without access to the markets of 60 millions of people to the south of us, we cannot progress satisfactorily. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that our manufacturers, as well as our lumbermen, our farmers, our fishermen and mine owners need the blessings of continental free trade.

And the "Globe" newspaper itself, in 1887, was found declaring:

> Obviously the Washington Government will not enter into the unrestricted reciprocity which Canadians wish for, unless Canadians will consent to apply to themselves the same commercial conditions as apply to the American states that have unrestricted reciprocity with one another. That is to say, Canadians must recognize that they cannot hope to enjoy continental free trade unless they shall agree to make a customs union with the continent.

Directly after this, in the session of 1888, the party settled down upon the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and discrimination against all countries except the United States of America. I need but ask the attention of this House to resolutions which were moved in the House, to make that point in my address clear. On the 26th of February, 1889, the present leader of the Government moved:

> That steps should be taken, at an early day, by the Government of Canada, for the satisfactory adjustment of such differences (namely, the fishery differences between the United States and Canada), and the securing of unrestricted freedom of the trade relations of the two countries.

That was in a debate on the fisheries treaty. But the formal resolution was moved on the 14th of March, 1888, when it was declared:

> That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles, manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries, should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted).
>
> That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

In the following year, 1889, Sir Richard Cartwright again moved:

> In the present condition of affairs, and in view of the recent action of the House of Representatives of the United States, it is expedient that steps should be taken to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

It is needless for me to say that the total Liberal vote in this House stood for both of these resolutions. Now, Sir, I want to read another resolution in the same line, of the date of June 23rd, 1891. I want to do that for a purpose which will more clearly appear later; for the 23rd of June, 1891, was after the defeat of the Liberal party upon their canvass on unrestricted reciprocity before the electorate of this country. But

notwithstanding that defeat, and against the theory that is some times put forward that the Liberal party have abandoned unrestricted reciprocity, on the 23rd June, 1891, the following resolution was moved :—

Resolved, that the situation of the country requires that the Government should forthwith reduce all duties on articles of prime necessity and more particularly on those most generally consumed by artisans, miners, fishermen and farmers.

And further, that the negotiations which the House has been informed are to open at Washington in October next, should be conducted on the basis of the most extended reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States in manufactured as well as natural products.

That received the full vote of the Liberal party in this House, and that was, on the 23rd June, 1891, a deliberate assertion by the party that, notwithstanding they had gone to the country, in the early part of the year, on the sole issue of unrestricted reciprocity and had been defeated upon that issue, it was yet an article of belief and an article of faith in the Liberal party platform.

Well, Sir, outside these official resolutions, let me, for the sake of the record, ask the attention of this House to certain statements of the leaders of hon. gentlemen opposite on this same question, in the five years that have last passed. In the House of Commons, Mr. Davies, now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is reported as having said :

Sir, we tender the people a flag of which we are not ashamed, a flag upon which is inscribed Unrestricted Trade with the United States.

In 1891, Sir Richard Cartwright, now Minister of Trade and Commerce, said at Chatham :

But what is of even more immediate consequence, we propose to obtain for you the power to trade freely with the rest of this continent ; to have leave to make the best use you can of your great natural advantages, which can only be done by full, free, and unrestricted reciprocity with our kinsmen in the United States.

In November, 1891, mind you, Mr. Speaker, after the elections were over several months he declared at Oakwood :

The fact is plain and clear and simple, the best market for the articles you produce—not by the decree of men but by the decree of the Almighty—lies in the country which extends to the south of you, separated generally by a mere imaginary line along the three thousand miles of our southern border, reaching from that line almost to the equator. There is your market, there is the only market you can hope to hold, there is the market you have the natural advantages to enable you to compete for. I deliberately tell you that the market of the United States is absolutely and exactly worth all the rest of the world to us, situated as we now are.

And at Sarnia, on the 2nd March, 1895, long after the Liberal convention had met and promulgated a platform, Sir Richard Cartwright said :

We must find you a better market, and we do not propose to look for that by preference at the Antipodes. We do propose free trade with all the world as our ultimate goal, but we will be very glad to secure for you free trade with the rest of this continent as an exceedingly comfortable instalment on the way thither.

And after the elections of 1891, the present leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) is on record, again and again, in favour of unrestricted free trade between this country and the United States, as being almost absolutely necessary. Sir, a few years ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote a characteristic letter to the London "Economist."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, I see, has not lost his memory on that point. There is no necessity for a course of ministerial mnemonics in order to keep my hon. friend's memory strong and fresh upon that episode in his career. In that letter he made very strong statements, that were discussed in this House.

An hon. MEMBER. And very true.

Mr. FOSTER. And, it is said, very true. In 1896, we had the pleasure of reviewing that letter, and the hon. gentleman had the pleasure of reading nearly the whole of that letter to this House, and across the floor of the House I put to him the question, again and again : Do you still hold to that ? And the hon. gentleman, in his jaunty and hearty way, declared, "I most certainly do." What did he read among the rest ?

Free trade with the United States is vastly more valuable to Canada than free trade with all the rest of the world would be, with the United States left out.

And it is reported in "Hansard" that Mr. Foster asked : "Do you still hold to that statement ?" and the gallant knight replied: "I most undoubtedly do." That was in the year of grace 1896, on the 28th of January, and that may be taken as an additional instance and proof of what I stated before, namely, that hon. gentlemen opposite have not swerved one iota in their innate determination, if they possibly can, to place this country, as regards the United States, within the bonds of unrestricted reciprocity. In that statement of 1896, written to the "Economist," was this, read by the hon. gentleman himself last year :

It is not merely the policy but the fixed determination of the Liberal party in the Dominion to overthrow this system——

That is, the system of protection.

—at all hazards, and after very full deliberation, they have come to the conclusion that the best and probably the only really available

method which presents itself for that purpose is in introducing a system of perfect continental free trade, or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

And it is on record in "Hansard" that the hon. gentleman, in 1896, asserted his absolute adhesion to what he had written four or five years previously. But there was the concomitant, that this principle of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States carried with it discrimination against the mother country and against the other countries of the world in a commercial sense. It was the habit of some hon. gentlemen opposite to deny that consequence, in the first stages of the debate on this important question. I remember that it was denied by the present leader of the Government, who declared that it was not necessary that this should follow. I remember the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) declaring that he would never submit, nor would his party, to discrimination against Great Britain, and that such discrimination was not implied in unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. But the discussion had not proceeded a single week in this House before these hon. gentlemen had to admit, and freely admit, that it was an absolutely necessary accompaniment of unrestricted reciprocity, that it should discriminate against Great Britain and the other countries in the world. In order that the country may not forget, in the light of the proofs I have read of the determination of hon. gentlemen opposite still to pursue that line, in order that the country may not forget that discrimination against Great Britain is closely conjoined with unrestricted reciprocity, let me quote what you, Mr. Speaker, then simply member for West Ontario, declared:

It has thus been shown to be fair and reasonable to discriminate in favour of the United States if they discriminate in our favour.

In case the hon. gentleman's memory may also be affected by the frightful epidemic of which I have already made mention, I want to cite my authority in this respect. It is a letter written and signed by himself, on the 23rd of January, 1893. Again, he said:

It is hopeless to expect reciprocity with the United States, which will not involve discrimination against Great Britain.

Sir Richard Cartwright, at Ingersoll, in 1887, declared:

There is no doubt whatever that before we can obtain such a measure of unrestricted reciprocity as the advocates of this system desire, it will be necessary for us to discriminate against the manufacturers of other countries, against those even of Great Britain.

At Oshawa, Ont., on the 8th February, at a meeting which was addressed by Sir Richard Cartwright, he was asked:

Mr. FOSTER.

Does the Liberal party favour discrimination against Great Britain by admitting American manufactures free, and taxing the manufactures of Great Britain?

Sir Richard Cartwright's answer was short and decisive:

Certainly we do.

The present Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) declared in this House:

I am satisfied that our manufacturers will not be destroyed by a reciprocal arrangement with the United States.

And again:

It has been argued that this proposition discriminates against Great Britain. Sir, that is one thing I do not just exactly like.

But he schooled himself to like it and subscribed to the policy. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) said:

One hon. gentleman opposite says that this will discriminate against Great Britain. Necessarily it must to some extent, but we cannot help that, in fact we have the right to discriminate.

And again:

I acknowledge that the proposition has on one face of it an element of discrimination.

Well, in this House in 1888, Sir Richard Cartwright, discussing his resolution, declared:

It has been made a grave ground, it has been attempted to set up as an insuperable ground of objection that when you propose to enter into a treaty for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, you must thereby of necessity discriminate against English manufacturers and the manufacturers of all other countries except the United States. Now, that is true; I admit that. It is perfectly apparent that we cannot hope to gain free intercourse and unrestricted reciprocity with them without discriminating against the goods of other countries. The thing, I grant, is of the essence of the bargain.

The Toronto "Globe" admitted it over and over again. One single citation will suffice:

If free trade with the United States will be good for us, let us vote for it, though it should involve discrimination against Great Britain twice over.

And the leader of the Government himself declared:

This involves that we should offer to the American nation advantages denied to the rest of the world. So it does, and it is a cause of bitter reproach to us by the Conservative party who charge us with disloyalty to England.

But, Sir, if there was any doubt—as there is not—as to what the leaders of the party understood to be an absolutely necessary accompaniment of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, namely, discrimination against Great Britain and other countries, that was set at rest by the negotiations of 1892; for in these negotiations it was distinctly stated by the American commission-

ers and in communications made to Congress by the President and Secretary of the United States at that time that no unrestricted reciprocity or commercial arrangement with this country could be considered by the United States which did not provide for favoured treatment of the United States in our markets and discrimination against Great Britain and other countries. So much with reference to that line of their policy.

Now, Sir, I admit that commercial union, continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity, are three sisters of one family. They are, in fact, to state it better, but three names with which one single idea has been christened. The whole kernel of the nut was trade relations with the United States, of a free kind, and these three were simply names given to lines and plans which were necessary in order to bring about that result. There is the family likeness in them all; they are, in fact, one and the same with certain small differences which, when you come to the last analysis, do not amount to much.

But, Sir, that does not exhaust the policies which hon. gentlemen opposite in their career of opposition formulated to the country. The next they took was free trade as practiced in England, plus reciprocity—and I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that whatever has happened since they took up the fad of commercial union, they have taken up nothing since either at their conventions or in their public advocacy to which they have not added reciprocity of the freest possible kind with the United States of America. Now, Sir, this propaganda of free trade as it is in England has chiefly for its god-father and propounder the present leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier). The present leader of the Government is easily taken with attractive names. He is, I think, essentially a theorist. I am sometimes led to believe that he has a less conviction from well-reasoned out principles and study as to what is best for the country in the matter of the fiscal policy than a desire in an academic way to adopt a striking theory which he may propound to the country to catch the attention of the people, leaving himself afterwards to strand, as he has repeatedly stranded, on the rocks of essential difficulty that he must meet as soon as he puts his little bark into the treacherous waters. And so the hon. gentleman, when he took upon himself the part of a commentator and expounder of a policy of the party as affirmed in 1893, launched out with this determination to put in the foreground and to keep to the front free trade as it is practiced in England. It was in 1893 that he was first attracted by it. He saw at that time a great contest in the United States of America. He read a certain portion of the press of the United States, which declared that the Democrats were a free trade party. He saw that party come into power with a tremendous sweep, and he leaped to the conclusion that the United States was to have free trade. At Hamilton on the 10th January, 1893, at the end of one of his characteristic speeches, he said:

> Sir, the day looked forward to by Cobden and Bright is arriving to-day. The principle has been adopted by the second nation of the world, the first-born daughter of England, and, Sir, I venture to assert this night that the third nation to adopt free trade will be the second daughter of England, the Dominion of Canada.

Well, Sir, that is the prophecy of my hon. friend. He had read so superficially as to believe that there was really a party in the United States which faced an electoral contest upon the principle of absolute free trade. And what happened? The Democratic party came in with a rush and a sweep. They undertook to reform the tariff, not on the lines of free trade, and, after wrecking their party in the attempt to reform it, they brought it down just two per cent and left it at 38 per cent, where they found it at 40 or 41 per cent. So much for the hon. gentleman's free trade millenium which had its dawn in 1892 in the United States. Then, Sir, in his tour in 1893, 1894 and 1895, he everywhere calls out for free trade. At Winnipeg he declared:

> I come before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of free trade—I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage. Yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which American slavery was bondage. Sir, our policy is freedom of trade such as exists in England, such as is practised in Great Britain.

In Peel he declared:

> I propose that we should follow England's example and open our ports to the products of the world.

In the city of Montreal he declared:

> The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines such as exist in Great Britain, and upon that platform exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party will fight its next battle.

At Montreal, in 1895, he declared:

> The Liberal party believe in free trade on the broad lines, such as exist in Great Britain.

Speaking in the historic city of Quebec, in January, 1895, he declared:

> Gentlemen, the only way in which Quebec can recover the old-time prosperity as a maritime city, is by adopting the policy of freedom of trade as it exists in the mother country, old England.

And at Brampton, in the same year, he declared:

> I propose that we should follow England's example and open our ports to the products of the world.

And then, joined on that declaration, is this:

> If we come to power on that day I promise you we will go to Washington, and if we can get a treaty in natural products and a list of manu-

factured articles, that treaty will be made. The policy of the Liberal party is to give you a market with the 65 million British men upon this continent.

There, Sir, is free trade as it is practiced in England, and, with that the absurd, and impossible, and inconsistent accompaniment of reciprocity with some other country. First, produce your tariff on the lines of free trade as England has it, then go to another great commercial country and propose to establish a system of reciprocity! But, Sir, my hon. friend had not sailed far on the treacherous waters of Canadian politics in that little barque whose flag at the masthead showed, to all who admired it, "Free trade as it is practiced in England," until he came upon the treacherous quicksands and the hard rocks of opposition and criticism. He was accommodating, my hon. friend always has been accommodating; so when he found the quicksands too many and the rocks too numerous, he said: Well, gentlemen, if you want it that way, I will say free trade as it is in England, but I will put it off for thirty or forty years. And so he was good enough to declare at last, when criticism began to pour down upon him: I am for free trade as it is practiced in England, but, gentleman, I meant to say, thirty or forty years after this date. Well, Sir, what next? The next line of policy upon which the Liberal party made their propaganda in the country, was tariff for revenue, void of protection, coupled with reciprocity. Do I need to read the statement in the platform of the party adopted in 1893? Do I need to read the comments upon it by my hon. friend who at present leads the Government, backed up, as it is, by these strong expressions of unbounded and inconsistent hostility to the principle of protection which has been the watchword of the Liberal party for the last twenty-four years? Surely not. But, lest it may be supposed that I am stating something which does not exist, let me read to you a little further. At Montreal, in 1895, when expounding his policy, he said:

> I have told you that our object is to have a customs tariff for revenue only. Upon the question of protection there can be no compromise. We stand here against protection and in favour of a customs tariff based upon the principle of revenue, and nothing else.

In other places he declared that:

> He would have a revenue tariff for revenue alone, and which would tax for revenue alone, but not one cent for protection.

And that, too, is coupled with statements made upon the same platform in favour of reciprocity with the United States. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have given you a sketch of the various and diverse positive policies which, from time to time, from 1887 to the present, the Liberal party have propounded. Now, what is their policy at the present time? We know what it has been; we know, to a certain extent, what it should be, if they are true to their statements. But hon. gentlemen opposite have developed so unfortunate a facility for quick and rapid changes, that even to-day there is doubt in the minds of men who believe in them most thoroughly, as to whether they propose to carry out either one of any of these several lines of policy which they have advocated in the past. At present, so far as we can learn from the Government sitting opposite, the only points that are certain are these: that there is to be delay, that there is to be a revision, and that there is to be an attempt to secure unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. That there is to be delay, is proved by the statement of the leader of the Government that no tariff revision will take place this session. That there is to be revision, is his statement that tariff revision will take place next session. That there is to be an attempt for unrestricted reciprocity, is proved by the statement he made the other day, that he was in favour of the policy previously stated, that, when the Liberal party came into power, he would send a commission to Washington and endeavour to bring about unrestricted reciprocity, or the freest possible reciprocity, with the United States of America. Those are things we know at the present time, and the only things we know—delay and revision next year, and the certain fact that the party is wedded to, and will strive to get, reciprocity with the United States of America. Now, I again ask the attention of this House and of the country to that state of things. Is there any one on this side of the House who believes that these gentlemen have thrown aside unrestricted reciprocity entirely, that they have let that go, that it is not now a part of their policy? Here is, in the first place, the policy stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that when they came into power, they would press for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Here is the statement of the leader of the Government, since they have come to power, that, at the first opportune moment, he will send a commission to Washington for that very purpose; and, combined with this, there are the statements made by all these hon. gentlemen, that they know they can get no reciprocity from the United States, except upon two conditions, one that the list of manufactured articles shall be broad and general, and the other, that we shall discriminate against Great Britain and against every other country. So that to-day, out of the mouth of the leader of the Government, and from the statements he has made on the floor of this House within the last week or two, joined to the exigencies of the case, and their own statements with reference to it, one part of their policy we know, and that is that they are bound to have, if they possibly can, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, accompanied with discrimination against the mother country and against other countries of the world. Is there any

doubt that I am right in that statement? If there is, let me read a statement of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, speaking in 1893, in the city of Toronto, after the conference, and expounding that conference, in the first place declares that it is impossible that there can be any reciprocity with the United States unless it takes in manufactured goods as well as raw products. He says it is impossible, and that we might as well dismiss it from our minds, that we can get reciprocity in natural products alone. There has to be conjoined to that a liberal and generous list of manufactures. That is the reciprocity which, as one of the planks of their platform of 1893, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the present time was then expounding. And what does he say?

> What we have proposed in that platform is a broad and generous measure of reciprocity, embracing natural products and a fair list of manufactured goods.

Mark what follows:

> We have proposed the adoption of such a treaty as Mr. Blaine in his official report to Congress says that he was willing to negotiate with the Canadian commissioners.

What was Mr. Blaine willing to negotiate with the Canadian commissioners? A tariff, which had two essentials in it: first, it should embrace a list of manufactured articles; and second, it should be accompanied with favoured treatment for those articles, that we should discriminate against Great Britain and the rest of the world. Do I need to go any futher to show that at this particular time, out of all the things we have not, there are three things we have: first, delay; second, promised revision after this delay; third, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, plus its concomitant, discrimination against Great Britain and every other country. I doubt if in the history of nations there has been an instance recorded where a party has for so long a time conducted so blind a course, full of such patent inconsistency, full of such, I may be excused for using the term, crude and changing conclusions with an utter absence of intelligent comprehension of principles and plans, with an utter absence of what may be called well-reasoned convictions, but with simply one apparent reason, that of catching all the discontents on the one hand and beautifying the cave of Adullam, in which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) could spread his nets to catch the unwary, former supporters of the Conservative policy and Government. I have stated those were theories, and those theories had to be abandoned from time to time. When? At the very moment the white light of criticism shone upon them, at the very moment they were put before the people where they could be canvassed. Commercial union was more than a high sounding name. It had to meet question and answer; it had to meet the criticism of public opinion, which was well informed, and before which you have to establish a case before you can convince the people of the soundness of the position which you are trying to maintain. What were the obstacles to commercial union? If you are going to have a customs union, what is the tariff going to be? And who is to frame it? There is a rock of difficulty, on which its supporters split. Then there will be a loss of revenue; how are you going to make it up? It is impossible to answer the question. More than all, there is the question of national sentiment, which, in the minds of the great mass of the people, commercial union would have buried in its grave forever, and left us but a part and parcel of the United States of America, or, as the "Globe" declared, a state inside of the United States. And when commercial union, well sounding on the lips of Mr. Wiman and other theorists, came down to be closely scrutinized by the public, met the loyal sentiment of this country, it split upon those rocks and was cast aside. The same took place with unrestricted reciprocity, which in 1891 on these very grounds met its disaster at the polls in this country, as it was thought not to rise again, but it appears now from the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, it has risen again and is already to the forefront in their tariff platform and programme. Although at this hour hon. gentlemen opposite cannot tell the House exactly when they will revise the tariff, although they cannot state the principle on which they will revise it, although they cannot give a single detail of what the tariff will be, they are able to declare in this House and the country that for one thing they are certainly in favour of reciprocity with the United States, and that at the first favourable moment they will send commissioners there to bring it about. So it was with respect to the policy of free trade as practiced in England. The moment hon. gentlemen opposite got down to the cool, sober judgment of the country and they were asked this question: free trade in England for Canada as it is situated to-day, would not such a policy be madness?—the very moment the cool, keen criticism of the hon. gentleman's own friends was applied, the hon. leader, in an accommodating mood, relegated it to some period in the future, thirty, forty or fifty years from now. So it was with respect to the policy of a tariff for revenue purposes, divested of every vestige of protection, which the hon. gentleman promulgated throughout the country. What does it mean? It means that the Government will not tax anything for the purposes of protection and that whatever is imposed will go into the public revenue. There is, as hon. gentlemen opposite are aware, only one principle on which such a policy can be carried out—that when so much duty is levied on cotton, wool or anyhing else, inasmuch as

that is an import duty which must be paid by the importer, the goods being from abroad, to that extent it is a protection to the manufacturer of the same article at home, unless by an excise revenue the Government place a countervailing inland revenue duty upon it to exactly countervail the possibility of any protective application of that tariff. Yet my hon. friend on almost every platform in this country has held forth loftily and airily about this celebrated policy which has this character: a revenue without one cent of protection, with every vestige of protection out of it. I ask him if when his tariff revision is laid before Parliament, he will be so good as to make his revenue tariff one that will have no protection in it whatever, by the only possible method of an equivalent countervailing excise tax. Those are the rocks upon which, one by one, their fine theories have either entirely collided and wrecked themselves, or are in process of collision and wreckage. Hon. gentlemen opposite will find that sitting on the opposite side of the House, they will have to put words into deeds and go before the House and the country with definite plans of legislation, which is something very different from arguing theories on a platform, and if I am not mistaken hon. gentlemen know to-day, even after their short tenure of office, what will be some of the difficulties that will meet them when they attempt to square their theories of twenty years' standing with the basic facts as they exist to-day, and the circumstances and competition of different interests of trade and commerce, and they will find that the people will not be satisfied with theories but will want honest common sense and statesmanship. What is the result of all these efforts? The result of these 24 years of propagandism by hon. gentlemen opposite, of all this shifting, change and vacillation, of all this present uncertainty as to what hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do is that the country knows: first, that if it is to trust hon. gentlemen at all, there is to be a change; second, that that change is impending; third, but that it is delayed. The axe has been sharpened, the handle has been placed in it, the instrument is upheld; there it remains ready to strike, but no man in the whole of this wide Dominion has the least idea as to where it will strike. There is to be a change; it is impending, but it is delayed, and it brings with it all the disadvantages and troubles which always attend delay and change in a matter of such vital moment as the tariff issue in any country. What else is known? If any reliance at all can be placed upon the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite—and mind you I am not questioning it, for I stand here to-day to say that I implicitly believe that what these hon. gentlemen opposite have been preaching for the last twenty-four years, they will carry out in practice when they come to the revision of their tariff—I must believe, and I do believe in my inmost heart, that when they come to revise the tariff, they are going to take every vestige of protection out of it. For twenty-four years they have declared it, and for twenty-four years they have been building up a public sentiment with reference to it, which they say has at last floated them into power. I cannot believe that public men in this country would so far forget their tenets and their statements and their principles as enunciated for twenty-four years, as not carry them out when they get into power. No party in England could live for a single hour which failed to do so. But if I state that there is an impression abroad that they will not, I say it because of statements that are made by supporters of the Government. There is not a section of the Dominion of Canada to-day in which which you cannot go and pick out gentlemen who either have seats in this House or have largely contributed to giving seats to members in this House by their influence, who will not tell you point-blank: Oh, you simply go home and keep quiet; the Liberal party is not going to disturb the protective basis of the industries of the country. They tell me that, and what am I to think? If I have any scepticism at all, it is because the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite say this. Aye; are there not sitting in these seats before me at this very hour men who have voted for the Government, who are here to support them, and who believe and say that the principle of protection is not going to be taken away from the industries of Canada in the proposed revision of the tariff. I think my eye can rest upon some one, or two, or three, or more, who have made that statement and who believe it in their hearts. Well, we shall see. But I am bound to suppose, and the country is bound to suppose, and it will be the worst page in political history that was ever written in Canada if it is not proven to be true; we are bound to suppose that the Opposition of twenty-four years will, when they come into power, make good the tenets that they held distinctively during those twenty-four years. We are therefore going to have a change, but it is to be delayed. We are going to have the principle of eighteen years eliminated from the tariff. And what else are we going to have? We are going to have just what we have now, accentuated by every week of further delay, we are going to have doubt and uncertainty as to what will happen permeating every branch of the business of this country, and working prejudicially to the progress and advancement of Canada. Why, Sir, a year ago capital became somewhat uneasy and great businesses began to think that a change might take place if the Liberal-Conservative party were ousted. We were approaching the period of the election, and as months passed by and the elections came

closer, that feeling of uneasiness, that a generic change would take place in the basis of the tariff policy, began to be more and more felt, until on the 23rd of June last, the coming into power of hon. gentlemen opposite made that uneasiness still greater, because then the business people of this country thought and said: There is to be a generic and absolute change as far as the fiscal policy is concerned; what it will be we do not know; we are involved in doubt and uncertainty. And the longer hon. gentlemen delay the greater will be that uneasiness and the greater will be the demoralization and confusion which will result from that uneasiness. It is morally impossible for my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) if this session passes with nothing done to revise the tariff and put it upon the statute-book, and get it into working order inside of six or seven or eight or nine months from this date. During all that time, and in proportion as the day approaches when there shall be an end of the present and a beginning of the future policy, the uneasiness increases and the demoralization and confusion grow in the same proportion. This delay is most prejudicial to both the present and prospective business interests of this country. They are in what you might call a state of suspended animation. Not knowing what six or eight months hence will be the conditions of sale or manufacture, they simply make from day to day, selling what they can and making nothing more than they can sell every day.

How will the channels of trade flow after this revision of the tariff? Will they flow north and south, as hon. gentlemen have so often declared to be the natural channels of trade in this country. They will, if hon. gentlemen adopt and carry out unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Or will they flow east and west as well as north and south, as they would if "free trade as it is in England" becomes the policy of the present Government in the six or eight months that is to come. They may flow in one direction or they may flow in another, but no man engaged in business knows how, and consequently every man engaged in business is to that extent in doubt and uncertainty, and paralysed as to his movements. What will be the conditions of purchase or sale? To-day when a man goes out to sell goods to his customers they say to him: We believe there is to be a revision of the tariff. The leader of the present Government has declared that there is going to be "free trade as it is in England"; if there is, imported goods will not have a duty upon them and they will be cheaper. I do not want to buy from you any more than I can just sell out to my customers between this and the time the change takes place. And the customer says to the man from whom he buys: What are you selling at now? And the seller says: So much. And the buyer says: There is to be a revision of the tariff, and the Hon. Mr. Laurier says that it is to be "free trade as it is in England." I think I will curtail my purchases until the time arrives when there will be no duties on these goods, and I will get them somewhat cheaper. And so the consumer buys less. Here is a man who has to manufacture to-day for a market which he cannot get at until nine or ten months have passed. He must either stop his machinery or he must run the risk that the conditions of sale may be entirely different when his manufactured articles are offered on the market. His whole plant is paralysed, and if the tariff is revised, we will say on iron, and if iron is made free in certain of its forms, all that he manufactures is subject to the loss represented by the duty which is placed upon iron now, or very nearly that amount. Is it fair; is it right? But it goes further than that. The farmer in this country for the last four years has been investing his capital more and more in the raising and manufacture of pork. He says: To-day I have certain prospects of commanding the home market and consequent confidence to go into the business for export, which I have done. But if I lay in my stock now, when they have been fatted and ready for the market, I may find myself in the face of a competition entirely unhindered, from the pork markets of Chicago and the United States, and they can drive me out of our markets. Timidity and shyness and doubt and anxiety are upon every producer in this country of cottons, woollens, pork, manufactures of iron: every one of these. What is the thing which should be done by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) opposite? He should have had his tariff ready and down, and passed at this present session of Parliament. When he (Mr. Laurier) for nineteen years has been heralding a change on a question of principle, when above all other things he has been declaring for "free trade as it is in England," or for a "revenue tariff without a vestige of protection," it does not take ten days' work to frame a tariff on either of these principles. All he has to do in either case is to settle for himself what revenue are required, then if it is free trade, to pick out the articles on which to put the duty and raise the revenue, and everything else is free; if it is a revenue tariff without a vestige of protection, in just the same way to find out what revenue it is necessary to raise, and raise it by duties on imports with countervailing excise duties on similar articles produced in the country, so as to make the tariff non-protective and to obtain just what is necessary for the services of the country. There is nothing difficult in that; and my hon. friend, if he were honest in his propaganda, and intended to put either of these courses into operation, could have done it in thirty days, as easily as he could deliver an oration

on free trade in the city of Quebec. Why the delay? From one of two causes, Sir: party ineptitude or party tactics; but neither party inepitude nor party tactics is an excuse for delaying, and putting into doubt, uncertainty and demoralization the vast business interests of this country for one single hour. Party ineptitude in that he has not yet, or his party has not yet, settled the principle of his tariff. He settled it before the election in the country? Free trade as it is in England, or a revenue tariff without a vestige of protection—in either case his tariff could have been ready and passed with a minimum of disturbance arising from delay. But if he has not settled the principle, he cannot arrange the details. Or it is party tactics, because there are certain by-elections to come, and, as in the general election he spoke fair words to every class of people, whereby he might sweep as many of them as possible into his net, so in the by-elections which are to come on before the next session of Parliament, he may gather many still within his net by whispering the word of promise into the ear of each section of the manufacturing or producing classes. But that is no excuse for delay.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was proceeding to state some things with regard to the state of general doubt and uncertainty in which the business and producing interests of the country were placed, owing to the peculiar state of things which has resulted from the long canvas of hon. gentlemen opposite on certain lines, their accession to power, and the delay which by their intimation is threatening the progress and stability of the producing and manufacturing interests of the country. I was proceeding to state that this doubt and uncertainty was felt in various ways. As is well known, business and commercial men have to look far ahead, and lay the lines of their business, make their purchases, prepare their stocks and arrange for their sale; and the period of six or seven months which must necessarily intervene between the present time and the completion of a tariff by hon. gentlemen opposite is not the length of time which completely covers the whole, or indeed a main part, of the great operations of business. At the present time men who are engaged in business and in production, in various lines of industry, looking forward to the time when probably the change will be consummated and the legal enactments made, find it impossible to arrange their business so as to free them from probable and almost certain loss. Looking out upon the few months that intervene between this time and the time when the final enactment will be made, these men, I was stating, are asking, In what direction will the channels of trade flow when our operations just now commenced shall have been completed so far that we shall be able to place our made-up stocks on the market? Hon. gentlemen opposite have for many years contended that the principal and natural channels of trade were from north to south—that the United States market was our natural one; and they have so far reinforced their statements in that respect as to declare—the only declaration which they have made at the present session of Parliament—that their policy in one respect is made up, so far as its principle is concerned, that is, that they intend, if possible, to have a large measure of free trade with the United States of America. Then, if there be a change in tariff regulations—a change consequent upon the adoption of a policy of that kind—there will inevitably take place all the confusion, all the loss, all the demoralization consequent upon changed channels of trade; and, as I said before, the manufacturing and producing interests are at this moment altogether uncertain as to whether this change shall be made or not, and as to the direction in which the channels of trade will run—whether they will cross those that have been the stated channels of trade, in the main, during the past ten or fifteen years, or whether they will run in the same directions. Then I have pointed out what takes place as regards the conditions of purchase and sale. Men who are engaged in any great producing interest, whether they are makers of cottons of woollens, or iron, or refiners of sugar, have to make their purchases six, nine and twelve months in advance. They have to lay in their raw material, they had to determine the prices they pay by the prices they propose to get for their products when finished; and not one of these heavy manufacturers and producers has, at this moment, the least certainty as to whether, if he lays in his stock of raw material to-day, when six, eight or nine months hence those shall have been worked up and ready for the market, the conditions upon which he has to sell them in this market will not be radically changed. In all these respects, the mere statement of fact carries with its own argument and its own conviction that all these great businesses must be almost paralysed, that whatever is done must be done, as it were, from hand to mouth, and that the conditions a few months ahead being entirely unknown, the element of certainty is entirely taken away, and these industries become confused and demoralized. And there is another point which I consider of great importance. Under the system of protection, which we have had in this country for eighteen years, under any system of protection, there is a certain scope and intensity of competition which all producers must meet in the wide fields where they sell their stocks. In a protected country, confining our attention, for the time being, to the home market, there are certain con-

ditions of competition to which the home manufacturers are subject as contrasted against outside competition. There is the compensating power of the protection which surrounds the country, be it great or little, which protects to a large extent against the intense competition of foreign countries. Within the country itself, the home market is largely served by its own producers, so that the competition inside of it is, in the greater measure, confined to those who manufacture in the country itself, and the conditions are as nearly equal as they can be. In the Dominion of Canada, capital ranges about the same for every manufacturer within its domain, the cost of fuel is about the same; the recompense which is paid to labour ranges in the main on about an even scale. For these producing interests, the temperature, the climate, and every one of the conditions flowing from these are about the same, so that the competitors here are placed upon as nearly the same level as possible. They know what they have to meet, and they know the conditions of competition into which they shall engage, and that competition to-day in the Dominion, and for years past, has been so strong and so vigorous on those planes that it has reduced the cost to the consumer, in all cases, to the veriest small profit upon the production, over and above the cost of the raw material and the cost of production. Well, Sir, we have here competition known, stated, experienced for year after year, and our manufacturers may well lay in their stocks, may well lay their plans, may go on with their work. But if you are going to strike down the wall of protection and allow the manufacturer from every country under the sun to compete without any compensating advantages in the way of tariff to our own manufacturers, you enlarge the scope of competition by that much. You introduce new elements into the matter entirely. Capital must cost the manufacturer in this country 6 per cent, but he will then have to compete with the manufacturers of countries where capital can be had at three, three and a half, or two and three-quarters per cent. Coal costs our people a stated amount, but if you open this competition, then you will find our manufacturers competing with rivals who can get their coal at one-half the cost. We know what skilled and unskilled labour costs here. The conditions for our home manufacturer are stated and well known, but if you throw down the wall of protection and open the competition to every European and Asiatic country and every country under the sun, we shall have to compete with a certain scale of wages in this country against the manufacturers of countries where the scale of wages is three-quarters or one-half, or it may be one-fifth or one-tenth of what is is here. You have to manufacture in this country under conditions of climate which are known and which bring their difficulties and add to the cost. Throw down the wall of protection, open the range of competition, and you find yourselves competing with the manufacturers of countries where the climate is such that many of the difficulties which add to the cost in this country are not met with there at all. The plan of competition changes entirely, its scope changes, and you have forced on the manufacturers of Canada, under these new conditions, a competition to which they are unused, for which they are unfit, under conditions which make it impossible for them to succeed. It goes without saying that, under those conditions, if you do as my hon. friend the leader of the Government has given his solemn word as a public man he proposes to do, if you take every vestige of protection out from the tariff of the country, if you throw down the wall entirely and invite competition from every country under the sun, with these varying and more advantageous conditions in their favour, you make it perfectly impossible that, in many of the producing industries of this country, our manufacturers can do business at all. These are facts which are known to every man who thinks on the question and the conditions of the industries in this or any other country. What have the manufacturers of this country to go upon—waiting upon the sweet will of my hon. friend who leads the Government, looking up to him who has practically nothing at stake, who gets his salary——

Mr. McMULLEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has broken out again, I would advise him to consult a physician. My hon. friend, I say, has no interest particularly in the matter. He leads this Government, he gets his comfortable salary, he floats at the top wave of popularity in his own party and on his own side of the House, but down in this country, from British Columbia to Cape Breton, there are men who toil from early morning to late at night—though my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has no particular love for that kind of creature at all—there are men who do not know where they are going to get their next day's wages. Are they not interested in this? They look up into the face of the leader of the Government, who says he is a beneficent factor in the government of the country, that he is going to do great things for the benefit of the country, and they say: If these industries which are of interest to us, to the tune of $100,000,000 of wages yearly, and which enable us to keep our families, are to be open to the competition of the wide world, without a vestige of protection, we have something to say in the matter. They look up to him, as leader of the Government, and ask him: Do you think it is fair for you to sit in your place, knowing exactly the principle upon which you propose to reduce the tariff, knowing in the main the details of the tariff

you propose to have, to keep capital in suspense and doubt, and thereby strike at the very means by which we get our daily wage, by which we earn our bread and butter and keep our homes and our families? Then, Sir, the farmers are interested in every branch of producing industry in this country. They look up into the face of the leader of the Government, and they say: You profess to be the farmer's friend; you have gone through the length and breadth of this country saying that, if you have to choose between the manufacturers and the farmers, you are going to stay with the farmers. There was no need for making a declaration of that kind. Mr. Blake, who was the former leader of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, never made a declaration of that kind. In his Malvern speech, he deprecated a declaration of this kind; he deprecated bringing this canvass down to a cleavage between two classes in this country. Sir, the farmer and the industrial producer, so far from having a line of cleavage between them, have twin interests, interests that are indissolubly connected with each other. The farmers of this country, who have had the home market increased to them since 1878 by $40,000,000 or $45,000,000, look up into the face of my hon. friend and say: We want to know whether or not you are going to introduce a policy which will break down the great manufacturing industries of this country, which afford the labouring men and artisans their means of support; we ask you if you are going to break these down, for, if labour is not employed, labour ceases to buy, and, if you break these industries down, we cease to sell what formerly was bought by labouring artisans. Capital has some rights as well, and the $400,000,000 of capital which to-day is invested in manufacturing industries in this country, has a right to ask the hon. gentleman who leads this Government, whether he thinks it is fair to that capital invested—there where they cannot pull it up at a moment's notice; lost, if the business in which it is invested does not bring them in a fair profit—for the purposes of party tactics, to keep them on the ragged edge of suspense for six, eight or nine months longer, to the loss of the capital at present in business, and to the utter negation of the employment of fresh capital in any business of producing, until that uncertainty and doubt are settled. So that my hon. friend will see that he is not now playing at politics. When a man is in the mad rush and fervour of a campaign, he can say and feel that many things are of little importance. But, when a man comes to his sober senses, when a man stands face to face with a monument of industry devised by one of the strongest minds that this country ever saw, laid on strong and broad foundations to the building up of a great Canadian nationality in this country, endorsed by the people, election after election, and in this last election of 1896 most emphatically not decided against by the electorate—I say that, when the mad rush and fervour of the campaign is over and he comes face to face with a monument of industry of that kind, he may well pause and think. And I do not think it is too late, even to-day, although the instrument is ready and although the hand is uplifted, to appeal to him not to strike. But, Sir, at least, if he is not ready with his details, if even at this time, when he has come face to face with the difficulty of the task that is laid upon him, he feels he is not quite ready with the details, he feels that it is a work of greater moment and importance than he had thought, at least the manufacturing and the business interests of this country have one request which they may make, and one question to which they deserve an emphatic, a clear and an immediate answer. If the leader of the Government is not able to-day to lay the details of his tariff before the House and before the country, at least he ought to have no excuse, under these circumstances, for not stating to the House and the country the principle upon which he proposes to revise the tariff. That would lessen the trouble, to some extent. While it would not take away all the difficulty, it would, at least, have this merit, that it would point out the road to be travelled six months from this time, and it would allow those driving on the road to arrange for the direction which the tariff was to take. My hon. friend can do that easily. Here, with all these interests lying before him, here with all this capital in doubt and anxiety, here with all this immense distribution interest which hangs still with uncertainty of doubt upon the next six months of possible action—with all this before him, has not he the duty imposed upon him of coming now frankly befor this House and before the country, and, to save these interests as much as he possibly can, at least to make frank and full definition of the principle that he proposes to base his tariff upon? Which will he take? Will he take free trade as it is in England? Then, let him state so; and, although many industries will be dismantled, and although all of them will be thrown into confusion, and although great demoralization and loss will occur—my hon. friend opposite me (Mr. Davies) shakes his head. Does he mean to say that if, after eighteen years of protection, protection is suddenly eliminated from the tariff and free trade as it is in England is suddenly introduced, that the industries and business of this country will not be thrown into confusion? It must be so. It may be his opinion that ultimately the good will far more than balance the evil, but no business man, I undertake to say, will rise in this House and declare that you can make a change from the principle of protection, kept in operation for eighteen years, with all its aggregation of capital and labour, to free trade as it is in England, and not produce the most widespread confusion and demoralization. The whole channel of

trade and business must necessarily flow in different ways, and, consequently, all that loss and demoralization consequent upon leaving the old and branching out into the new, must inevitably take place.

Now, Sir, if he is not going to take the principle of free trade, let him at least say so, because surely by this time he must have settled that question. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot be at variance upon this. Whatever other differences there may be amongst them, however they may differ about lines of policy of less importance, it surely cannot be that men who have been led and marshalled together on the lines of the statements that I have put before this House this afternoon, for ten, twelve or fifteen years, have the least doubt to-day as to the principle upon which they shall revise their tariff. If it is not free trade as it is in England, will the hon. gentlemen state that his principle is to be a revenue tariff without one vestige of protection? Then the producing interests of this country, from one end of it to the other, will know at least what to expect after six or eight, or nine months, and they can make the disposition of their business according to that which is to be the accepted policy after that time. It will not obviate all the loss, nor much of it, it will not obviate all the confusion, but it will at least make a certainty along the line of which they can import, and arrange, and re-arrange their businesses so as to be ready for the inevitable change when it comes. Whatever is the policy, whatever is the principle, if the details are not known, at least let the hon. gentlemen opposite—and I make this appeal again—give to this House and the country a clear and definite statement as to the principle upon which they propose to proceed in the revision of their tariff.

Now, after having called the attention of the House to these matters chiefly in reference to the record of the policies, and the enunciated principles, and to some results that I think would flow from them, of hon. gentlemen and the party opposite, let me ask the attention of this House for a single moment to the contrast which is afforded upon this tariff and business issue, by the history and the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party down to this present time. Whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say of the Liberal-Conservative policy——

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is it?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not think, at this age, in this day, in this Canadian Parliament, there was a single representative, even on that side of the House, who would look up in my face and ask, What is the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. The hon. gentleman's case is perfectly hopeless, if he does not know it; and so I will forego all attempts to struggle with him, and will try to impress my views upon others, and I hope more intelligent members of Parliament. Whatever, then, may be said of Liberal-Conservative policies along other lines, there is this statement which cannot be gainsaid, that from the year 1876 down to the present time, as regards the tariff and trade policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government and party, there has been the utmost clearness, there has been the utmost consistency, and no man can substantiate a charge in either case contrary to these two assertions. Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1876 and 1877, by his resolutions, laid the foundation of the policy which has been adopted and pursued by the Liberal-Conservative party from that time to the present. It has been the principle of protection, steadily applied to the tariff and the trade of the country.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What was the date of their conversion in 1876?

Mr. FOSTER. Whose conversion?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The Conservative party's.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I want to answer my hon. friend's question, as I have a perfect right to do, I suppose, by asking another. I want to ask him whether he, having been a protectionist at that time, has met with any argument sufficient to convert him; and if he has not, why does he sit on that side of the House behind a leader who has done nothing for the last ten years but to fulminate against protection, who declares that it is robbery, that it is a wrong system, and has promised that when the Liberal party came into power, it should be entirely blotted out from the statute-book.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Give us the date of the conversion of the Conservative party. I want the date.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me, for my own special information, whether he is to-day a protectionist, as he was in 1877?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I will give the hon. gentleman the date, if he wants to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we would like to have all the information you have.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Very well, it was on the 26th February, 1876, when the hon. gentleman's leader came down to this House with a speech specially prepared to pitch into the Government for increasing the taxation of the people. When the then Finance Minister, Sir Richard Cartwright, came down with his Budget Speech, and not a word was said about the tariff, the hon. gentleman's leader looked up at the clock, and asked the Government kindly to call it six o'clock—it was then a quarter past five. At eight o'clock he came back with a tirade against the Government for not taking into consideration the manufacturing interests of the country. Then was the date that the

Conservative party was converted, and since that time they have gone on with their protection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to state, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to state that the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh ! oh !

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to state, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) commenced his statement by an assertion that is utterly untrue and foundationless.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have several points satisfactorily settled, we have some points not so satisfactorily settled. The point that is satisfactorily settled is this, according to the testimony of the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are settled, anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall have to ask your kind offices against impertinent interruptions. The interruption of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) was a perfectly pertinent one, and I gave place to it, as I should be glad to give place to any interruption that was conceived in the same spirit. But the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has a very bad habit of making impertinent interruptions when hon. gentlemen on this side are speaking; and I think it would be well for the leader of the Government who poses and passes, and rightly so, as a gentleman, to take my hon. friend under his especial and kindly teaching for a little while, and teach him how he ought to behave in a deliberative assembly. I was going on to say that so far as my hon. friend from Hamilton was concerned, we have one thing satisfactorily settled, and it is settled directly in the line of my argument. Does my hon. friend object to conversions ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Certainly not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's testimony was that so far back as 1876 the Liberal-Conservative party were soundly converted to protection, and he himself stated before he sat down, that from 1876 up to the present time we have pursued the even tenor of our way. Now, it might be a pertinent question for me to ask my hon. friend——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Impertinent.

Mr. FOSTER. I am interrupted again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to keep order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, we will now say quits.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if my hon. friend will be quiet——

Mr. LANDERKIN. All right, if you will be civil.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go on one step further. I have now the right, having answered the hon. gentleman's question, to ask a question, and it is if in 1876 he was a strong protectionist ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I beg your pardon.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Never as bad as that.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I do not desire to interrupt the hon. gentleman by stating what I was then. The hon. gentleman is making an eloquent speech, and I am listening to him with great pleasure.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank my hon. friend very much. I have a very distinct recollection of reading statements made by a Mr. Wood, and I think it was my hon. friend opposite who expressed his views, and if I am not mistaken he also submitted a motion in this House, and the purport of the motion was in the same direction, in favour of protecting the industries of this country.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him ? The first motion I ever made in this House was to ask for a committee to investigate the manufacturing industries of the country. The first hon. gentleman who arose to oppose the resolution was the hon. gentleman who sits on the right of the hon. member who now has the floor. His statement was simply this, that this was the thin end of the protectionist wedge, and the committee must not be granted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must give a most emphatic contradiction to that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I really cannot allow these hon. gentlemen to take up the rest of my time. They seem to have misunderstood one another, one stating exactly the opposite of what the other affirms. I desire, however, to call the attention of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) to one matter which is almost implied in the charge made against my colleague and chief, that at that particular time the hon. member opposite was the man accused of putting in the protectionist, not the free trade wedge. Now, after these interchanges of pleasantries between the hon. gentleman and myself, I wish to go on with the remarks I was proceeding to make. Those remarks were to this effect, that from 1876 up to the present time the Liberal-Conservative party, so far as its trade and tariff policy is concerned, has been consistently advocating an adequate and sufficient protection for the industries of this country. I do not think there is any gainsaying that statement. Hon. gentlemen sometimes make the argument that because rates

of duty change, at one time being higher and another time lower, there is inconsistency in the policy. But, Sir, if the principle remains always the same, on the one hand the principle of protection, or on the other the principle of free trade, the changes which are made in the items and the application of the principle afford no proof of a change of principle, but rather prove the permanency of principle and precise adherence to it. Even though we were converted in 1876, according to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, we have remained steadfast ever since, and are at this date on the very same platform as we occupied in that year. It will be for some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to explain why they are there, and how they can consistently remain behind a Government which is pledged to take every vestige of protection out of the tariff, especially when they represent constituencies vitally interested in the maintenance of protection, and when even they themselves have explicitly stated their views in favour of the protective principle as applied to our industries. Then I would urge this, that if you look at the policy of the Conservative party for the last eighteen or twenty years, you find it a consistent policy in its endeavour to apply the principle of protection to the tariff and business interests of this country. It may be perhaps not too late for me from this side of the House to appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding all that array of statements which they have made of their antipathy to protection, of their determination to supplant it by some policy which has no vestige of protection in it, that when they to-day stand in front of the great interests of this country, built up and around a period of protection for the last eighteen years, they will consider whether after all it will not be better for them, when they think over the question calmly and seriously, to acknowledge they have made a mistake, and when they come down to the hard work of adopting a policy they will not deem it better to adopt the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party and continue the application of the principle of protection. Iconoclasm is not the noblest of occupations. The man who lifts his axe or implement of destruction in the face of a monument to the consistent and uniform action of a great people, like the people of Canada, for eighteen years, may well pause before he brings that instrument down to the demolition or defacement of a monument which has been erected by the people through so long a period of years. This policy of protection, Sir, was not singly and by itself adopted in this Dominion of Canada. It was part of a grand scheme for the development and building up of this country. Confederation was prior to it—the joining of these different provinces in a union of government by the political cement of our institutions. The joining together of all the different parts of the country by cheap and rapid means of communication was a second element in the progress of the country. The development of the great industrial life of the country, and the development of its matchless resources by the application of industry under those conditions was a third principle laid down for the development of this Dominion. All these three have their places; and I am satisfied, Sir, that if hon. gentlemen opposite could be convinced that free trade, taking every element of protection out of the tariff, would be to the detriment of the development and upbuilding of the great industrial life of Canada they would hesitate before they applied it. Well, Sir, the history, not only of our own country, but contemporary history all around us shows that the principle of protection is applied in almost every modern country in the building up of its great home industries. That it was considered necessary in this country follows from the judgment of the people in 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891. And here let me state what I implied a moment ago, that I do not consider the elections of 1896 gave hon. gentlemen opposite a mandate to destroy the principle and the application of protection as applied to our business and commercial interests. My belief is that if upon the single issue of tariff policy the two parties had gone to the electors, and there had been no other issue, the electors would have returned the advocates of the National Policy, the principle of protection, triumphantly at the polls. Other questions of less moment in many respects; the accretions that grow around a government of long standing; the difficulties that they meet and are not able in every case to solve to the satisfaction of everybody; these and a thousand side issues entered into in the last contest—and it is for no man in this country to affirm that the verdict of the people in 1896 was given unequivocally against the National Policy, so far as the principle of protection is concerned. So that the first thing that counts for a continuance of this system is the eighteen years of growth and persistence that it has had in Canada, with the repeated endorsement of the electors. But, Sir, there is something else. The environments of this country have to be looked at as well. When we look over the world, what do we find with regard to this principle? We find that protection is almost everywhere. If it is not everywhere at the present time—and the only great country which can be appealed to as not having the system, is Great Britain—the answer is, that Great Britain, in the first place, began to develop her wealth of skill and industrial capital and prominence by a system of the most virtual and most effectual protection. And, having developed it thus for a series of centuries, she at last came to the conclusion that, under her peculiar conditions, it was better for her to make her food free and cheap, and trust to her superiority of position, of skill, of capital, and of commer-

cial supremacy to keep her manufactures in their ascendancy throughout the wide world, and to become, as it were, the great manufacturing shop for the nations. Outside of England, where is the great country that in this commercial war takes down its walls and lets competition come in untrammelled? If my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) carries out his policy to-day, and takes every vestige of protection out of the tariff, what is the position in which Canada will be placed? Sir, when that policy is carried out, our industries, our labour, our enterprise here are all open to the uncompensated competition of every country in the world, and, with the exception of Great Britain, every other country into which we would like to throw our products by way of mutual trade, has its tariff walls of greater or less height raised against us. That may be a brave proceeding for us, but it is not prudent commercial warfare. For this country to open up its industrial enterprises in which labour is so much interested, to the competition of the wide world, without getting from the wide world a corresponding entrance to their market, is not commercial warfare, but, to most of our industries, it would be simple and absolute suicide. It may be brave to say that a Canadian is as good as any other man, and that a Canadian workman is as good as any other workman. That may be all true, and yet, when the Canadian comes to fight against workmen no better than himself, if they are protected in their home markets and fight the Canadian from behind high tariff battlements, then even equal enterprise and equal skill in a non-protected country cannot fight a people like that successfully. What will the agriculturists of this country say, if today they are laying their plans for raising their products, and when their products have been raised, eight or nine months hence, they find themselves without entrance into the markets of other great countries? What will they say, if they find, also, that the surplus products of the United States of America are liable to be brought into Canada without any hindrance of tariff, and without any compensation which the tariff now gives them in this competition?

Sir, with reference to the other great industries of the country, the same question might be asked and the same answer given. The manufacturers in every great line, whilst the doors are closed to them in every other great country, either by high protective tariff or by great compensating advantages, as in Great Britain, will find that their home market is thrown open to the competition of the wide world, and that they will be placed on this platform of disadvantage. I was going on to say that the history of every modern country proves the necessity of this principle for the development and upbuilding of its industrial life. England's case I have cited. Take the case of the United States. Does not every student of history know that the United States has come to its present proud position as a manufacturing country by the exercise of the strong power of a protective tariff in its younger and weaker stages and which has been perpetuated up to the very present time? Take Germay. Does not every student of history know that within the last fifteen years Germany has made tremendous strides in its manufacturing life by virtue of the protection that is given to its manufacturers and artisans? To-day, instead of being a country which takes from Great Britain and other manufacturing nations almost the total of their manufactured goods, and offers no competition in return; to-day, Germany, protected in its home market by a tariff wall, goes out over its borders and floods Great Britain herself and floods every civilized, and almost every uncivilized country on the face of the globe, with a keen and constant competition against the products of the manufacturing power of Great Britain. In Asia, in Africa, in South America, everywhere the German manufacturer is successfully pushing his wares. Surely, if this is a principle necessary to be applied in almost every case that history gives us, it is a principle that ought to be applied as well to a young and growing country like ours, with its wealth of natural resources and its comparatively small aggregation of population, of capital, and of skilled labour. More than that, Sir, in the results of this system of protection, which for the last eighteen years has held sway in this country, we have something which ought to be a strong argument, and ought to be well weighed before an attempt is made to strike down protection and to replace it by a fiscal policy which is entirely different.

What, Sir, are the facts of the case? Between 1878 and 1896 there has been an immense growth in the manufacturing industries of this country. Unfortunately, we have no statistics which run for those years; but we have the statistics gathered in the census of the country from the decade of 1881 to 1891.

Mr. DOMVILLE. They are not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. And what do those figures give us as the progress which has been made by the manufacturing industries of this country? Why, Sir, that the number of establishments has increased from 49,000 to 75,000, or 52 per cent; that invested capital has increased from $164,000,000 to $354,000,000, or 114 per cent; that the number of employees has increased from 254,000 to 370,000, or 41 per cent; that the wages paid have increased from $59,000,000 to $100,000,000, or 69 per cent; that the cost of raw material has increased from $179,000,000 to $256,000,000, or 42 per cent; and that the value of products has increased from $309,000,000 to $476,000,000, or 53 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite may cavil at the census statistics; they may declare that they are right or that they are wrong.

These are the figures obtained on the very same basis of enumeration that existed in preceding decades, and they are as approximately correct as the census figures ever are, for none of which can absolute accuracy be claimed, but all of which are known and taken to be as approximately correct, and worth everything for the purposes of comparison of decade with decade.

But Sir, if these are to be cavilled at, there is something else that cannot be cavilled at; that is, the increase in the imports of raw material, the staples which are worked up by our manufacturing industries. Let us see what the figures are as to these. From 1878 to 1895 the imports of wool has increased from 6,000,000 pounds to 7,750,000, or 24 per cent; cotton has increased from 7,000,000 pounds to 45,000,000, or 525 per cent; hides have increased from $1,200,000 to $1,900,000, or 61 per cent; gutta percha and rubber have increased 339 per cent; hemp, 277 per cent; lumber, 62 per cent; and raw sugar from 11,000,000 pounds to 345,000,000 pounds, or 2,845 per cent. These back up the statistics of the census as to the great growth that has been made by this country under the application of protection.

But, Sir, there are other ways in which testimony is borne to the good of the system of protection which has been in force. The farmer's home market has been increased. The farmer's home market consists of the dwellers in the cities and towns and villages who do not produce farm products, but who require them for the sustenance of their families. There has been an increase from 1878 to 1895 of more than 150,000 families in that class of population in our country, an increase largely due to the growth of our industries in the towns and villages and cities; and that increase has increased the home market for the farmer's products by from $40,000,000 to $45,000,000 on a fair calculation as to what is consumed by each family. Let us go a little further. The farmers of this country know well what has taken place in the shutting out from the domestic market of meats and that kind of product from the United States, owing to the direct operation of the tariff, by the change of duty which was made in 1890-91, and which in the short period from then to 1895 has enlarged the farmer's home market for those products by more than $1,500,000 in those articles alone; and, Sir, the statistics show that although there has been a falling off in price in certain great agricultural products, yet the exports of the great staples which the farmer raises have increased since 1878 from $15,000,000 to $36,000,000, an increase of nearly 150 per cent. If then, there has been this great increase in capital invested and in wages paid, if there has been this great increase in raw material brought into this country to be made up into staple manufactures, if there has been this great increase in the home market of the farmers of the country owing to the employment given, and if at the same time there has been this notable increase in the foreign market of our farmers, these are proofs that cannot be gainsaid of the value of the system which was introduced in this country in 1879, and which has been worked out on the lines of progress and advancement from that period up to the present time.

Sir, we may go further than that. The trade exports in home products in 1879 under a revenue tariff administration had sunk down to $63,000,000. Last year, Sir, that is, in 1896, the trade exports of home products had risen to $110,000,000, the highest figure since confederation. The imports for home consumption in 1879 were but $80,000,000, having fallen to that figure under the previous regime. This year they total $110,500,000, and the total trade of home products and home consumption has risen from $143,000,000 in 1879 to $220,000,000 in 1896, the highest, with the exception of one year, since confederation.

So, Sir, I might take, as we have often done in this House, as indications of the progress of the country, the savings of the people. I might show that while under the previous regime of tariff for revenue only, the savings of the people actually decreased they have increased from 1878 to 1896 by over $155,000,000. I might show that the credit of the country has constantly improved until to-day it is very nearly 2 per cent better than it was in 1875-76. I might point to the experience of every member sitting around these boards, of the general improvement that has taken place in those years in the whole character of the country and in the whole condition of the people. It is a libel, a calumny upon Canada to say that it has not made staunch and notable progress in those eighteen years; and to my mind that progress has been largely due to the stability which has been imported, to the confidence which has been given, and the sustenance which has been afforded, to the producing interests of this country, from the farmers up to the highest skilled manufactures, by a wise national policy of protection, graduated according to the circumstances of the time and the environments of Canada in the tariffs which surrounded her from year to year. Sir, it seems to me that even at this late date, my hon. friend, before he raises his instrument to destroy this creation of eighteen years, which has been so beneficent to the people of Canada, ought to pause and reconsider well the principles of his action; and if he finds that it is a dangerous proceeding, if he finds that it will be productive of certain loss, if he is not fully convinced that the compensating advantages will be certain, even at this late day, in spite of all his protestations in favour of free trade and against protection, it is better for him to do the best for his country than to try to be consistent with himself.

I am not sure that my plea will have much effect on my hon. friend. Having been for the last ten or twelve years constantly reiterating these statements of a doctrine absolutely opposed to protection, it may be that his convictions run in the same line, and it may further be that ideas of consistency will impel him to carry them thoroughly out. But again, before I take my seat, I ask my hon. friend opposite, for the sake of the wide and immense business interests of this country, if he cannot at this session give us the details of his tariff revision, that he should to-night take the country into his confidence and give us at least the principle upon which he proposes to proceed. That will mitigate some of the difficulty, although it will not take away all of it by any means, but it will be an answer which will be received with gratitude by the great producing interests of this country, in that it will remove all the doubts and uncertainty which to-day paralyses every effort and clouds every hope for their future. I beg to move, seconded by Sir Charles Tupper:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following added instead thereof:—"since 1879 the Liberal party in Canada has in the main evinced uncompromising hostility to the principle and practice of protection as applied to the producing interests of Canada.

That during this period the leaders and organs of the party have from time to time advocated:

(a.) Commercial Union with the United States.

(b.) Continental Free Trade.

(c.) Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States, with discrimination against Great Britain and other countries.

(d.) Free Trade as practised in Great Britain, and

(e.) Tariff for revenue only in which there should be no vestige of protection.

That the authoritative platform of the Liberal party, adopted in 1893, declared that the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, which it denounced as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and resolved, as the conviction of the party, that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

That the Government, through its leader, has announced its determination not to introduce any measure dealing with the tariff during the present session.

That the platform of the Liberal party and the utterances of the leader of the party and its principal organs and supporters have led the country to believe that a radical change is imminent in the principle upon which the revision of the tariff is to be based.

That the uncertainty and delay consequent upon these announcements will result in great disturbance in business and serious loss to the commercial and producing interests of the country.

That this House, while willing to allow reasonable time to perfect details, is of the opinion that a declaration of the principle upon which the Government propose to base their tariff revision should be at once made.

And that, no revision of the Canadian tariff will be wise or satisfactory which does not proceed upon the basis of an adequate and sufficient protection for the producing interests of the country."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Were my hon. friend a less distinguished apostle and professor of temperance than he is, I would be almost disposed to think that circumstances over which he had no control had compelled him to forget after dinner the statements that he made before, for most assuredly the first half of his speech was in wonderful contrast to the latter half. In the first half, he exhausted all his eloquence in appealing to my hon. friend beside me, over and over again, to bring down at once his tariff, which, he declared, might be composed in ten days, while the latter half was an elaborate argument to show that the utmost caution, care and deliberation are required at our hands before we venture to meddle with the tariff at all. Which is it to be? Are we to be condemned for not having brought a tariff down at once, or for meddling with an institution, as the hon. gentleman puts it, which has grown so long, which has spread its roots so wide and far, that it is only with the utmost caution and care that we can venture to touch it at all. But first let me pay a well-deserved tribute to the eloquence of my hon. friend. He did, before this House took recess, what I think but rarely is accomplished by any orator, however eloquent he may be. Sir, I observed the effect that my hon. friend's speech had on the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition respectively, before recess, and it is eminently to the credit of—what shall I say?—the soporific influence of my hon. friend's declamation that he succeeded, at one and the same moment, in putting both those hon. gentlemen to sleep. It is true that the slumber of my hon. friend beside me was somewhat fitful, but I was happy to observe that my hon. friend opposite slept the sleep of the just during an entire hour while the hon. gentleman held forth. Perhaps there was a reason for it, because I am bound to say that the older members of this House will bear me out when I say that by far the greater part of the hon. gentleman's speech has been delivered time and time again in this House.

The hon. gentleman was specially exercised to find out at what time, and why, and how the Liberal-Conservative party became converted to the doctrine of protection. If my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whom I do not see in his place, were here, he could throw some light, as well as myself, on that interesting question. I happened to have been exceedingly well acquainted with the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald in his earlier and better days, and this I know that in those earlier and better days there was no single intellectual

conviction more fixed in his mind, and more often expressed by him, than the conviction that protection was a fraud and a revenue tariff the only thing satisfactory to Canada, to which conviction he gave effect in the strongest way during the earlier days of his regime after confederation. And no one knows better than the hon. gentleman who sits opposite, that confederation would never have been adopted but for the solemn pledge to the people of the maritime provinces that the tariff would not be increased but would remain as it was when they entered confederation. However, by the way if the hon. gentleman desires to know how, and when, and why the Liberal-Conservative party were converted to the doctrine of protection, I would refer him again to a man who was deep in their counsels at that time, that is my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who was good enough to explain to us that the reason why the Liberal-Conservative party took up the policy of protection in 1876, was because they saw in it the only way to defeat Mr. Mackenzie. There was the genesis, that was the cause, it was the desire for place, the hope to obtain office, that led to the introduction of that policy, and nothing else.

The hon. gentleman, in the early part of his speech, recalled forcibly to my mind another departed Liberal-Conservative, endeared to fame in the old days by the title of "Scrap-book Charlie." I thought the mantle had fallen on another distingushed member of the Opposition, another Charlie, but I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is not going to allow himself to be surpassed, even in scrap-book quotations, by any man on that side of the House. Sir, I do not blame the hon. gentleman. To my mind the quotations were by far the best part of his speech. I was very glad to see that so many redeeming sentences studded that somewhat dreamy waste of words. Now, Sir, what is the hon. gentleman's charge? Before dinner, his charge was that my hon. friend would not bring down the tariff at ten days' notice. There are certain conditions—and I will explain them to the House and to the hon. gentleman—under which a tariff may be brought down in ten days. When the Finance Minister of any government or party is content to make himself the mouthpiece and speaking trumpet of a number of combinesters scattered over the country, when the Ministers are the paid agents of the men with whose assistance and by whose aid they hope to derive the means by which alone they can hope to remain in office, a tariff can be made in ten days, or even in a much shorter time. But, when the tariff is to be brought down by men who are awake to their responsibility, by men who desire to do their duty by the immense and varied interests of this country, and who have weighed and understand how extensive and how intricate the complications are which are involved in any material change of the tariff, then, Sir, they would not be doing their duty, they would be false and recreant to their duty, if they allow any of this silly badinage—I can call it by no better name—to cause them to depart from their policy or to anticipate by one hour the time when they can lay a well-considered scheme before the Parliament and people of this country. It is hard to know whether the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is serious in the statements he makes. He has been Finance Minister himself for a number of years, and, if there be one man more than another who knows he is asking an impossibility, in asking what he did in one part of his speech, it is that hon. gentleman. He knows he is asking what no Government ever did. I will go further and say, what no government ought to do. And let me recall to his mind and the minds of my hon. friends opposite that, in asking for this, he is going in the most direct contradiction to his own previous practice and of that of his predecessors. It is a much more difficult and a much more complicated task, as every one who has had the smallest experience in these matters knows, or ought to know, to revise and reduce a tariff, than to add to a tariff. Nevertheless, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1878 on their protective policy, the House will recollect, and those members who do not recollect, can ascertain it by reference to "Hansard," they took six or seven months before Sir Leonard Tilley was ready to bring down his tariff. We were defeated on the 17th September, and we went out of office, if my memory serves me, in the first week in October. Nevertheless, it was the middle of March, 1879, before Sir Leonard Tilley was able to bring down his tariff, involving, as I said, a number of additions and not reductions. But what was the course of the hon. member for York himself? It is within the recollection of a great many members whom I now address, that, when the hon. gentleman undertook to lop the mouldering branches away, he called to his assistance two or three of his colleagues and sent them all over the country, from one end to the other, to confer with the manufacturers and farmers and the chief producers of the country; and, when he had done all that, after taking a year to do it, what did he effect? He effected changes in the whole tariff to the extent of three-tenths of one per cent. In that respect, I think the hon. gentleman's practice—and it is not often the case that I have to make that statement of him—was decidedly better than his precepts. He found that a revision of the tariff, even to that insignificant extent, took time, required consideration, required a great deal of labour on his own part and on the part of his colleagues, and, when he had prepared his revision, as this House will perfectly well remember, he was obliged, after two or

three months of strenuous struggle, to abandon almost every single proposition he had originally laid before the House. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that the very first conditions are absent, the very first and primary conditions which alone would have justified my hon. friend in bringing down a revision of the tariff of this moment. Why, Sir, what is the very first thing, after all, that the head of the Government and the Minister of Finance must ascertain? First of all, they must ascertain what is the exact sum the needs of the country require them to raise in any particular year. How could they do that, when they had scarcely been sworn into office ten days before this Parliament met? The thing is utterly absurd and preposterous. We have brought down, it is true, the Estimates submitted by the hon. gentleman, but we have brought them down expressly on the ground that we had not time to examine and review in detail these various items, and that we must have time to do so. I say no more, Sir, about the absolute necessity of weighing, and weighing carefully and cautiously the effects of the changes we have to make—that goes without saying; that was admitted and dwelt upon by the hon. gentleman himself in the latter part of his speech. The hon. gentleman took upon himself to reproach my hon. friend the Premier as a mere academic theorist, and he went on to intimate that my hon. friend had no stake in the country. Why, Sir, what is his stake in the country, I should like to know? My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has this stake in the country, the highest stake any man can have, more perhaps than any other Canadian. He is responsible for the welfare of the people of Canada, and as much as any living Canadian does my hon. friend feel and acknowledge that responsibility. Sir, he calls my hon. friend a theorist, and I would like to know was any more unbusiness-like proposition ever made in any House of Commons than the proposition insisted on by him, that we should bring down to the House of Commons a revision of the tariff at ten days' notice. The hon. gentleman talks about the case of the importers and the trials of the importer. It may relieve his mind to know that during the last three months the importers do not appear to have manifested any great alarm, for I find, on looking at the ten days' return, that we have imported a little more and got a little more revenue than we did in the corresponding period of last year. But let me ask the hon. gentleman, and let me ask those hon. gentlemen who are engaged in the business, what do importers want, what did many importers ask expressly in so many words? Did they ask that the moment the House met the new tariff should be brought down? Not at all: they asked that time should be given to get rid of stocks on hand and a natural and reasonable request it was. They will be about the last men—I speak of the importers—to complain of the fact that my hon. friend is taking time before he brings down any revised tariff. Now, Sir, it is perfectly true, and I know it as well as the hon. gentleman, that business men and manufacturers, as a rule, undoubtedly do desire to see stability, they do desire that the changes made in the tariff and fiscal policy of the country should be carefully and well considered.

But, Sir, we know perfectly well, and if hon. gentlemen don't know it, there are plenty of men in the House besides myself who can point out the facts to him—they know that the so-called National Policy has been a ghastly failure; they know that the so-called National Policy has heaped up taxes on the people of Canada, they know that it has heaped up debt, they know that it has utterly and entirely failed to colonize the magnificent territory we have acquired in the North-west, they know that it has utterly and entirely failed to keep the people of Canada in this country, the most important thing of all, the best test of statesmanship, and the thing of all others in which those hon. gentlemen have most signally and most disastrously failed. What has their National Policy done to increase the population of Canada? Why, Sir, in these ten years to which that hon. gentleman appealed, the records of the census which he dared not quote, show that of our own population at least half a million are missing, and of the 900,000 people who were brought to Canada at our expense, scarcely 150,000 could be found in Canada when we came to count noses in the census of 1891. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what they have been successful in doing, what our annals show only too well they have been successful in doing. They have been successful in breeding the grossest political corruption which this country or perhaps any other country has ever seen. My hon. friend laughs. He thinks it is a trifle that we should have witnessed such scenes as those we witnessed in the session of 1891; he thinks it is a trifle that a Minister of State, standing in the very place I now occupy, should dare to tell the people of Canada that he had spent $112,000 in corrupting, or trying to corrupt, fruitlessly, I am glad to say, in most cases, some twenty constituencies in the province of Quebec, and that he was prepared to do the same thing again. Sir, the hon. gentleman prates to us of the duty of accepting the will of the people. I say let him accept the will of the people as recorded now. I say to him that we would have been ready enough to accept the will of the people if there had been any ground for believing that that will had been honestly or fairly declared. But were we going to accept a verdict such as that recorded in the province of Ontario where fifty-four constituencies were deliberately gerrymandered, prepared for the general election of 1882? Where the franchise Bill had practically disfran-

chised, in a great many counties, something like the sixth or seventh part of the voters? And when we know, as I have just stated the scandals of 1891 show only too clearly that these things were backed up by an almost unlimited corruption fund in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite? Sir, I say that since 1878 to 1896 there was no occasion, more particularly in the province of Ontario, where the result of the general elections could be said to have declared the real will of the people, and even in 1896, we were largely handicapped, and we lost many seats that we ought otherwise to have won, by reason of that same Franchise Act and Gerrymander Bill.

Sir, the hon. gentleman is continually sneering at the prospects of obtaining reciprocity. Well, far abler men than the hon. gentleman, leaders of whom the Liberal-Conservative party had good reason to be proud in many respects, acknowledged over their own hand and signature time and again, on the floor of Parliament and in state papers addressed to our friends on the other side of the water, that reciprocity was the very greatest boon that could be bestowed on the Canadian people. In 1876, and in 1877, and in 1878, too, no men were louder than those men in proclaiming that the object of the protectionist movement was to obtain reciprocity with the United States. Will the hon. leader of the Opposition deny that one of the arguments he used in the maritime provinces was that if he were permitted to get the National Policy into operation, he would have reciprocity within two years? No, he does not deny it, to do him justice. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman desires to know what we think about it. Well, we think reciprocity is a most desirable thing to secure, alike in the interests of Canada and in the interests of the British Empire. But we admit that it takes two to make a bargain; and we admit, further, that the failure of the late Parliament in 1888, in 1889, and in 1890, and the worse than failure of the then Ministers of Canada, have done a great deal to raise up barriers, and prevent a fair and honest understanding between ourselves and the people of the United States. Sir, I well believe that these barriers will disappear, and very shortly; I well believe that under a better Government, and an honester Government, when once we show the people of the United States what we ought to have shown them long ago, that we desire a fair and honest treaty with them, I have no doubt we shall obtain a good hearing, and I have no doubt that we shall have a very good prospect of negotiating a satisfactory reciprocity treaty.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, above all things, is desirous of knowing what our policy is on this same trade question. For the benefit of those hon. gentlemen who were not her during the late debates on this question. I propose to give the hon. gentleman in detail what our policy was, and what our policy is, on that question, as formulated by the Liberal party in a full convention where all sections of Canada were represented—a thing, let me add, which the Liberal-Conservative party have not shown the least disposition to do. Sir, the hon. gentleman read one sentence or two, and I will give him more. We declared here in formal convention, and by that decision the hon. gentleman has a right to expect we shall be bound—we declared:

That the custom tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

As the hon. gentleman knows right well, and as our returns show in the clearest possible manner.

In these and many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

And, Sir, we wind up by declaring:

That issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the citizens of Canada.

Which was given on the 23rd June, given on that issue as well as on many other issues. There is what the hon. gentleman wanted, a clear and definite enunciation of the principle on which our tariff revision is going to be based. I do not think that he or any of the gentlemen sitting beside him would find it easy, in a mere declaration of principles, without going into details, to add anything to the statement which I have now read.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call my hon. friend's attention to his leader, who was just going to sleep.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think you will find that my hon. friend is a good deal too wide awake to be influenced by your sophistries, although, after having stood the strain of trying to listen for three hours to the hon. gentleman, human nature might be pardoned for indulging in a few winks. Now, Sir, this Government propose to carry out their policy as there enunciated: this Government proposes to do that carefully and deliberately, so as to redeem to the best of their power their solemn declaration that they would not do any injustice, so far as in them lay, to any class or interest in this country. This Government proposes to weigh the whole situation at home and abroad. We know perfectly well that Canada, whatever great resources she may possess, and her resources are great, must of necessity more or less depend on other countries with whom her commerce is chiefly carried on. We cannot be blamed, we would deserve censure, it would be an imprudent and impolitic act in the highest degree, as my hon. friend has said, to approach the people of the United States for an extension of our trading facilities with them at this time when that country is convulsed by one of the most desperate political struggles ever known in its history. We must have time—and I tell the hon. gentleman we will take time—but the Government know their duty and mean to do it. Moreover, the Government do not propose to be coaxed, bullied or humbugged into taking a step until they have well and maturely considered it. We know, and the hon. gentleman when he sat here realized it in some degree at all events, the very great responsibility resting on those who for the time being are endeavouring to manage the affairs of five millions of their fellow-countrymen in a country like Canada. We admit that, we feel that responsibility, and as I have said, we propose to act in accordance with it. For one moment allow me to pause to review some of the declarations made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with respect to the proofs, as he alleged, of the unexampled prosperity in Canada as shown by the census of 1891. Sir, that matter has surely been threshed out often enough; surely the so-called facts which the hon. gentleman presented a few moments ago have been dealt with time and time again, not only on the floor of this Parliament, but I venture to say, on every hustings in the country. But if the hon. gentleman—and I apologize to this House and to every member of it for being compelled to go over this ancient history—will force us to go back over these matters, I will call the attention of the House to the value of some of those statistics the hon. gentleman has quoted so glibly. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that five and twenty thousand new industrial establishments had been added in those ten years to the average number of industrial establishments in Canada. But he did not tell the House that in all human probability of those five and twenty thousand establishments added, no less than twenty-two thousand were run by one man and a half on the average. Why, I will give the hon. gentleman an example. I have here the list of manufacturers in the town of Strathroy. Strathroy in 1881 contained 3,000 souls, all told, and it was reported as having 131 industrial establishments—131 industrial establishments to 3,000 souls—and of those 131 establishments no less than 11 employed an average of 10 hands, the remainder about a hand and a half each. I see that in Mount Forest there were 88 industrial establishments to about 2,500 souls, and five of those establishments appeared to have employed ten hands each. My hon. friend who sits behind me (Mr. Flint) will be pleased to know that Yarmouth reported 145 industrial establishments, 125 of those employing one hand and a half each. Owen Sound was reported as having 135 similar industrial establishments; Aylmer, 71; Blenheim, 54, with a population of 1,000 souls; and not to do any injustice to my hon. friend behind me, (Mr. Brown), Caughnawaga is reported as having 60 industrial establishments, mostly occupied in manufacturing birch bark baskets. It is simply folly for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to seek to ignore those facts, for he is perfectly well aware that those so-called 25,000 industrial establishments simply and solely represent the fact that in their extreme distress hon. gentlemen opposite were obliged, when in power, to pay their census enumerators so much per head for discovering new industries, and their industry in that respect was indeed remarkable. In one county in Nova Scotia they discovered 91 new industries, carried on by 91 old women, earning $15 in the course of the year each. I ask in all seriousness what valuable purpose the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) expects to serve by reiterating for the fiftieth time these oft-exploded fallacies in our ears. If the hon. gentleman and his friends could have pointed to an addition to the population of Canada of two or three millions of people who had come to this country during the eighteen years they held the reins of office, whose presence here could in any shape or form be attributed to their policy. I would say to them: Although your policy may have been expensive, extravagant and even corrupt, still there is something to show for the time you have occupied the Treasury benches. But as every man knows to-day, if there is one fact more than another that strikes attention it is that an enormous mass of our population, the very flower of our population, has gone from amongst us, and until now there has been no reasonable hope of bringing them back or keeping them when they come here. I say that one cause of the

exodus—I do not say it is the only cause—is the enormous mass of taxation heaped on our people, and the general loss of prosperity which, so far as my section of the country is concerned, attended the inception of the policy of the hon. gentleman's policy. Does not the hon. gentleman know, and if he does not know, every man who represents an agricultural constituency knows full well, that I am speaking within the mark when I say that in almost every class of agricultural products which the farmer raises there was a shrinkage of more than one-third in price compared with sixteen or seventeen years ago; also that the value of land property in the towns, villages and farms of Canada has shrunk enormously within that period. The hon. gentleman talks of the amount accumulated in the savings banks. I have said often before to the hon. gentleman, and I repeat it now, that I do not appreciate the importance which may be attached here to the value of certain conditions as indications of prosperity; but it is not to my mind a sign of prosperity that to-day in a great many towns and villages in Ontario particularly, and I dare say it is the same in other provinces, you will find in the banks hundreds, thousands of dollars, and yet in the market place you will see half a dozen farms put up at auction—and I have seen it—and no bidder to be found. Sir, the hon. gentleman contends that conditions have changed since 1878. In part it is true—the conditions have changed, for the worse. Then we had only about $24,000,000 to provide; now we have very much nearer $40,000,000 to raise. Then our debt was a mere fraction per head of the debt of the people of the United States; now our debt is double or treble that of the people of the adjacent republic. Sir, the conditions truly have been changed and for the worse, and it is to the great detriment of the progress of the people of Canada, that they should have so changed. It is most true that eighteen years of folly, fraud, and falsehood have left many a deep taint on the national heart and the national conscience, and I do not pretend to say—I never have pretended to say—that the mischief which was done to Canada in these eighteen years can be undone in an afternoon. I know full well that many glorious opportunities have been lost by the folly and incapacity of these hon. gentlemen opposite. In the North-west alone they well nigh fooled a whole Empire away, and without putting enough money in our treasury to pay for the boundary stakes that marked it off. But for all that, I cannot and do not take such a pessimistic view of the subject as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) does. I believe what he does not believe. I believe in Canadians, and I believe in Canadian enterprise and Canadian energy. I believe that with a fair field Canadian manufacturers and Canadian farmers above all, and Canadian producers of every class can hold their own, and will hold their own, when they are relieved from the crushing burdens of debt and taxation which now rest upon them. I do believe that a better day is dawning upon us, and perhaps not the least evidence of it is, that all this senseless clamour on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who will not learn to take their medicine quietly; all this senseless clamour has so far failed utterly, and is likely to fail utterly, to produce the slightest impression on the popular mind outside of this House, or in it for that matter. I cannot compliment the hon. gentlemen opposite on their tactics. I like to see the game well played, and I am bound to say that so far—although they may perhaps improve under the wholesome discipline of opposition—so far they have not shown much tactical skill in the grounds selected for attack. I do not think they themselves are disposed to say that the attack on the Governor General's warrants, by the use of which alone we were able to avert grave disaster and confusion from the trade of this country, was a brilliant success. If they do, I think they are entirely single in their opinion. I do not think that even the hon. gentleman who sits opposite to me (Sir Charles Tupper) would be disposed to rise in his place and declare that the attack on His Excellency was altogether a brilliant success. To use a favourite phrase of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am in the judgment of the House whether these various attempts on their part to rebuke my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blair) for his zeal in purging the civil service from active partisans has resulted in anything except the exposure of their own methods, and the showing of how very completely they had turned great public institutions into partisan machines. So far they have all fallen as flat as ditch water, and I am inclined to think that in spite of the admitted eloquence of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) this most foolish censure of his is going to do the same. Now, I will take him (Mr. Foster) and the House into my confidence. I have not the slightest doubt myself that had we done otherwise, had my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) and his Government come down with their tariff when this House met, had they proposed then and there to inaugurate great fiscal changes, I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would have raised his voice in the most emphatic and invenomed denunciation of the reckless, inconsiderate, and mischievous conduct of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) for presuming to meddle with the tariff at such short notice. He (Mr. Foster) would have pointed out how unjust it was to the importers, to the manufacturers, and to the producers of Canada. He is quite capable of making as lively a turn as was ever made by any man—I won't say as was made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) beside him, because his memory

and mine are at variance on the facts, and, of course, I am bound to accept his statement. This I will say, that I am perfectly certain that he would, and with much better cause than he has done to-night, that he would have severely condemned our hasty precipitation, if in a matter in which such grave and important interests were involved, we had presumed to act almost before our Cabinet could be got together, and certainly before several of its most important members had had time to become acquainted with the very officers of their departments. He would, I say, have condemned us without stint and without remorse, if we had ventured to introduce the tariff this session.

I will tell the hon. gentleman this further: that apart from the gentlemen on his side of the House who support him and who may find themselves compelled to sustain the position he has taken, I do not believe that he will find half a dozen intelligent and capable business men from one end of this Dominion of Canada to the other, who, whatever else they may say or think about the conduct of the Government, will not admit that it is the duty of Government most assuredly on the present occasion, to think well and to move deliberately and cautiously before they propose any important changes in the fiscal system of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) who has just taken his seat, did not attempt to reply to the long sustained and masterly argument of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). It was one of the most able speeches ever delivered in this House by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) although many of his past addresses have been comparable with the best efforts of financial eloquence in any Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, the aphasia, the epidemic of want of memory of which my hon. friend the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has spoken, has fallen on other gentlemen opposite besides those who occupy the Treasury-benches. When the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) interrupted the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and pitted his memory against the memory of the leader of the Opposition, he (Mr. Wood) forgot that we could send to the library for "Hansard" to substantiate the assertions that were made from this side of the House. Before I proceed to deal with the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I will ask the House to give me its attention while I point out how inaccurate was the statement, in the form of interruption, that was made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) declared that in 1876 the Minister of Finance of that day made a speech introducing his budget, that he concluded that speech by a quarter past five o'clock, and that then the Hon. Mr. Tupper, the present hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) asked that it should be called 6 o'clock. Now, all the business in the shape of questions which usually takes place had been transacted that day, before the then Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose to make his budget speech, and at the conclusion of his speech the "Hansard" says:

> The Hon. Mr. Tupper rose to reply, but the hour being six o'clock, the House took recess.

The speech of the Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) occupies from page 241 to page 262 in "Hansard," and those of us who have had experience of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) can readily suppose that the minute hand must have been touching near upon the XII twelve, and that the hour hand must have been biting close to VI 6 o'clock when the then Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) took his seat. But, Sir, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) was asked a question which he was very unwilling to answer, as to what his own principles were at that time, and here we have a speech made by him in this House on 16th February, 1876, on a motion dealing with the financial depression, and this is what he says:

> I think the commercial men of this country have a right to be thankful to the hon. gentleman for the anxiety he is manifesting in their interest. If the hon. gentleman, instead of asking for a committee, would go among the manufacturers of this country, he would get all the information he required before the end of the session. If he goes to the hon. member for South Leeds and asks why his manufactory is closed, he would learn that the country is flooded with American manufactures, which are sold at prices which render competition impossible. If he goes to the hon. member for Cornwall and asks why the cotton factory there is idle, he will find that it is because they cannot compete with American cottons. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Americans are sending furniture into Hamilton and other Canadian cities and having it auctioned for what it will bring? And this is not confined to furniture, but in almost every class of goods manufactured in the United States, it is the same. I ask the hon. gentleman why it is, if that country has been protected to death, as he says it has, that its manufactures are taking the place of English goods? In 1872 we imported from the United States of cabinet ware or furniture, $122,070; in 1873, $220,457; in 1874, $311,476; and in 1875, $328,536.

And he goes on, making a very able protectionist speech, in the course of which he quotes a paragraph from Horace Greely, which might well be pondered at the present time, in relation to the argument of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), in relation especially to the splendid appeal which my hon. friend made for labour in this country, at the close of his speech. Horace Greely points out that in the United States, even as things were, they had enough men looking for employment without introducing a tariff that would strike labour hard. Not merely did the hon. gentleman make that speech, but on a subsequent occasion he also spoke at considerable length in Supply advocating the National Policy. So that the

want of memory that has prevailed on the Treasury benches is an aphasia that has extended to some of the subordinate members of the party.

I will ask the attention of the House for a very short time while I point out how completely the hon. member for South Oxford has failed to make any case for the position taken by the Ministry of the day. The hon. member for York reviewed the history of the varied changes of untried being through which the Liberal party had passed. He showed how, from time to time, they had taken up one cry after another, and pointed out how at last, in 1893, they appeared to fix upon a definite policy. He went on to point out that unrestricted reciprocity still seemed to cling to their policy, although the leader of the Government had declared for free trade as it is in England; and he said their policy to-day is delay, unrestricted reciprocity, discrimination against England. Then he went on to point out that there was the greatest danger to the commercial affairs of this country, to the importer as well as to the manufacturer, to the labourer as well as to the capitalist, in consequence of the suspense that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite entailed. Well, Sir, what is the answer of the hon. member for South Oxford to that? The answer of the hon. member for South Oxford would be a cogent answer, if the party for which he is the mouthpiece had not proclaimed for some years back, but especially since 1893, that they thoroughly understood the condition of the country and had a policy in their pocket that would cure it of all its ills. To use the figure again and again used by the hon. First Minister when he was leader of the Opposition, he described himself as a doctor and said: "The country is suffering from serious ills; call me in and then I will prescribe." He talked as a doctor who had diagnosed the condition of the patient. He is called in, and what does he do? He wants a commission of inquiry; he wants to have other doctors called in—doctors that he objected to the hon. member for York calling in when he was Finance Minister, but that he thinks he may call in with perfect appropriateness. The hon. member for South Oxford made only one attempt at an answer, because all the rest of his speech was the mere ramfudge of the echo of old speeches. With the exception of one sentence in that speech, there was not a single sentence that was not the stale echo of stale speeches which he has delivered in this House and elsewhere.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say "Oh;" but the country is sufficiently represented here, even though hon. members on that side of the House take flight when I rise up to reply to him. The country is well enough represented, both by the press and otherwise, to hear what I have to say about a Government which in its infancy shows the pallor of death. I have been a student of politics for twenty-five years, and I tell the leader of the Government that never in the history of any government that I have had an opportunity of studying, or any government that I have read of, did a fatal delicacy so rapidly manifest itself as in the Government of the hon. gentleman. Why, before it is well out of the cradle, it has the rickets. Before it is well out of the cradle, a fatal disease has seized on it, and within the last fortnight it has gone rapidly back. So I intend to-night to deal with the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, and I will deal first with the only sentence in that speech that could be considered as an answer to the speech of my hon. friend. The hon. member says: "We are to deliberate: we are to take plenty of time." That, of course, is all right, if they have not their policy. That is all right, if their policy is not to be revenue tariff. For instance, he takes as an illustration what was done by my hon. friend from York, as Finance Minister. In 1893, when my hon. friend determined to revise the tariff, he and Mr. Angers, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), went through the country to meet the manufacturers; and what, Sir, occurred in this House? Why, when we remember what occurred, it requires unbounded effrontery for the hon. member for South Oxford to make the speech he has made here to-night. We had the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) rising up in this House and making a motion condemning the Government for delay. I have the motion here, and I have not merely the motion, but I have the words of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, supporting the motion. That motion condemned the Government of that day because forsooth they took delay to inquire, although it was perfectly right for them to inquire because they were going to revise the tariff on a protectionist basis, and revising it on such a basis meant carefully going into every detail and incident of the finances of the country. But there is no such thing required if you are going to have a revenue tariff. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says that the Government must first find out how much revenue requires to be raised before taking any other step. That would be all right, if we had not the record of these gentlemen protesting against any such course. I may say, in passing, that the reason of that inconsistency is to be found in the fact that they are a party without principle and a Government without a policy. They are a party that has not thought out any principles. What they have done is, year after year, to throw out any catch-word that they thought might take with the public, just as a fisherman throws out a fly. When he finds that a fly with a red wing is not successful in making the trout rise, he tries a fly with

a blue wing; and so hon. gentlemen opposite have gone on from year to year trying in what way they could best bamboozle the public and get into power. Sir, it is an incongruous party from every point of view, and the position taken by the Government on this very question is a fit expression of what that party is. I have never hesitated to say that I admire the leader of the Government. He stands apart from his party, and when leading the Opposition I sometimes, if I may be allowed to quote Longfellow, thought that some lines of that poet were peculiarly applicable to him as contrasted with his party:

It seems to me a stagnant fen,
Grown o'er with rushes and with reeds,
Where a white lily, now and then,
Blooms in the midst of noxious weeds,
And deadly nightshade on its banks.

Amid the deadly night shade and noxious weeds, the fairest lily blooms, and thus amongst the then Opposition stood their hon. leader. As somebody said of Apollo and his muses:

The leader was fairest,
But all were divine.

But, Mr. Speaker, I could not say all were divine.

With the facts that I am about to bring before the House, it required a boundless audacity on the part of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to make the remark that I have just referred to. In 1893, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) made the following motion:—

That since the introduction of the protective system sufficient time has elapsed for the establishment and development of such manufacturing industries as under existing conditions can be successfully carried on in Canada. Moreover, many manufacturers sheltered behind the rampart thus erected have formed combinations and trusts which prohibit competition and create and maintain monopolies.

That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure has proved in many instances oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the consuming classes and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits; is unfair and unequal in its incidence and has been productive of discontent verging on disloyalty among those who suffer from its injustice.

That no sufficient reason has been adduced or exists requiring investigation respecting the foregoing facts which are notorious, nor justifying delay in the passage of remedial legislation which is imperative.

That in the opinion of this House, the tariff ought to be at once amended in respect of the matters herein indicated and also by the substantial reduction of customs duties in favour of the United Kingdom.

And so on.

Well that was only the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe, and notwithstanding the eulogy that was poured on him to-night by the hon. member for South Oxford, I may say that although I would highly prize any opinion he gave on a point of law, on a matter of economic policy the opinion of the hon. member for North Simcoe would be to me lighter than the dust in the balance. In the course of the speech made by the present leader of the Government on that resolution, he said:

Then, Sir, the conclusion which is asserted by the hon. member for Simcoe, is that in the opinion of this House the tariff ought to be at once amended in respect of the matters herein indicated. What matters? That is to say, the tariff ought to be amended so as to remove the shelter behind which combines take refuge in order to exact from the people of Canada extortionate profits; that it should be amended at once in order to remove from the shoulders of the farmers the burden of taxation which they now carry; that it should be amended at once in order to remove the discontent which is spreading through the land to such an extent as to make the future of this country perhaps doubtful. Now, Sir, for these reasons I am prepared to vote for the motion of the hon. gentleman; for these reasons, which we have asserted again and again on this side of the House, I am prepared to cast my vote in favour of this motion. The principal proposition which is laid down there seems to me to be true, and the conclusion drawn from it appears to me to be a logical conclusion, and to be based upon the facts herein set forth. While I say emphatically, and without hesitation, and without the slighest equivocation, that I am prepared to vote for the motion of the hon. gentleman for the reasons I have given.

That was from the hon. gentleman leading the Government, and to-day we have one of his colleagues, a subordinate, telling us that they must take plenty of time to decide how and what they are going to do. But there is something more to be said concerning the position of the leader of the Government. This is what he said on the motion condemning the policy of the Government of that day in asking for delay to revise the tariff. The hon. member for South Oxford said that we must find out how much revenue we want. What that means is this that this Government may not be able to take off perhaps anything from the tariff lest they should not raise enough revenue to meet expenses. But the Government cannot take that position. In 1894, August 20th, the leader of the Government thus spoke at Brantford:

There can be no justification for such an expenditure, the great bulk of which is a corrupt expenditure. Moreover, they tell us that if we were in power, we could not retrench and economize. I do not believe that it would be a very difficult task to retrench to the extent of one, two or three millions, and my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) told his constituents a few days ago that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four million dollars a year.

Two years ago, the leader of the Government knew it was possible to retrench to the extent of two or three millions, and one of his then colleagues, a distinguished Reform leader, said four millions: but now that the hon. gentleman who leads the Government has got into power, he says he

must take time to ascertain whether he can make any retrenchment. But surely if the hon. gentleman was in a position two years ago, to say that millions could be taken off the expenditure, the people have something to complain of when, now that he is in power, he hesitates and delays and asks time for inquiry. Again, the same night, speaking at Peel, he said:

> And the Conservatives do not shrink from it but swallow it all. If we came into power, we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount from two to three million dollars a year.

Is there any excuse for the leader of the Government, under those circumstances, in not bringing forward a measure of retrenchment? We have his own words depicting the very attitude he takes. I have shown what he said in September, 1893, on the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I have shown that he said that we should at once act. And here is a speech made at that famous convention in the Rideau Rink, and here is what he says about the delay of Sir John Thompson in lopping the mouldering branches away. Sir John Thompson had stated in January that he would lop away the mouldering branches. Two months elapsed and he did not take away the mouldering branches, and he sent out a committee of inquiry. The present leader of the Government condemns that step. He says:

> Sir John Thompson, at the Board of Trade banquet in Toronto, told a large audience that the Government would be prepared next session to lop off some mouldering branches. When we came to the session we were fully prepared to see the Government lop off these mouldering branches; but we found that the Government had changed their views, and what were mouldering branches in January like the rod of Moses, became flowering boughs in March. They had no alteration to make.

So that when addressing this famous convention, we find him condemning a delay of two months on the part of a Conservative Government, a protectionist Government, in making a revision on protectionist lines, which everybody knows requires careful examination. And now here we have a declaration that this is a revenue tariff Government, and that he is not going, even now, to declare the general principles of his policy. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says the Government is asked to bring down a tariff at ten days' notice. Ten days' notice! Why, they were proclaiming through the country that they were coming into power, and for more than three years they declared that the country was in a sad state economically, and they should not have spoken in that way unless they were confident that if they were brought into power they could apply the remedy. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people throughout this country understood from their language that if they came into power they would redress the grievances that they declared then existed. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an excuse made for the position taken by the Government that was not given by the hon. member for South Oxford. It is said that a delay until January is not a long delay; the House will meet in January, and then the revision will take place. What guarantee have we, Sir, that the House will meet in January, or that if it does meet in January, the revision will take place? We heard to-night from the hon. member for South Oxford hesitating words on that subject; and I have here an article from a paper which has become an organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, although up to the time of the Reform party coming into power it was a protectionist paper—that is the "Weekly Sun." That paper, on August 26th, in an article headed "Mr. Fielding's Task," declared that the Finance Minister had a difficult task before him, that there were rocks ahead, and that it was a pity he would have to deal with this matter in January:

> Mr. McKinley is almost certain to be elected in November; he will take office in March and will soon know what he and his friends are going to do in the way of tariff legislation, or rather what they can do with the Senate constituted as it is.

Now, Sir, that and the language of the hon. member for South Oxford to-night justify the belief that we have no right whatever to entertain strong hopes that in January this matter will be dealt with. And let me say here in passing what interests the people of the North-west very much who have listened to the language of the hon. gentleman at Moose Jaw, at Regina, and at Winnipeg. All over the west the hon. gentleman declared he was going to bring in free trade as it was in England, and his followers declared they were going to have free implements in the North-west; and I may say that from one end of the North-west to the other, and all over Manitoba, there is the strongest belief among the farmers that they will have their implements in free. Very well, Sir, the people of the North-west say: If you are going to do this, do it so that the farmers can have the advantage of it by next year. You have spoken the word of promise to the ear, do not break it in the act. I must not refer to a previous debate save by way of illustration, but I may say that this was referred to in this House by a member from the North-west supporting the Government, and if the leader of the Government will read the North-west papers, he will find that the Grit papers supporting the hon. gentleman have not supported his follower in some matters regarding which the hon. member had adversely criticised

me, but have supported me, and they condemn his follower for the course he took in not supporting me. We are told that we have only to wait until January. Sir, with such a statement as this in the "Sun," and with such a statement as we have had from the hon. member for South Oxford, what guarantee have we that the House will meet in January, what guarantee have we that the suggestion in the "Sun" will not be adopted, and delay take place? The "Sun" goes on to say:

It is preposterous to talk of making Ontario a manufacturing centre while she is cut off by heavy duties.

And further on it points out how difficult it will be to make any changes:

To pull down the whole fabric just now would be to precipitate a financial crash. Mr. Fielding will have to move carefully at first, and those who fought for a sweeping reform must wait till the times are propitious.

Now, Sir, we did not hear from the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to-night. What we heard to-night was the language of a discarded financial servant; the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) no longer speaks with the authority of the financial leader of the House. It seemed to me that he spoke in a jejune and feeble manner compared with the screaming, eagle-like notes we used to hear from him when he was on this side of the House. But he has been tamed with the taming process that sometimes takes away a man's spirit. My hon. friends from the North-west know that if you break a broncho too quickly and sandbag him into docility, you make him very tame, but he loses his spirit. The hon. gentleman has been sandbagged into docility, and has not the spirit he used to have. If you go into the zoological gardens in London amongst all the sad sights one sees there, the saddest to a well-balanced mind is that of the eagles in one huge cage. They look drooped and spiritless. Their feathers are without beauty and gloss. Their home is in the clouds or on the lofty crag, and they are not to be brought into bondage with impunity. The hon. member for South Oxford has been brought into captivity, and he has been placed in a position where he can do little harm; in fact, he no longer speaks with authority, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) can repudiate him as easily as he repudiated the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) the other night; and if he should stand up and repudiate the hon. member for South Oxford we should see that we have a Government not only of discordant principles, but still more emphatically of mutual repudiation. Now, there is no hypercriticism on my part in suggesting that we have no right to build on the hopes that in January this matter will be dealt with. Let me speak for a moment about the Reformers throughout the country who have looked forward to free trade being introduced; let me speak for those who have looked forward to promises big with all sorts of glowing hopes that have been held out to them.

Mr. BRITTON. Speak of the returning officers.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, my hon. friend from Kingston has attempted to make a joke. Well, as some one said of a man who played Romeo in Romeo and Juliet, that he had not the figure for Romeo; and my hon. friend has not the figure for a joker. I think he may leave the monopoly of buffoonery on that side to the hon. member for Grey. I want to show how little foundation we have for building any hope on statements that were made by the leader of the Government. Now, we know very well that anything that gives expression to a great political truth, often strikes the character of a public man, and strikes what is in the public mind. Sir, there is a humorous paper published in Montreal called "Le Canard," that I think may safely to be said to be a supporter of the leader of the Government. It refers to something that was very graceful in the course of the canvass of the hon. gentleman who leads the House. In the course of his perigrinations throughout the country, nothing was more graceful, nothing was more beautiful then to see a charming little girl come up and present a bouquet to the hon. gentleman, and then receive a delicate osculation. Well, "Le Canard" gives an account of a dialogue between the mother of one of these interesting maidens, and the maiden herself. After having drilled the maiden in the part she was to play, the mother says to her:

Après avoir été embrassée par M. Laurier, tu te marieras comme tu voudras.

ROSE.—Mais pas avec lui, je suppose?

LA MERE.—Non, ma fille; M. Laurier embrasse, mais n'épouse pas.

I will translate that into English. The mother says: "After you have been kissed by Mr. Laurier, you will marry whom you wish." Then says the maiden: "But not with him, I suppose." "No, my child," says the mother, "not with Mr. Laurier. Mr. Laurier kisses, but he does not marry." That is to say he makes promises but he does not fulfil them. "M. Laurier embrasse, mais il n'épouse pas." Now, what I am afraid of is that these people who have trusted to the protestations of the hon. gentleman, will find that he does not intend to implement his promises. That is the way it strikes me at the present time. As I have referred to the North-west, let me finish that reference. When the contest was going on, Mr. Grant, who was one of the candidates of the hon. gentleman in the North-west, ran over the history concerning the advent of the National Policy:

Protection was wrong in principle because it accorded to one man the right to grow rich at the expense of his fellowmen. No man is born

with the right to make a serf of his fellowman. * * * * If Mr. Laurier goes back on tariff reform, I will go back on Mr. Laurier. I will uphold no Government who will be kind to these individuals at the expense of the people.

In my canvass I argued that the statements made by men supporting a leader who declared for a revenue tariff, were impossible of fulfilment. The statements were made that if the hon. gentleman got into power he would take the duty entirely off implements, and I argued that these statements were without foundation, and would never have any fulfilment. If the hon. gentleman is going to do that, there is no reason why it should not be done now. If the hon. gentleman is going to give us a revenue tariff, there is no reason whatever why the tariff should not have been arranged, not after ten days, but after two or three years of advocacy of that policy.

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) commenced by saying that the importers were not dissatisfied. Mr. Speaker, that is not the fact, as I find it. I have spoken to some importers, and I have spoken to tradesmen, meaning shopkeepers, and I find the same answer from them as from the manufacturers. The manufacturers tell me that they are now paralyzed by the uncertainty, and the tradesmen tell me that trade is already injured, and they are looking forward to a blue winter. If that be so, and if the manufacturers speak by the book when they say they are paralysed, what is the answer of the hon. member for South Oxford? What is the answer of that experienced financier to my hon. friend? He says the importers actually asked the head of the Government not to make his tariff reform too soon. Now, Sir, I am inclined strongly to doubt that. I do not like to say it is not true, but the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce might have given us some names of importers who asked that his change in the tariff should not be made too soon. He says the importers want to get rid of their goods. What the importers want to do, then, is to lose a whole year of business to void their shelves and get rid of all their stock, and then wait with their hands clasped and their thumbs moving one round the other, until a month after January, or two, or three, or four, or six, or nine, or ten months from now, when the hon. gentleman comes down with his tariff reform, or comes down with his revenue tariff or to say they had not been able to make up their minds. And we may have another year of suspense and another year of delay. Now, the hon. gentleman for York very properly said that in his opinion no mandate had been given by the people of Canada to the present Government to deal with the tariff. Can anybody doubt that? What has Ontario done, the great manufacturing province? We know very well what was the real battle cry in Ontario which greatly affected the constituencies, and notwithstanding that it did, Ontario disappointed everybody who knew Ontario; it disappointed agreeably those of us who know Ontario well. No man who knew Ontario could have expected that with such a question in the forefront and flame of the battle, she would have given such a following to my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper). Nobody could have expected it, and what is the explanation? The only explanation is that Ontario was true to the core to the National Policy. Then look at the other provinces. Now, you must remember that the Government is supported by one pillar, and that pillar rises from the province from whence you yourself (Mr. Deputy Speaker Brodeur) come. That is the sole support, practically, of the Government, and we know well that the tariff had nothing whatever to do with giving the hon. gentleman that support. Why, I may say to you, Mr. Speaker, that a friend of mine was at the Basilica in Quebec, when the mandament of the Bishops was read, which, when first read sounded in the ears of the congregations as if the Bishops wished the people to support my hon. friend the member for Cape Breton. But what did the people say: They called out "Ils peuvent aller au diable"—we will now have a man of our own as Prime Minister. I might as well translate the French literally. It will be: they may go to hell, because we have now a man of our own and we will vote for him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Do I understand that he heard that said?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman give the authority?

Mr. DAVIN. Am I bound to do that? I will do nothing of the kind.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then there must be some reason for it.

Mr. DAVIN. As the hon. gentleman has challenged me, I say that in Winnipeg a friend of mine was at St. Mary's——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was asking the hon. gentleman about Quebec.

Mr. DAVIN. But I am going to Winnipeg; and I will come back to Quebec if I like. At Winnipeg a friend of mine went into St. Mary's, and a clergyman at the close of the service called the men to the railing, said to them: There is to be an election in a few days, and what you should do—he spoke in French—is to vote for a Catholic and vote for a Frenchman. My friend, who is a good Catholic, knew what that meant, but he did not act on it. No doubt, however, it had its influence. The Solicitor General can have dozens of names of people who heard similar utterances, if he is deeply interested in the matter. If there was any point in it, I

would give the hon. gentleman the name. He does not doubt my word ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no point in it—that is quite enough.

Mr. DAVIN. No point in it ! We will now see what "Le Canard" says with rspect to this matter. That paper, like other papers of the kind, often hits the public sentiment, and it is a paper which supports the Government. It has a cartoon in which the leader of the Government is represented as holding in his left hand a hoop on which is written "Province of Quebec." In his right hand is a whip, and there are seven dogs, and the Premier cries :

En avant, la musique ! Le spectacle va commencer ; et si quelqu'un veut regimber, gare au fouet.

The dog Ontario is leaping through the hoop, and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, North-west Territories, Manitoba, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island are represented as dogs over which he is about to crack the whip sending them through a hoop of triumph labelled "Quebec." That expresses a certain opinion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. "Le Canard" is edited by Mr. Lasalle, one of the translators of the "Hansard," whom the hon. gentleman defended in the committee.

Mr. DAVIN. If he is so, I can easily understand how we found the Liberal members of that committee ready to let Mr. Lasalle off. In looking through the paper I find it is clearly in favour of the leader of the Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Excuse me, but the majority of the Liberal members of the committee desired to have him dismissed.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman was one of those who most persistently barked at him. I will accept what the leader of the Government said—I will accept the suggestion made by the hon. and learned Solicitor General. The suggestion is this, that behind such remarks as those reported to me as having been uttered there is no point whatever, and there was nothing whatever in the view expressed by one of the hon. members from Montreal, who said that in his constituency some of the people said they were voting for the hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Government because he was one of themselves. We will say there is no point in this. What, then, is the significance of the large majority given in Quebec except that it is the most pronounced protectionist province in all Canada ? There is another explanation, and it is that Quebec must be the province of all the provinces most diametrically opposed to remedial legislation. Or there is another explanation, that it must be a province, as I have been told by very prominent people, the people of which were led to believe that if the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) was defeated, and the hon. gentleman now leading the Government came to power, he would do more for them and would go one better than the leader of the late Government. I make the leader of the Government a present of these facts.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not want any present.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is so rich now that he has become leader of the Government of Canada, he spurns a present from a poor devil like me. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, what does he do ? He trotted out that broken-winded, spavined old jade, the exodus. He has been going through this country with that broken-winded Rosinante, the exodus, and he has been stating that the tariff caused the exodus. No sensible man would or could believe it. Now, those chickens will come home to roost. Now, the hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if he should remain long enough in the Government, will be able to ponder what Sydney Smith told the Americans,—"beware of superlatives." The hon. gentleman is now a member of the Government, and the speeches of the leader of the Government confront them, and they are in a quandary—they do not know exactly what to do. The Government is a timid organization of self-distrustful gentlemen who really do not know their own minds. I can easily understand the difficulty. The Prime Minister of to-day said, when in Opposition : Once put us into power and we will take off three or four million dollars a year, and now that they are in power, they will find it pretty difficult to do that, as well as to fulfil some other promises they made. Amongst all the charges they made, not one will so completely come back upon them as their statement connecting the exodus with the tariff. If the exodus, as it was called, was great under the tariff, let us have free trade as they have it in England and you will have that exodus trebled, because you will strike a mortal blow at labour in this country. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) again used one of these ridiculous clap-trap arguments, that it is discreditable and humiliating to this country should be used by a man of his eminence—for he is an eminent man. Somewhat gauche, it is true, but it is palpable that, if there had been some divine influence to rough-hew him and shape him to better ends, something might have been made of him. It is quite clear that in him there were the elements of a great man spoiled. There is about him what the French call "manqué ;" there is something wanting. I do not wish to say that there is a screw loose : in fact there are several screws loose ; so that one screw would do the business. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) used this ridiculous clap-trap argument, and he said : "Canadians are as good

as other men; they are not afraid to face other men in competition." Sir, that is no reply to one of the ablest arguments I ever heard in this House. There was not in that closely-reasoned speech of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) an abler argument than that in which he pointed out that it would be a dangerous thing, wantonly and with a light heart to submit the industries of Canada, where we have a climate and conditions that are sui generis: to submit them to competition with the industries of countries where the rate of interest was lower, where wages were lower, and where there were conditions wholly different from those that obtain here. There was never a more statesmanlike argument than that put forward by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). But how was it answered? It was answered as some foolish stumper or reckless heeler might answer it. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that Canadians are not afraid of competition. Are they not? Why, there is the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), and he wants $500 of a prohibitory tariff on Chinamen coming into Canada, and the leader of the Government has by a telegram in advance endorsed his note. He sent a telegram across the continent, saying that he would endorse the policy of the British Columbia members supporting him, and these members come here and want protection against the competition of the Chinese. Why do they want that protection? It is because Chinamen can live cheaper than Anglo-Saxons can; it is because the Chinese can live many percentages lower than the poorest white man would care to live. The white man, on this account, cannot compete with the Chinaman. If the Chinese were to come here in sufficient numbers and plant themselves as an industrial army, and identify themselves with our institutions, they might overrun the whole country in less than no time. It is easy to understand why our labouring men shrink from that competition. It is the same thing that makes the labouring men of the United States shrink from the competition of poorly paid labour in Belgium, Germany and elsewhere. I will turn the tables on the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright). He says that the Canadian is not afraid of any competition; and I say, that the Canadian is afraid of competition that will lower him in his social, and moral, and material life, and for that reason there is no man in the country so interested in protection as is the labouring man or the mechanic. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made a reply like that, it was simply like an overgrown boy squirting ditch water in reply to cannon, and artillery, and real ammunition. The argument of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was strong, 'twas cogent, 'twas statesmanlike, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in reply, made an argument that would be unworthy of the merest stumper spouting reckless clap trap. Now, Sir, another argument used by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) was also an old jade of his. He told us his oft-repeated story that the farm lands in Ontario are lowered in value. That is also one of the things that will come home to roost. These hon. gentlemen are now in charge of the Government of Canada, and we will ask them to put up the value of farm lands in Ontario, and, no doubt, they will do it for us. All the leader of the Government will have to do is to wave his magic and eloquent hand, and the value of farm lands in Ontario will be raised instanter, just as all the housewife has to do is to put a little more leaven in her dough, and up it goes. Well, I am afraid that the leaven is not within reach of my hon. friend that will enable him to increase the farm lands in value. Why is it that farm lands in Ontario have gone down in value? It is because more farm lands have been brought into the market. That is what occurred in the eastern states of the Union. The moment their great North-west was opened up, the farm lands in the east went down in value, and the moment that millions and millions of wealth were added to Canada by the opening of our North-west, the price of farm lands in Ontario also went down. But how does that affect the real prosperity of the farmer in Ontario who is not a speculator in farms? It is notorious that the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) has had many a mortgage on many a farm, and the fact that the opening of our North-west has lowered the value of farms in eastern Canada, no doubt comes bitterly home to the farm mortgagee. But it does not affect the real farmer. It does not affect his produce. It does not affect his cultivation of the ground; it does not affect his comfort in his home; and so that argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is worthy of going in pairs with his argument in regard to the exodus.

Reverting for one minute to the argument made by the hon. member for York as to the danger of subjecting Canada to competition with continental countries, he might have gone further than he did. He might have dwelt on the fact that the most thoughtful men in England, who may have been Cobdenites until quite recently, are pointing out that unless England resorts to protection, unless England gives up its fetish of free trade, the results may be disastrous. A very interesting book has recently been published bearing on this subject; and an article by Mr. Low, which appeared in a recent number of the "19th Century," refers to this book; and, with the permission of the House—and I beg your attention—I will read an extract from this article, because it bears on the argument of the hon. member for York, and emphasizes what poor refutal I am

making to the wretched argument of the hon. member for South Oxford. Here is what it says :

We have shared in the industrial and commercial activity of an era of astonishing material progress. That is true. But the question which Englishmen ask themselves, with an ever-growing anxiety, is whether we have had our fair share, and whether we are now advancing as fast as our rivals. They know that in the protected period—before Cobdenism was by law established—they had a commanding superiority. Mr. Villiers gives figures to show how small, compared with what it is now, was the foreign trade of Britain in the earlier half of this century. Small—yes ; but how vast compared to that of our rivals. Not in one trade, but in many, we had an unchallenged and, as it appeared, unchallengeable lead. In shipping, in cottons, in metals, in cutlery, in hardware, in machinery, Egland seemed beyond competition. Great is the change to-day. The competitors who have deliberately rejected what Mr. Villiers calls "the inestimable blessings of freedom of trade" are overtaking us with long strides ; nay, in some vital cases have caught and passed us already. In his striking little book, "Made in Germany," Mr. Ernest Williams, with facts and figures plucked from the official returns, shows how far and fast the process is going. Already Germany is abreast of us in the production of iron and steel. America has long since passed us ; little Belgium is gaining on us rapidly. The German export of iron and steel rose from 957,000 tons in 1890 to 1,439,000 in 1894 ; the English export in the same period fell from 2,700,000 to 1,735,000. Even our carrying trade is menaced. We no longer own the first shipping port in Europe. Liverpool has been passed by Hamburg, and it looks as if it would presently be passed by Antwerp. Here are the figures of the last few years :—

	1885. Tons.	1895. Tons.
Hamburg	$ 3,704.312	$ 6,256,000
Antwerp	3,422.172	5,340,247
Rotterdam	2,120,347	4,038,017
Bremen	1,289,399	2,184,274
Total	$10,536,230	$17,818,538
Liverpool	$ 4,278,881	$ 5,965,959

These are very striking figures, and they justify alarm. They justify those gentlemen who are taking the free traders in England by the throat, and pointing out to them that they have ruined the farmers, and that now they are threatening to ruin the merchants and manufacturers of that country.

Ten years ago Liverpool was the first port in Europe. Now she is the second, soon, apparently, to be the third. And here is the general summary of the situation as given by Mr. Williams :

In 1872 the total declared value of British and Irish produce exported from the United Kingdom was 256,257,347 pounds sterling ; in 1895 it had sunk to 226,169,174 pounds sterling ; and in the meantime the population of Great Britain and Ireland has grown from 31,835,757 to 39,134,166. The market is bigger, the ability to supply the market is greater ; but, whereas the proportion per head of exported British produce was £8 1s. 0d. sterling, in 1872, it had sunk to £5 11s. 3d. sterling in 1894.

That is very striking, and, of course, the argument I am making is not at all new. The argument is that of the hon. member for York ; but I think the House will agree that I have not wasted its time in reading that extract as rounding off the very able argument of the hon. member for York.

Now, Sir, I rather think I have pretty well gone over whatever there was in the way of argument in the speech of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. He spoke of eighteen years of fraud and falsehood. I have no doubt that in the course of eighteen years the Conservative party have committed errors. I have not the least doubt that there have been members of the Conservative party who have not done right in those eighteen years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. I am very glad to have those "hear, hears," and I hope I shall have a "hear, hear" for what I am now going to say, because it is not capable of being controverted. I say that in those eighteen years the Conservative party of Canada have made a record that is not surpassed by the record of any other party in any constitutional country. You have only to look at what Canada was eighteen years ago and see what Canada is to-day. You have only to look at the position that Canada has in the world to-day as a great progressive nation, and at its position eighteen years ago. You have only to look at what Canada's credit was eighteen years ago and what it is to-day ; and you have only to take the figures given you by the hon. member for York—the exports and imports, the imports especially of raw materials—as evidence of the great material advancement and more than material advancement of this country. I have been a student of the history of Canada for the last 25 years, and I say that in every thing that can dignify and enrich and ennoble a nation, in these eighteen years Canada has made giant strides of advance. I do not say that all that is due to the Conservative party.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not say that. My hon. friend from Wellington will not find me making a proposition so absurd, but I can say this, that we can put our fingers on mighty industries due to the Conservative party, on the opening up of greater Canada, the North-west, all due to the Conservative party. With the effrontery which distinguishes the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, he spoke slightingly of the policy of the Conservative party with regard to the North-west. Why, he was a member of a Government whose wretched, higgling policy with regard to that country stands in strong contrast with the policy that opened it up and has made it the hope

of Canada. Compare the huckstering and wriggling policy with that of the Conservative party, and you will have some idea of the difference between the two, and from what I now see, I am satisfied that the difference is as great to-day as it was eighteen years ago. What I fear is that if the Liberal party remain in power four years, as they did from 1874 to 1878, we shall have the same miserable huckstering, and the sun dial will again be put back, as it was during the Mackenzie regime, when the hon. member for South Oxford was Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman spoke of eighteen years of fraud and corruption, forgetting that in the short time his party was in power, from 1874 to 1878, they piled up scandals.

The hon. member for South Oxford had the folly to refer to the position taken respecting employees of the Government, who had taken part in politics, a position which did not help to raise the Liberal party in my esteem, and he proceeded very unnecessarily to refer to the action taken by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) with regard to Governor General's warrants. Well, however difficult it may be, with regard to a constitutional question, to impress the popular mind, I am perfectly certain that when the sober common sense of the country is devoted to that question, the people will see that never was the time of Parliament more profitably taken up than it was in discussing that question. Then he referred to a matter which I do not think should have been referred to at all. He referred to what he described as the censure of the Governor General. I think that was a most improper reference. There was no desire on either side to extend, still less to reopen, that controversy. I may say here, however, that if they were inclined to extend it, my hon. friend who leads the Government never laid himself so open to a crushing reply as on that very question. I cannot refer to any previous debate, but I say that come whence it may, any aspersion on the judiciary of Canada is without foundation. I do not care from what quarter it comes, I do not care how high he may be or what leading position he may hold, the man who states that the judges of this country have been appointed solely on political grounds, makes a statement that cannot be substantiated.

Mr. DOMVILLE. So they have.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman must know very well that the late Sir John Macdonald appointed strong political opponents to the bench.

Mr. DOMVILLE. He has been dead some time.

Mr. DAVIN. But the men that he appointed are still alive. We had a lecture some time ago in this House from the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) about the zeal of converts. Well, a zeal of that sort, when it is strong and reasoned, and well based, and seriously expressed, is respectable, but the kind of flibberty-jibberty zeal of the hon. member for King's——

Mr. DOMVILLE. I will attend to you presently.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman says he will attend to me presently. In that case I shall be a benefactor to this House, for since the hon. gentleman has been here, we have only heard him sound two notes, and these were the hon. member for York and his references to the time when George and he were schoolboys—infantile reminiscences of that sort constantly repeated. Let me tell a little Italian apologue for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. There was a contest at one time between the nightingale and the cuckoo as to which sang the sweeter, and the decision was referred to a donkey. The nightingale poured forth those notes that have been celebrated time and again ever since man has had any taste for music and song, and then the cuckoo went on to show the donkey what it could do. The donkey turned to the nightingale and said : you have sung very sweetly and your trills are more numerous, and there is a great deal of variety in your songs, but, turning round to the cuckoo, he said—and I think the same thing could be said of the hon. member for King's—I will give you the prize for there is more method in your song. The constant reiteration of the hon. gentleman has method in it, but it is horribly monotonous, so that if I should turn away his attention from the hon. member for York and his schooldays, I would have gained some good for this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I paid the hon. gentleman a sufficient compliment. I have done what I had not intended to during whatever time we might be in this House together—I have taken notice of him. I think I have gone far enough; and, if there are any more interruptions, I will ask you to protect me, because I want to make a serious argument. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that, if any one were to state, no matter how high his position, that the judges of this country were appointed on political grounds, he would make a statement he could not substantiate : and I go further, and say that, if he were to lower the bench in this country to the level of the bench below the line, he would commit, in my opinion, a very grave offence against the fact and against the judiciary of this country. I never knew of an American to speak in the same breath of the judges of our country and those of his own. There has never been a suspicion of the integrity of our judges. And if a speaker, or a writer, while thus maligning our judges, were to use the illustration of the electoral commission appointed to decide whether Mr. Hayes or Mr. Tilden had been elected President of the United States, he would, in my opinion,

be guilty of a very grave offence. If you would compare, for instance, the judges of our own Supreme Court with those of the Supreme Court of the United States, you would be doing what would be fair. But, while there were Supreme Court judges upon the Electoral Commission, what were the facts in that case? It was a dodge of Senator Edmonds'. Senator Edmonds had a committee struck, and that committee formed a commission composed of five senators, five members of the House of Representatives and five judges of the Supreme Court. If a man were to make an argument, that because the judges on a commission of that sort, a purely political body, voted according to their political proclivities of the past, therefore, they, as judges of the Supreme Court in the United States would, if they were acting as judges, be influenced by their political predilections, there would be no cogency in the argument. It would be a scandalous argument as regards the judges of the Supreme Court who took part in that commission, and a still more scandalous thing if on that foundation the argument were made, that because the members of this electoral commission are supposed to have been influenced by their political predilections, therefore, the same is true of the judges of Canada sitting in their judicial capacity. So it was a most unfortunate reference on the part of the hon. member (Mr. Laurier) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce was not more happy.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, carried. There is a good deal I might say on the subject, but I think I have entirely replied to the argument of the hon. member for South Oxford. But let me say one word with regard to the position of the North-west in this matter. I have already referred to what the North-west feels. I have already referred to the fact that the hon. leader of the Government came to the North-west. At Winnipeg, he told us that his policy was then cut and dried. Here is what he said.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Dispense.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I will not "dispense." I have a serious duty to perform to the country. I am not come here to play the mountebank; I have come here to represent my constituents; and I have to do it, even under all the difficulties that such hon. gentlemen as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) may be able to throw in my way. This is what the hon. gentleman said at Winnipeg:

I come to you to-night to preach to you the new gospel of freedom of trade. New, yes; new to this country, new on this continent, new on the other side of the line, in the American Republic, but now new on the other side of the water and in the old land. (Applause.) Not new in the small island that has been the cradle of all freedom and civilization, not new in this land from which we Liberals are proud to derive our inspiration. The Conservatives who pretend to be loyal, and who are hacking up the cry of "God save the Queen," in which they take inspiration. In the American Republic you have the line of cleavage which exists within the Liberal party and the Conservative party, the question of free trade. We stand for freedom, they stand for restriction; they stand for servitude, we stand for freedom. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage, yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage, not in the same degree, perhaps, but in the same manner. The slave in the American confederacy had no freedom. He grew tobacco for his masters; he grew cotton or sugar, working day and night in rain, and in the sun, but he never derived a cent of profit for his labour, the greed of the master would take away from him all freedom, giving him only such a pittance as you give to your horses.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will feel that he was carried away with enthusiasm in using such extraordinary language.

In the same manner the people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially are toiling for a master who takes away not every cent of profit from you, but a very large percentage, a very great portion of your earnings, the earnings for which you toil and sweat. But you have to toil and sweat for privileged masters—you have to toil for those who use protection, which I claim is bondage. But what reason have I to say this? I have the word of the Minister of Finance himself. You know that the Minister of Finance has his moments of weakness as every other man, but he has also his moments of frankness.

Sir, I should like indeed to see any language of the ex-Finance Minister that would have justified this, one of the most contemptible pieces of demagogy I have ever read in my life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at it. But let them read it. My hon. friend who laughs (Mr. Scriver) is a clever and able member of this House, whom I reverence and honour, a gentleman much more experienced than I am; and, if he will read that, and will say that I have unfairly characterized it, I will apologize to him and his party, and will retract every word of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do it now.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot do it now, because I do not feel convinced that I was wrong. But this is all taken au sérieux in the North-west. They believe they are in manacles, and they have looked up to him, and up to the present time they have looked to him in vain, and I fear they will ever look in vain to him to liberate them from the slavery which he described. He went to Moose Jaw, and this is what he said:

It was necessary for him to talk much about protection—no one now defended protection. All must admit that it has been a bane and a curse to this North-west Territory. The man who would defend it would be looked upon as a

curiosity, a phenomena, a freak of nature. The hope of the Conservative party had been that the Government would reform the tariff. His own confidence in the Government did not weigh upon him—did not overburden him—but he believed the Government sincere in their announcement that the tariff would be reformed. He thought they must surely have some bowels of compassion—they must have a heart in their bosom, but the Government had failed to carry out their intention. * * * * * He believed no more taxes should be levied on the people——

Now, mark this.

—than are necessary for revenue.

And two years ago he stated in Peel that he could take off two or three millions and give a revenue tariff. What, then, is to prevent him coming down this session, breaking those fetters in which he says industry is bound, giving us the revenue tariff and relieving the country from suspense and anxiety and his party from the extraordinary position in which it is at present, of following a Government without a policy and supporting a Government which was well described in the correspondence of the "Globe" as composed of members who know one thing—and the correspondent seemed to think they knew nothing else—how to keep silent.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is something you did not know.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to see my hon. friend is making some progress in the study of that art, for he is much more silent than he used to be. In that respect, he is like many others who have gone over there, who used to be very talkative on this side of the House. But now they have been told that their eloquence is likely to embarrass their friends who are in power, and they have grown silent in accordance with the old distitch :

As bees on flowers alighting, cease to hum,
So, settling into places, Whigs grow dumb.

And the legitimate descendants of the Whigs in this country are as dumb as the dumb dogs of Jupiter, which could not bark. I had intended to give the genesis of my hon. friend's free trade, but I will defer that. I know the genesis of it, I know who inspired him, and the source whence he got his inspiration is very interesting. But the important thing for us is that there is the promise, and the North-west looks to him for the performance. On the 15th December, 1885, the North-west Council passed the following resolution :—

That the benefits derived from the National Policy to the older provinces of the Dominion do not apply to the North-west Territories, as regards agricultural implements and lumber, and it being necessary to the future development of the country that every encouragement should be extended to the agricultural interests of the North-west, this Council recommends that a rebate should be given to the duty now imposed on agricultural implements and lumber.

That is the resolution passed ten years ago. An hon. gentleman criticised me with regard to the motion I have on the paper, and thought there seemed to be some inconsistency on my part. If he will take the trouble to look at the early files in 1882, 1883 and 1884, of a paper edited and controlled by myself, and published in the North-west Territories, he will find that I advocated taking off the duty from agricultural implements and lumber. During the late contest I stated that I believed that if the party I was supporting got into power they would take the duty off agricultural implements. I made this argument: A revenue tariff Government could not, without the most ridiculous inconsistency, take the duty off agricultural implements ; but a protectionist Government, which has an element of paternalism in it, which believes in making exceptions and protecting every interest, if we can convince it that it is necessary for the farmers of the North-west that they should get their implements free, such a Government can say to the rest of the country : We must make this exception for the farmers of the North-west, and we can make it consistently with our policy. It was in response to our action and to our efforts that, in 1894, the member for York took off 15 per cent from these agricultural implements at one stroke ; and I say that it was a fair argument on my part that if a Conservative Government had been sustained, and if convinced that it was necessary for our farming interests, that they could do and would do it. But the argument thrown back to me was that a revenue tariff Government would do it too. I pointed out that it was impossible. I venture to say that when the Minister of Finance comes to deal with the tariff, he will not attempt to give us these implements free ; but if he does I will thank him for it, and we will sing peans to him, we will elevate him as high as the dythrambic writer in the "Globe," who eulogized the hon. Minister of Finance for keeping silent. This was in the earlier part of the session ; but we have heard him speak since, and if it were not impertinent on my part, I would say that nobody can doubt that he is a great accession to this House, in that respect, and in others too. But I will raise him as high as the writer in the "Globe," who said that he was manifesting a powerful personality, and deeply impressing the House ; and all the time the hon. gentleman was keeping silent. Although the hon. gentleman has not been quite silent, he has not been very effusive in giving a notion of what he would do when he comes to deal with the tariff. I am afraid he won't carry out the promises made by those who opposed me in the North-west Territories, and give us implements free. Let me

say in regard to this motion, that I cannot for the life of me see how the supporters of this Government, who declared that the people in the North-west were in slavery, that they were in bondage like that of the southern slaves, can justify a leader who comes into power, and with a fairly large majority, says: You are in slavery; you are doubly oppressed; there are robbers pulling the money out of your pocket; but I will allow month after month to pass by, I will sit in Parliament and won't lift a finger to help you; I won't lift a finger to break a link of the chain which binds you. My hon. friend spoke of sunny ways. Sir, sunny ways are very nice, but there is a vulgar but expressive proverb which says: "Fine words butter no parsnips." If we have only sunny ways, and the gilded phrases of expedient rhetoric, and no fulfilment of the glowing promises that have been made to us, it will be a sad thing for the country. But it will not be a bad thing for the Conservative party; it will be a good thing for them to have crossed the floor for a short time, because it will be a very good thing for the people of this country to be placed in a position to come to the hon. gentleman and say: Here is note after note that you passed upon us, note after note that you gave us as good and genuine paper. Now, give us the gold of act and fact for these notes of yours. Why, Sir, distrust has already manifested itself in every part of the country in regard to this Government. In Quebec at the present moment the hon. gentleman's followers are in mutiny; the best elements of his party have risen up against the Mephistopheles of the Public Works, to whom the leader plays the part of Faust. He has mesmerized the leader of the Government, whom he has under his tutelage and power.

They have run up against that dark spirit which sits behind the Prime Minister, the Mephistopheles of the Public Works Department, who has hypnotized the First Minister and now does with him as he pleases. The best element of the party has risen against him. Good and life-long Liberals in the province of Quebec and supporters of the Government do not wish to see him in his present position. Let him read an article in "La Libre Parole." It is a very good and eloquent article, and it is written by a good Liberal, by one who has more claim on the First Minister than the Minister of Public Works. The feeling is one that inspired the conspirators at Rome against Cæsar, which Cassius expressed:

> He doth bestride the narrow world like a Colossus;
> And we petty men walk under his huge legs,
> And peep about to find ourselves dishonourable graves.

Leading Liberals have to peep about to find themselves dishonoured while the great legs of this Colossus, who has to go here and there to get a constituency and now lords it over the Public Works Department, rise on stilts, that do not become him, and from which it appears as if he would speedily fall. I repeat that from Halifax to Vancouver there is a feeling of distrust, and the result of the miserable exhibition made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was powerful when in Opposition, is such that we imagine something must be wrong when a man who used to be powerful on his side of the House has become emasculated, and instead of being a Boanerges, a lion roaring in his strength, now coos like a sucking dove. A contrast so great affects the public mind, and from Halifax to Vancouver public opinion has been disturbed. If the sentiment of Parliament in Canada were as sensitive to public opinion as is the Parliament of England, there would be such a reduced Government majority on a division as would almost send the hon. gentleman leading the Government to His Excellency to hand in his portfolio. But our Parliament is not so sensitive, as we all know. A change has occurred, and the change is a striking one. I would echo the advice of "La Libre Parole" to the hon. gentleman: my advice is to get rid of the Minister of Public Works. That would strengthen the Government, and it would tend to restore confidence. At the present time we are in a very difficult and disagreeable position in this country. We have a party in power which for eighteen years has been complaining that all sorts of evils resulted from the policy of the late Government, and yet when those hon. gentlemen come into power they cannot give the country a policy on anything. Not only so, but already there are manifestations of disease. If I were to quote Latin here, which I will not do because hon. gentlemen opposite do not like languages in which they are so highly instructed, I would give the description that Virgil gives of Scylla. The description can be well applied to the Government. It was translated, I believe, by an old poet in this fashion:

> At top, it shows a gracious face,
> The breast replete with human grace,
> The rest is all an ugly whale,
> With maw of wolf and fish's tail.

We have the gracious presence of the eloquent leader of the Government; we have the maw of the wolf in the person of the Minister of the Public Works Department and some others. In regard to the piscine description, I will not enter into it—but there is a good deal that is fishy about the party. I say once more that we are in this position, that we have now been sitting in this House for over a month and we have had no policy enunciated by the Government, and to-day the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) feels compelled to make a motion in which he lays down this proposition, that if you are going to give a revenue tariff, it should be

given at once ; that if you are not going to give a revenue tariff but a protective tariff slightly revised, you should state that that is your policy in order to relieve the suspense. If the Government are going to adopt such a tariff as could be dealt with at once, then it should be dealt with at once ; but if they are going to adopt the Conservative policy and revise the tariff on protective principles, that principle should be declared for the information of importers and exporters, manufacturers and labourers throughout the country, so that the policy of hesitation may cease to exist, and the country be relieved from the suspense which has already paralyzed industry, created fear, and which, if persevered in, will give starving labourers and clamouring mechanics during the winter.

Mr. MOORE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee).

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897, the sum of $9,728,671.48 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported, and read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 30) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1897, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported and read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the House adjourns I would like again to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) if any progress is being made in regard to the Manitoba schools question. It is a matter which the hon. gentleman knows is of great public interest. I would also ask, at what time it is expected that the writs for Brandon and Saskatchewan will be issued. There seats have been a long time vacant and I think it is only reasonable I should make these inquiries.

The PRIME MINISTER. In regard to the Manitoba school question I have no new information to give to the House, further than what I gave some few days ago. With regard to the writ for Saskatchewan, there is a difficulty which the Government is considering, as to whether a Bill should be introduced in order to dispense with the system of revision which is now going on, or if a new revision is to take place before the election. This is a matter which is under the consideration of the Department of Justice and as to which I hope we shall have an answer in a few days. As to the writ for Brandon we expect to have it issued some time—probably to-day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to mention, for the information of the House, that I have received intimation that His Honour the Deputy Governor, about four o'clock, will request the attendance of members of this House in the Senate, when assent will be given, I suppose, to the Supply Bill.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved :

That the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the present session, be concurred in.

Mr. DAVIN. Explain.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have no intention to go into the subject at length in explaining the reasons why the committee brought in this report.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that this matter was to be postponed until the present debate was concluded. I think it would be better to bring up this report to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A proposal was made, in which I understood the leader of the House concurred, that the report with respect to the translators should be deferred until the conclusion of this debate.

Mr. BERGERON. That was the understanding yesterday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I did not so understand it, because it was not mentioned to me. The understanding come to yesterday was that we should resume the debate that was going on and dispose of it, and afterwards finish Supply. I do not see why we should not take up this matter in the course of ordinary routine, and afterwards resume the debate that was adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER. Yesterday we agreed to finish the debate and take a vote to-night. If we are now to enter upon a long discussion on the proposed adoption of this report, it will be impossible to carry out this arrangement.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman will remember that there was no mention of the debate regarding the translators, and I did not think of it for a moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not be better to defer the matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Defer it—why ?

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman cannot expect the adjourned debate to close to-night if he intervenes with a discussion that will occupy five or six hours.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very sorry, but we must take things as they come.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be much better not to intervene with this matter of the translators in the middle of the debate, especially when there has been an understanding arrived at that the debate would close to-day. I would suggest that it would be much more convenient to close this debate, and let the other matter come up subsequently.

The PRIME MINISTER. As I understood from the hon. gentleman yesterday, his intention was to conclude the present debate and afterwards allow the Government to pass the balance of the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. By no means. What I proposed was that we should take the vote on the motion that was introduced yesterday. The idea at first was that it would be found almost impossible to complete the debate to-day, but I promised that it should be brought to a close to-night. After the vote has been taken, I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we have no disposition to obstruct the passing of the Estimates in any way, as indeed there has been no obstruction manifested.

The PRIME MINISTER. So I will ask my hon. friend to postpone the matter and bring up the consideration of the report to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I hope it will be for the last time.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

DAIRY PRODUCTS.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893. He said : Mr. Speaker, in relation to this matter, I would say that I have been requested by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) to assume the responsibility of putting the Bill which he introduced early in the session, on Government Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a public Bill, and notice will have to be given for to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Very well, Sir, I give notice.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Charlton.)

SUPPLY—TARIFF LEGISLATION.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding : That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in rising to place my views before the hon. members of this House, I do so with no little embarrassment, realizing, as I do, when brought face to face with the discussion of the great questions of parliamentary and public interest, the almost hopelessness of the task of presenting in any new or interesting manner a subject which has been so carefully analysed and so forcibly presented by hon. gentlemen of long experience, great abilities, and undoubted eloquence. I am, therefore, under the necessity of invoking the kind indulgence of hon. gentlemen on both sides, an indulgence which, I understand, they usually accord to new members who venture to address the House upon the important questions which it may have under consideration.

The present discussion involves the investigation of questions of public policy of the utmost importance to the welfare and prosperity of Canada. It is a matter of no great consequence to the country who the 213 members of the House of Commons are; but it is of vital importance what policy these hon. gentlemen adopt, for upon the adoption and execution of a proper and wise

fiscal policy depend and rest the progress and the well-being of the country in which we live. It may be assumed that every wise and patriotic citizen desires that course to be pursued which will promote and develop to the greatest extent and which will advance most rapidly and satisfactorily all our great national interests. Much has been said, and I believe much depends upon our loyalty and devotion to Canadian institutions and Canadian interests. And, although we may hold different views regarding the mode in which the results we seek are to be brought about, yet all ought to be united in the desire and in the determination to make Canada what her position, her natural resources and her undeveloped wealth has destined her to become. We may, therefore, conclude that we are all agreed in desiring the greatest possible success for the country, but, unfortunately, we disagree as to the methods to be pursued and the best course to take to produce the desired results. We have now come to the parting of the ways. The Liberal party, through its honourable and distinguished leaders, have recommended to the electors of Canada on different occasions the various policies which they claimed were calculated to attain the end and to bring about the desired and wished for results. Amongst the systems submitted to the electorate, were free trade, tariff for revenue, commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, free trade as it is in England, and protection. For many years these policies were discussed, and all in turn, with the exception of the National Policy, the policy of protection, were rejected by the people at the polls. The Liberal-Conservative leaders prepared, proposed and favoured a policy which they claimed would foster and encourage Canadian industries, by giving to the Canadian producers control of the Canadian markets. This method was devised, formulated and crystallized into the system known and designated as the National Policy. It was proposed by Sir John Macdonald in this House in 1876, also in 1877, and it was adopted by the people of Canada at the elections of 1878 by a very large majority. I wish here, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the House to the name which has been attached to this protective system. It is called the National Policy, and it may not be known to all the gentlemen of this House that that word was coined and that policy was so christened by the former member for the county of Stanstead, the Hon. C. C. Colby, who was a member of Parliament for some twenty-five years. It was he who gave the name; it was he who christened that policy and that fiscal system which has been of such incalculable benefit to the people of this country. The speech of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Colby), which went throughout this country, travelled across the water and was circulated all over Europe, will carry his name down to posterity, and will cause it ever to be remembered with respect and honour by those who follow him. That policy was submitted to the public in 1882, in 1886, and also in 1891; and on these occasions it was confirmed by the overwhelming majority of the electorate. Last election was decided on other and unfortunate issues, and cannot fairly be claimed as a condemnation of the National Policy. The present Government, therefore, have no real justification in concluding that they have a mandate from the electorate of Canada to "remove every vestige of protection from the tariff."

The National Policy has been a friend to Canada. It has been the great prop upon which the struggling industries in their infancy rested for support, and fostering care; and the hand that strikes an unfriendly blow, the hand that strikes down the protection to Canadian industries, is not a hand friendly to the prosperity of the people of Canada. The Liberal-Conservative party, twenty years ago expressed their convictions, owing to the changed conditions of trade and commerce between us and the United States, "That the welfare of Canada required the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff would benefit and foster (amongst others) the agricultural interests."

Before comparing protection and free trade and tariff for revenue, I desire to consider for a short time some of the assertions which were made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) regarding the National Policy, and the acts of the late Administration. I hope that it may not be considered presumptive in so new a member to discuss important issues with such an experienced and eloquent parliamentarian and such a political oratorical gladiator—as is the hon. member for South Oxford. And while I shall not try to make any display of oratory, or enter into any declamatory denunciations of the Liberal party, or any members of that party, I desire to have a little talk in a business way upon the great financial question which has been a burning theme of contention for a score of years. The member for South Oxford condemned in the most emphatic manner the National Policy, and said it had been the cause of the great debt being "heaped up on the country." Perhaps I may be in error, but I certainly have not been under the impression that we can charge the large public debt to the National Policy; and I was inclined to the opinion when that statement was made in this House that the facts did not warrant the hon. gentleman in putting the charge quite so strongly.

The net public debt of Canada to-day is $253,074,927. Now, how was this created? The provincial debts assumed at confederation and afterwards amounted to $109,430,148. That portion of the debt certainly cannot be assumed to have been caused by the National Policy, because it was incurred several years before the National Policy was adopted. There is left, then, to be ac-

counted for $143,644,779. If we had nothing to show for this great balance of debt, possibly we might be open to the accusation which was hurled across the floor of the House last night, that the Conservative party was a party of boodlers and corruptionists. But, Sir, I hold in my hand a paper which shows the manner in which the public funds of this country have been used. In the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the canals, in the Intercolonial and connecting railways, in the North-west Territories, in Dominion lands, in public buildings at Ottawa, in the Prince Edward Island Railway, and in other public works, we have expended the sum of $200,143,171. Is there a man in this House who can claim that our investment of $62,653,745 in the great trans-continental railway that traverses this country from the east to the west, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, opening up to colonization and settlement the great fertile lands of the North-west and British Columbia, was money badly laid out for this country? Gentlemen from the North-west and British Columbia tell us very encouraging and enthusiastic stories in regard to the great wealth of that western country; and I am sure that no man to-day, looking at that country in its present condition of development, will say that $1,500,000 was a high price to pay for all that great North-west, including British Columbia, with its immense stores of wealth. I am sure that there is not one item of those I have mentioned in regard to which hon. gentlemen opposite can say that the money was badly laid out, or that represents institutions which we could do without. Our expenditures on these public works of great benefit to the country amount to $200,143,171; the increase of the debt since confederation, exclusive of provincial debts, amounts to $143,644,779; so that we have expended upon them the sum of $56,498,392 in excess of the entire public debt of this country.

There is another point to which I would like to call the attention of this House, that is, that the public records show that during five years of Liberal rule, when the hon. member for South Oxford was the financial manager of the country, there was expended $40,513,607, or a yearly increase of the public debt of $8,102,721. That is a portion of the debt which he says the National Policy imposed on the people of this country. Now, the Conservative party have been in power, since confederation, twenty-three years, and during that time they increased the public debt by $103,131,172, or an average of $4,049,181 a year, or about one-half of the increase under the financial administration of the hon. member for South Oxford. Therefore, I think I have conclusively shown to the hon. members of this House that that hon. gentleman's statement that the National Policy had heaped up this great public debt on the people of this country was a little too strong a statement to be borne out by the record. In 1878, at the conclusion of the period during which the hon. member for South Oxford was Finance Minister of this country, the debt per head amounted to $3.68. And in 1894, after many years of this Liberal corrupt Conservative administration that had declined to $2.91 per head.

We have other sources of comparison by which we can determine which Administration dealt with the affairs of the country in the most economic manner. Take the Customs. We find that the collection of revenue in 1878 cost $5.18½ per head, while under the Liberal-Conservative Administration, during the same length of time, it only cost $5.13.

We have heard a great deal about the population of Canada. We have had calamity howlers all over this country, who seem to be opposed to the prosperity of the country and to feel bad when anything develops that shows the bright side of the picture, and who have all taken great pleasure in quoting the United States of America to show how much more progressive that country is and how much faster it goes ahead than Canada. I have only a word to say with regard to the population question. Take the increases of population in the United States. Up to 1890 it had increased eighteen times. Take the increase in the population of Canada up to 1891, and I find it had increased forty-two times. The increase in each province of the Dominion, according to the census of 1891, was as follows:—

Ontario	9·73
Quebec	9·53
Nova Scotia	2·23
New Brunswick	0·00
Manitoba	144·95
British Columbia	98·49
Prince Edward Island	0·17
North-west Territories	75·33
Total increase	11·76

Therefore, there has been some increase in the population of the Dominion.

Then take the value of settlers' effects. From 1874 to 1878, both inclusive, their value was $2,665,100, or a yearly average of $666,280. From 1878 to 1882, the value was $9,808,603, or a yearly average of $2,452,126. Thus the increase under the Liberal Administration was $666,280 per year, as compared with $2,452,126 in four years of Conservative administration.

We have had something said with regard to the cost of immigration. The late Government was charged with not paying due attention to this question. I believe it to be one of the most important questions with which the Government have to deal. We have a great territory and a great many broad acres that are not under cultivation, a territory sufficient to keep in comfort and happiness fifty to seventy-five million people. I think that money well laid out

to induce the right kind of immigrants to come and settle here would be expended in the interests of the people and should not meet with any objection. The cost of immigrants to Canada during the years when the Mackenzie Government held power was $13.80, and the cost during the same number of years under the late Conservative Administration was $5.72 per head.

The next point I have to deal with is to be found in the argument of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that farm property in this country had greatly reduced in value. Unfortunately, we have not statistics in all the provinces of the Dominion by which we could ascertain the increase and decrease. But in Ontario the statistical bureau keeps a record, and this record shows that there has been at least some mistake made with regard to the decrease of farm property in that magnificent province by the hon. gentleman. Farm lands, buildings, implements and live stock in Ontario were valued in 1884 at $949,873,170, and in 1894 that value had increased to $954,355,507. Therefore, instead of there being a decrease in the value of farm property, we find that there has been in Ontario a very substantial increase, especially in buildings and implements and live stock. There have been decreases in some portions of Ontario in the value of land, but that has not been caused by the National Policy, but by the opening up of Manitoba and the North-west Territories lands, to be sold cheaper to agriculturists, and by the low price of produce which has existed during the past eighteen years. We were told, too, that the National Policy had caused the farm prices to fall to about one-third of what they were. I have here a list of quotations from a newspaper published in Canada giving the prices on November 7th, 1878, and also on November 7th, 1895. While the list is too long to read in detail, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House that there is very little variation in prices considered in the aggregate, and that such difference as there is is quite favourable to the prices of 1895. If any hon. gentleman desires to know these prices, I will read them, but it is tedious to read such a long list of figures. This is taken from the "Globe" newspaper, and hon. gentlemen on the other side will not object to that authority.

There is another very important matter in connection with this. While depression exists to a great extent in Canada among the agriculturists as well as among all other classes of the people, there is one fact patent to every man, and that is that a dollar to-day will buy as much as two dollars would buy in 1878. In answer to those who speak depreciatingly of Canadian industries and immigration and the population of this country, I may be permitted to refer to some matters within my own knowledge. We have in Magog the Dominion Cotton Mills Company's works. In the census of 1891 we find a record of the increase of the population of that little manufacturing town. Between 1881 and 1891 the population of Magog increased 173·4 per cent; and between 1891 and the present year it was increased 125 per cent. The valuation of the township in 1878 was $175,000. The valuation of the town to-day is over $1,000,000. The number of hands employed in the Dominion Cotton Mills Company's mills at Magog is 800, and the wages paid to these men per year amount to $230,000. If you were to go into my constituency as a free trader and say to the people that they do not want protection, that you will take away protection and close the doors of this factory, and offer yourself as a candidate on that policy, I am sure that instead of having 500 majority as I had in the last election, I would receive 2,000 majority. There is no question, Sir, that this industry has been of great importance to the people of that country, that it has given employment to a large number of operatives, who furnish a market for the farmers of the surrounding country that is highly appreciated.

There is another matter to which, perhaps I may not be excused for calling attention, being a young member. But somehow, not being accustomed to political life, when I have heard accusations and criminations and recriminations hurled across the floor of this House repeatedly and upon the most trivial question, I have felt that if strangers were here they would say that if we were telling the truth about each other in this House we would be unworthy of the positions which we hold as representatives of the people. I came here as a business man to do business. I have listened quietly to the speeches that have been made, and I have been surprised to hear the hard talk hurled across the floor of this House by hon. members upon either side. I believe, Sir, that my constituents and your constituents did not send us here for the purpose of cursing and calling each other hard names; and when the Liberal-Conservative party here last night were told that they were corruptionists——

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message from His Honour the Deputy Governor by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. Speaker,

His Honour the Deputy Governor desires the immediate attendance of this House in the Senate Chamber.

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

(In the Senate Chamber.)

His Honour the Deputy Governor was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

SUPPLY—TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Mr. MOORE. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, before I took my seat, I was trenching a little too much upon the prerogative of older members, and might be thought to be reading them a lecture upon decorum in this House. But that was not my intention. Perhaps I may not be made of quite the same stuff as other men are. It seems to me that a Liberal is as good as a Conservative if he behaves himself and I see no reason why we should not treat each other with that respect and courtesy due to gentlemen outside of this House. There is no man I appreciate more than the leader of the Government, and that for his courtesy, but I think we have men on this side of the House who are worthy of respect also : and I do not think the evidence that has been given here should be taken and a verdict rendered upon it by the people of this country. I have an article placed in my hand of which I will read one paragraph. It is from the "Week," and is on the subject of dignity of Parliament :

The prerogatives of Parliament are preserved by immemorial custom and protected by positive law ; the dignity of Parliament must be maintained by its own members in their personal relations. If, while they call each other "honourable gentlemen," they abuse each other like pickpockets on the floor of the House, they cannot fairly expect the general public to hold either Parliament or its members in high esteem.

And I may say that, not being an experienced parliamentarian, I was not a little surprised to hear a gentleman of the great ability and great reputation of the hon. member for South Oxford call the Liberal-Conservative party a party of corruptionists and boodlers and all that was bad. Sir, I belong to the Liberal-Conservative party : I have belonged to the Liberal-Conservative party for the last twenty-five years, and while I do not profess to be any better than other men, I do not believe that I am guilty personally upon this charge that was hurled across the floor of the House, and I do not believe other gentlemen who are associate with me are open to such a charge. But, Sir, if I were willing to retaliate, I might remind the hon. gentleman that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. I think, Sir, that according to the court records of this country between 1874 and 1895, there were eighty-eight Liberals unseated for corrupt practices in elections, and eight personally disqualified for seven years, while there were only forty-eight Conservatives unseated and only one disqualified. After listening attentively to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), I appreciated more fully a story that was told of an old Presbyterian minister. He was located in a place, but went away to preach one Sunday, and another man filled his pulpit. When he came back he asked his beadle what he thought of the new minister. The beadle replied that he did not like the new minister very well, that he had made all his points clear. "I do not like him as well as I do you," said the beadle ; "because you have the faculty of confusing the understanding and tangling up the judgment in a way that is very amusing indeed." I thought when listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman that he had the same qualification as the minister—he had the faculty of confusing the understanding and tangling up the judgment. I would like to compare the protective tariff in force for eighteen years with the free trade and tariff-for-revenue-only policy which the leaders of the Liberal party have undertaken to force upon the people of this country.

Unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union, under the emphatic condemnation of the people, may be considered dead and buried. Therefore, we may conclude that free trade, and tariff for revenue, and free trade as it is in England, are the only policies which the Liberal party have to replace the protective tariff of the late Government. I will now undertake to show by figures which I have in my hand, the effect of a free trade tariff in Canada, and I will make a comparison between a free trade tariff and the protective tariff of the late Government. Let me take the article of breadstuffs, and give the importations into Canada in 1878, just those articles which the farmers of this country can raise, if they can raise anything, consisting of barley, oats, peas and beans, rye, corn, wheat, wheat flour, rye flour, meal and oatmeal. The importations of these articles amounted in value to $13,446,960, in 1878, under a free trade policy. They came in here freely in competition with the home-grown grain of the farmers of this country. In 1878 the Liberal-Conservative party imposed a protective tariff upon these articles of breadstuffs which I have enumerated ; and in 1894 we imported only $1.000,862 worth, showing a decline of $12,446,098 per year, which, in eighteen years, would amount to the enormous sum of $224,049,764 in favour of the National Policy over the free trade tariff that was in operation up to 1878. That is the encouragement which the Conservative Government gave to the farmers of this country, stimulating them to raise enough for themselves and also for export. That is the comparison which I make between free trade and a protective tariff,

because that was a free trade tariff, and ours has been a protection tariff.

I will now compare the results between a revenue tariff and the protective tariff that has been in operation for the last eighteen years, taking the line of meats, including pork, lard, bacon and hams. Of these articles we imported into Canada, in 1890, $1,458,286 worth. The farmers of this country were not satisfied with the protection they were getting under a tariff for revenue upon meats, and they went to the Government and asked them to increase the tariff, and it was accordingly made a protective tariff. In 1895 the importation of meats, in the articles mentioned, declined to $309,436, or a difference of $1,148,850 in one year. We also exported a very large amount of meat in consequence of the stimulating effect of a protective policy, and that, added to the decrease in importations, made a difference of $4,443,365 under a protective tariff over a tariff for revenue only. Sir, under the protecting care of this policy that has effected such wonders in the development of the agricultural interests, we, in 1878, exported of animals, meats, dairy products, fruit, poultry and game, eggs, hides, hams and skins, under a tariff for revenue, $29,922,145 worth. In 1894, under a protective policy, we exported $47,802,859, being an increase of $17,886,714. Taking breadstuffs and the increase of such exports as I have mentioned above, and we have a difference of $30,000,000 a year in favour of the National Policy over the policies which the people of this country have declared they do not want.

Now, Sir, we have heard something about reciprocity with the United States. I am of opinion that we cannot get, on any terms, reciprocity with the United States which would be advantageous to Canada. We never can expect to renew a reciprocity treaty on the lines of that which existed in 1854; and, Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that a renewal of that treaty of 1854 would be a great injury to the agricultural interests of Canada. The United States are competitors with us, instead of being consumers of our farm products. Not very long ago I had occasion to go along the frontier, and found that a merchant was buying dressed hogs upon this side of the line and paying 4½ cents a pound for them. On the other side of the line another merchant was buying from the Vermont farmers and paying them only 2¾ cents a pound. The pork raisers of Vermont sent a delegation to the custom-house officer upon this side of the line and offered to give him a cent a pound if he would permit the introduction into Canada of dead hogs. Of course he told their delegate that he could not change the tariff, that he would have to pay three cents instead of one; and he said then, of course, that would rule them out and they would not be able to come into Canada. There is a fair illustration of the effect that reciprocity would have in pork and many other articles, if free trade were to take place between Canada and the United States. Another gentleman was buying wool on the frontier. On our side of the line he was paying 15 cents a pound, while on the other side he was paying only 13 cents. Now, I do not believe the farmers of Canada want to renew negotiations with the United States for a treaty under which they would get two cents a pound less for their wool and two cents a pound less for their fresh hogs. I had occasion to travel through portions of the states of Vermont and New Hampshire last summer, and I tell you as a positive fact, incredible though it may seem, that within 15 miles of the town of Wells River, I saw many abandoned farms; and I travelled through three abandoned villages, and saw only one house inhabited in each. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we wish for a treaty with the United States that would permit the free introduction of farm products into this country in exchange for ours going into that country, and if such a policy is going to reduce the prices of farm products to the people of Canada, I am sure that the farmers of this country would not derive any advantage from such a treaty. In a city not very far from where I live, there is a gentleman who has an interest in a ranch in the western states. He imported several car-loads of horses into Sherbrooke, and sold them out to the people of the Eastern Townships, after paying the duty, at a less price than the farmers of this country ask for horses of the same class. Therefore, we may say that so far as horses are concerned, there would be no benefit from a reciprocity treaty on the lines of 1854, when the people can import horses from the United States, and pay duty on them, and sell them in competition with horses raised in this country. The Americans raise dairy products, and have a surplus, as we have; they find a market in England, as we do, and there is no object in removing the duty from dairy products entering the United States. So far as our farm products are concerned, with the possible exception of some not very important articles, it would be disadvantageous to our farmers to enter into a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, even if its terms were as liberal as those of the treaty of 1854. In my opinion, it would be more useful and profitable for our people to turn their attention to London, instead of looking to Washington. The American market is practically closed to us. We cannot compete either with the farmers or manufacturers of that country in their own market. But England admits free into her markets products of the Canadian farms. The population of the United Kingdom is 40,000,000, in round numbers. They raise food for only 18,000,000 of their population, and so it is the equivalent of a nation of 22,000,000 which has to be supplied from other countries. According to the statistics, we find that she imports among food products from other countries the following:—

Dressed meat	$115,678,905
Butter	69,326,785
Cheese	22,747,681
Eggs	19,483,408
Fruit (raw)	23,680,347
Lard	14,317,446
Condensed milk	5,258,720
Poultry and game	2,945,141
	$273,438,435

These products are what we can supply profitably if transportation is furnished with cold storage. When the appropriation for $20,000 was brought down by the Minister of Agriculture, I ventured to suggest that it would be rather unfair to limit the aid to creamery butter, and I asked the hon. gentleman if the privilege could not be extended to dairy butter. The best qualities of dairy butter and factory cheese are produced around Lake Memphremagog, in the county represented by the hon. member for Brome, and also in the county of Stanstead which I represent. When we come to consider the subject of the dairy and the claims of the women engaged in butter-making, and consider that they will have to pay transportation and cold storage expenses on their butter sent to England, and creamery butter at the same time, being aided by the Government in being placed in cold storage and delivered in good condition in the English market; under these circumstances, I am afraid that the regular dairy-butter makers will not feel that the Minister of Agriculture has fully appreciated their claims. I suggest, in view of the fact that our agricultural products are available towards supplying this value of $273,438,435, the Government should provide cold storage for dressed meat, butter, eggs, condensed milk and poultry. I know the Minister of Agriculture possesses ability for his present position, and that he will conscientiously do what he can in the direction of assisting our farmers to place their dairy and other perishable products on the English market and open up a great trade with the mother country. When we come to the subject of butter, we find the imports of Great Britain in 1895 were as follows:—

Canada	$ 746,552
Australasia	6,932,980
United States	1,322,643
Sweden	8,001,340
Denmark	28,946,186
Germany	2,750,119
Holland	4,571,387
France	11,897,705
Other countries	4,154,874
	$69,326,786

It will thus be seen that, while Australia sent butter to the value of $6,932,000; Denmark, $28,946,000; France, $11,897,000; Canada, although it is admitted we have as good pasturage and water as any of the countries enumerated, only shipped butter to the value of a little over $700,000. It is not creditable to the intelligence and enterprise of Canadians that our farmers should be able to place on the English market only a little over half a million dollars' worth of butter, when Denmark places there this article to the value of almost $29,000,000. I am sure that, if cold storage is provided, so that all our dairy products, and especially butter, can be placed on the English market in good condition, the trade will be largely developed. While I profess to be a loyal subject, a patriotic son of this country, it seems to me—although I do not wish to criticise the actions of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House—that, if we took a little of the money appropriated to the Minister of Militia and placed it in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, it would be very much better for the people. England is represented to us as a nation whose example we should follow. I am proud of old England; I am proud of Canada. I am proud of the achievements of this Dominion to which I belong, for this country is one of the brightest jewels, and perhaps the brightest jewel, in the Crown of our noble Queen, and I would hesitate to allow anything done that would tend to restrict the commercial relations between the mother country and Canada. But, if we were to enter on a free trade policy as it is in England to-day, no doubt similar results would follow here, as in the mother country. A recent statement made by Lord Salisbury, as put upon the bulletin boards of Montreal, was that free trade has wrecked agriculture in England, as it has in every other country where it has been tried. We can, however, understand the reason why England has adopted a free trade policy. The farming class form a comparatively small percentage of the population, and, I suppose, Lord Salisbury and those who hold his views, are of the opinion, as expressed by him in regard to the introduction of German sugar into the United Kingdom, that it was a question of securing the greatest good to the greatest number, and that the Government could do nothing to relieve the English refiners. That is the position taken, I understand, by the free trade party in England. Undoubtedly, while this system, from their point of view, may destroy agricultural interests, it may benefit the great majority of the population. But it has brought distress on the farmers to such an extent that there was introduced into the Imperial Parliament, last session, a Bill entitled the Farmers' Rating Bill, by which $10,000,000 a year was to be contributed to relieve the distressed condition of the farmers. England has adopted a free trade policy. It came in force in 1846, and, on looking over the returns between England and every other importing country, we find the balance of trade has been largely against England, until last year it amounted, according to the "Statesmen's Year-book," to $960,000,000. She is the only country that has adopted a free trade policy: all the countries with which she is trading, have adopted the opposite policy, or are advancing in the direction of protection, instead of

free trade. We are told that she has investments all over the world that recoup her, but I can only find an annual return of $470,000,000 upon investments outside of the United Kingdom, which leaves $490,000,000 to account for. If that drain continues from old England, in the balance of trade with other countries, the time will come when the eyes of the people will be opened to the fact, that as Lord Salisbury said: It may be a nice thing in sentiment to allow other nations to come in freely and compete with our own manufacturers and producers, but it is not a matter of business.

I have already taken up the time of the House longer than I intended to, but I have a few more figures which may prove interesting and instructive to hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me refer for a moment to the taxation and the expenditure per capita in Canada. The Liberal-Conservative party have been accused by gentlemen opposite of being extravagant and corrupt; and they have been charged with the maladministration of the affairs of the country. I hold in my hand figures, taken from authoritative sources, which give the expenditure per head of the various countries in the world. Europe, which includes Austro-Hungary, France, the German Empire, Netherlands, Portugal, Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Italy, Norway, Roumania, Russia in Europe, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey, the average expenditure is $8.62 per head of the population. On the continent of America, including the Argentine Republic, Brazil, Mexico, Peru, United States, Uruguay, Chili and Venezuela, the average expenditure is $10.17. Australasia, including New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, New Zealand, the South Seas, Fiji and the Falkland Islands, the average expenditure is $30.44 per head. Now, Sir, in Canada which has been ruled for the last eighteen years, as we have been told (by hon. gentlemen opposite and their Liberal friends in the country), by a corrupt and boodling administration, the Liberal-Conservative party has carried on the affairs of this country for an expenditure of $7.50 per capita of the population. In view of such a record as that, it is unfair and unjust to characterize the Liberal-Conservative Government as boodlers, thieves, and corruptionists. I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should resort to such unfair denunciation. For my part, I would be sorry indeed to hurl such accusations against these gentlemen on the other side of the House. I entertain great respect for those of them whom I know, and later on when I may become acquainted with the others I hope that my respect for them will increase as my acquaintance with them increases. I will close, Mr. Speaker, by repeating a few lines which were written a great many years ago by a patriotic citizen of the United States, for it occurs to me that they are as applicable to Canada now, as they were to the American republic when written:

Our country 'tis a glorious land,
With broad arms stretched from shore to shore;
The proud Pacific chafes her strand,
She hears the dark Atlantic roar.

And nurtured on her ample breast,
How many a goodly prospect lies;
In nature's wildest grandeur drest,
Enamelled with her loveliest dyes.

Rich prairies decked with flowers of gold
Like sunlit oceans roll afar,
Broad lakes her azure eyes behold
That bright reflects the polar star.

And mighty rivers mountain born,
Go sweeping onward dark and deep
Through forests where the bounding fawn
Beneath her sheltering branches leap.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in complimenting my hon. friend the member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore) upon his very successful maiden effort in the Canadian House of Commons. I have listened to his speech with much pleasure. It is a speech upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Moore) has evidently bestowed a great deal of time, and he has compiled and presented to this House a vast amount of information; some of it bearing upon the question before us, and some of it useful mainly for the reason that it is interesting, although not particularly applicable to the subject under consideration. I can unite very heartily with that hon. member (Mr. Moore) in the desire he expresses, that the intercourse of the members of this House shall be of a kindly and gentlemanly character, and I have no doubt that further on in his parliamentary career, which I trust will be a satisfactory one to himself, the hon. gentleman will be able to live up to the standard he now places before the House as a desirable one to aim at. Should he remain in the House of Commons for fifteen or twenty years, and pass through some of the struggles that have characterized our contentions here in years past; should he be called upon to resist some of the acts of usurpation of the Government, similar to the Franchise Act, the Gerrymander Act, and others that I could mention; he might possibly, Mr. Speaker, have the gloss of his etiquette slightly rubbed off. We sometimes here meet in contests over great political principles. The Opposition in this House has at times resisted gross impositions and outrages upon the people, and on such occasions men are apt, perhaps, to forget their manners in their earnestness. If the hon. gentleman should happen to see anything of that kind in the future, I hope he will be able to make due allowances for the intensity of purpose which may characterize members in their mode of urging their views. I do not know that I shall bestow much time on the points my hon. friend (Mr. Moore) has raised, but I will refer to a few of them.

My hon. friend (Mr. Moore) evidently has the idea that the administration of the financial affairs of Canada from 1874 to 1878, under the leadership of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not a commendable one, and he informs us that after all the talk about the increase of debt, and that after all the denunciation against the Conservative Government for recklessness in this respect, yet, that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie increased the public debt by forty millions dollars during its term of office. My hon. friend (Mr. Moore) is a young member, and when he will look a little further into this thing, and when he will inquire into the reasons for that increase of debt, he will be able to judge more properly of the character of the financial record of the Mackenzie Administration. I desire to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Moore) to the fact that when the Mackenzie Government assumed charge of the public affairs of Canada, they found certain obligations resting upon the country, which as the successors of the previous Government they were called upon to discharge. The honour of the country was placed in their hands; the interest upon the public debt must be provided for by them; the contracts entered into by their predecessors must be carried out by them, and when they came into office they found obligations to discharge, contracts entered into, and expenditures incurred which it was necessary for them to meet. They found that the preceding Government had a railway under construction called the Intercolonial Railway. The road was partially built, but the balance of the line was under construction, and the Mackenzie Government were under the necessity of completing this work which the Macdonald Administration had commenced. They found that the Welland Canal and other canals were in process of enlargement, and that very large sums of money were necessary to carry out obligations in this respect which the preceding Government had entered into. They also found that the previous Government had incurred certain obligations with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway scheme, and that contracts were in progress at Ottawa in respect to the erection and enlargement of public buildings. And the Mackenzie Administration, for carrying out these contracts which were entered into by their predecessors, incurred the entire amount of the public debt added during their term of office. So I desire my hon. friend to take notice of the fact, not only that was the debt increased by $40,000,000, but that the Administration preceding the Mackenzie Administration was responsible for every dollar of that increase. A half truth is often worse than a whole falsehood; and if the hon. gentleman will hereafter tell the whole truth, he will not be designedly or undesignedly misleading the people of this country.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The hon. gentleman remarked that access to the markets of the United States is of very small consequence to the people of Canada. He has travelled in the state of Vermont, and the extent of his travels in that state enables him to give us information with regard to all the states of the union. He has found in Vermont some deserted farms and two or three deserted villages, and he has found that pork in Vermont is actually cheaper than it is in Stanstead. The trade returns, however, show that we do find a market in the United States, even under the trade restrictions at present against us. We find a market in the United States for various food products of our country. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that we find a market there for barley; but we also sell lambs, horses, swine, tallow, wool, flax, beans, hay and a great number of other articles. Our trade with the United States is a very large one, and those in favour of a reciprocity of trade simply maintain that if the barriers between these two countries were removed, the great cities on the seaboard, the great centres of population quite contiguous to our territory, would furnish us with a very large and very important market for the productions of our soil.

I desire to-day, as I do not want to consume very much of the time of the House, to refer to some points made by my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Foster) last night, who I am sorry to see is absent from his seat. I may say at the outset that I consider the policy of attack upon the Government at the present time with reference to their trade policy a most absurd thing. The trade policy of the Government has not been formulated. The time for the criticising of that policy has not arrived. When that policy is formulated, my hon. friend from York may disagree with it; I make bold to suppose that in all human probability he will disagree with it; but until that policy is formulated, the hon. gentleman is not able to say what he is striking at. He does not know what to strike at. He does not know what he is condemning. He is only condemning in advance what he supposes the Government policy may be; and I repeat that the motion made by the hon. gentleman, and every position taken by him in reference to this matter, is entirely premature, and that it is a useless consumption of the time of this House to place this motion before it and to invite the discussion which must necessarily follow. But the hon. gentleman may say we ought to have known what the fiscal policy of the Government would be before Parliament was called together—that if we are not aware what that policy is, if we are not in a position to discuss the details of it, the Government is at fault for having convened Parliament without being able to place before Parliament their policy with reference to this matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, the conditions under

which the Government have called this House together are of a very peculiar character. Under ordinary circumstances the newly-formed Government might have waited, and probably would have waited, until time enough had been taken by them to consider and mature their policy with regard to the tariff; but under the circumstances, it is well known to every intelligent gentleman in this House that this course could not be followed, that the exigencies of the public service demanded the immediate convening of Parliament for the granting of the supplies necessary for the public service. If the present Government had been responsible for that position of matters, then criticism would have properly lain at their door for having called Parliament together before they had matured their tariff policy and were ready to formulate it. But the circumstances were not of their own making. The exigency did not arise through their own misconduct or through their own failure to apprehend what they should do. But the situation was entirely due, not partially, but entirely, to their predecessors. Their predecessors remained in office until the term of the last Parliament had expired by efflluxion of time. They kept Parliament together until the last day it could sit as a Parliament, without securing the voting of supplies. They wasted the time of that session in a useless attempt to pass a measure which was foreordained to defeat, and which they must have known could not be forced through this House; and when the last Parliament passed out of existence on the 24th day of April, these hon. gentlemen, instead of immediately issuing writs for an election and having a new Parliament convened in time to vote the supplies before the expiration of the then current fiscal year, delayed the issuing of the writs, and did not hold the general election till the 23rd day of June. The election was held, the Government were defeated, but they did not resign their portfolios until after the expiration of the fiscal year, 1895-96. When they did resign, and His Excellency called in his new advisers, those advisers had no time to develop a policy, no time to decide what they were to do about the tariff, no time to decide what they were to do about any of the public questions of the day. They had to provide for the exigencies of the public service, and we all know that they were obliged to tide over the difficulty by resorting to Governor General's warrants. We all know that this was a temporary expedient. It was condemned by the hon. gentlemen now in Opposition; and if their condemnation of this expedient was well-founded, it follows as a matter of course that they must approve of the calling of Parliament at an early day to obviate the necessity of issuing Governor General's warrants beyond the most limited extent. Well, the House was called to meet within forty days of the time the new Government was formed. And during those forty days His Excellency had to choose his advisers, and the preliminaries of the organization and formation of the Cabinet had to be gone through, and these advisers had to go to the country to be re-elected, and a session was held at the earliest possible day, and it was convened avowedly for the sole purpose of tiding over the difficulties that existed through the failure of the late Government to provide supplies. We are here in session for that purpose. The Government avowed, when this House met, that its sole purpose was to get supplies. They informed us that they had not had time to formulate a tariff policy and consider the provisions of that policy, and address themselves in earnestness to that task, until this exigency of the service had been overcome, and, the supplies being granted, they would be enabled to proceed with public business. What we should properly do now, is to give the Government their supplies. We should say to them: Now, gentlemen, you have the money you require to carry on the affairs of the country, get ready your policy, ascertain what you intend to do, and, when you are ready to submit that policy, call us at the earliest day. That is what it is reasonable to ask the Government to do, but that is not what the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) thinks ought to be done. He rose in his place and gravely presented a resolution, censuring the Government for not having during the forty days within which the House was to meet after the Government was formed, made a tariff policy, to make which properly must require ample and careful consideration and judicious and thorough investigation into the diverse wants of the country and the state of its business. Reference was made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the delay in formulating the tariff when the National Policy was adopted in 1878, and when the verdict of the people was given that it should be adopted. The Mackenzie Government resigned in October, and the new Conservative Ministry was formed. Were they ready to submit their tariff to the country in forty days? Were they ready to do it in eighty days? The House was assembled, and the tariff policy of the new Ministers was presented to the House the following March, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite, who approve of the course adopted then, are now impatient because the same work has not been done by this Government inside of forty days. The difficulty in dealing with the tariff question, the fact that time is required to study it properly, is strikingly exemplified by the experience of the United States, when the last revision of the tariff was made there. The presidential election was held in 1892, the issue of that election was the tariff. The Democratic party had carried the country upon a platform of tariff reform, calling for large reductions in the amounts of duties imposed. Now, one would suppose that, with a sol-

emn verdict of the people in favour of that policy, the carrying of that verdict into effect would not have been a work requiring a very great time. But what were the facts? President Cleveland was elected in November, 1892. He was inaugurated the 4th March, 1893. A special session was called in the following September, two or three months in advance of the regular time, for the purpose of dealing with the tariff question, on which the people had passed their verdict. How soon did they get the tariff passed? The House of Representatives sat, for that purpose, from September until February, preparing a tariff measure, which went to the Senate. And the Wilson Bill never became law until August, 1894. It required from September, 1893, to August, 1894, for Congress to put in shape their Tariff Bill, and yet the Government of Canada are expected to deal with a question of this magnitude in forty days, and at the same time form a Government and go back to the people for re-election, and go through all the confusion and excitement and uncertainty which are necessary incidents to the formation of a Government. The idea is preposterous. Hasty, immature action in this matter would have been wrong. The Government, had they adopted such a policy, would have been likely to make serious mistakes, the consequences of which could scarcely be retrieved, and the Government are worthy of all commendation for having decided to take up this matter cautiously, to proceed prudently, to study their ground thoroughly, ascertain what the wants of the country are and what are the conditions of trade and of manufacturing enterprises, and what the wants of the agricultural classes are—in fact, to master the situation as much as they possibly can, in order that they may formulate a tariff policy in accordance with the wants, desires and interests of the people.

It was said by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that there is commercial distress and business derangement in the country in consequence of this delay in bringing down the tariff. I deny the assertion in toto. There is of course, to some extent, business derangement in the country. There is a feeling of disquietude in business circles with regard to certain matters; but this derangement, this feeling of disquietude, has no connection whatever with the tariff issues. It proceeds from other causes. We have to the south of us a condition of things which reacts upon Canada. Nothing can affect the commercial interests of that country, without having its influence upon the commercial interests of this country, and it is in consequence of the state of trade in that country, it is in consequence of the unrest and the uncertainty that exists in that country to-day, as to the very foundation of all the financial operations in the United States as to what the basis of its circulating medium will be, that there is commercial distress and business derangement in Canada. I think it is safe to say that the manufacturers, the importers and the business classes generally of this country are, so far as this Government is concerned, in a hopeful mood. I believe that all these classes expect that this Government will do what is right. They expect that the Government will proceed cautiously, and that the measure the Government formulates will be of a character calculated to secure the best interests of the country. These classes understand perfectly well that the Government proposes to carefully examine the situation, to consider the interests of all, to avoid class legislation, and, so far as it possibly can to conserve the interests of every great business in Canada, whether manufacturing, commercial, agriculturing, mining or lumbering. This being the belief—and I think I am warranted in saying that this is the belief which exists among business men—the people of Canada intend to wait patiently until the Government has formulated its policy, entertaining the belief that that policy will be in the best interests of Canada, and I am confident that the people will not be disappointed in their expectations.

The hon. leader of the Government, in his speech the other night, gave the keynote of the policy of his Government, when he said, quoting the immortal words of the late President Lincoln, that this was intended to be a government of the people, by the people, for the people. The intention of the Government, he said, is to consult the interests of the people, and there is no element of the population that will be considered too insignificant to receive from the Government fair consideration. I do not suppose that my hon. friend from York desires to create a panic. I do not suppose that he desires to see a condition of things created here which would enable him to say: You see the results of Grit rule in this country: you see what condition of things results from putting these Grits into office. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman has any feeling of that kind; but I will say that, whether unintentionally or intentionally, his remarks were calculated to produce such a result; and, had he desired to produce a panic and throw the discredit on the present Government, he could not have adopted a line better calculated to produce that result, and, if his remarks do not produce that result, that simply proves that the people have too much sense to be misled by any such representations as the hon. gentleman made.

As to the character of his speech, it was rather a curious conglomeration. It reminded me of the story told of an individual who went to a restaurant in New York. The waiter asked him what he would have, and he said he would take a little of everything, and the waiter shouted down to the cook: "A plate of hash for one." The hon. gentleman's speech was a plate of hash, contain-

ing a little of everything. He went over a great deal of ground, and, so far as I could see, scarcely dealt with any issues now before the House. There is one point in the hon. gentleman's speech to which I feel bound to devote some attention. He made a set attack upon different members of the Government and other members on the Government side of the House, regarding their position upon the reciprocity question. He took particular pains to ring the changes upon the assertion that reciprocity with the United States meant discrimination against England. He was specially particular to impress upon the House that the adoption of this policy would be disloyal in the extreme, because it meant unjust, undue and disloyal discrimination against the mother land. Well, perhaps this charge, coming from the leading advocate of a policy that discriminates against England, coming from a leading advocate of a party whose aim is to exclude English goods from this country altogether, and, if not possible altogether, then to as great an extent as possible. I imagine that the formulating of such a charge of discrimination against England by a party which has been doing this for the last eighteen years, is slightly inconsistent. The hon. gentleman asserted that the truth of the charge had been admitted by the leader of the Government and the Minister of Trade and Commerce and other members of the Government, including myself.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it would be well, in considering this question, to look at it fairly. When the charge is brought against the party favourable to reciprocity of discrimination against England, it must not be forgotten that, in approaching the United States and asking for concessions, for trade modifications that must necessarily be made by that country if we do secure reciprocity, we are asking the United States to discriminate against other countries in our behalf. If we approach the United States with an offer of a reciprocity treaty, if we ask of the United States free admission into their markets for our natural products, free admission into their markets for such articles of manufacture as are placed on the list for mutual free exchange, we are asking for discrimination on the part of the Government of the United States against the world in our favour. There can be no doubt about that. And if a treaty is granted, the United States places us, so far as the different articles covered by the treaty are concerned, upon a vantage ground in a position where we have exceptional advantages, and are discriminated in favour of as against other countries having trade with the United States. And if it is true that we ask the United States to discriminate in our favour, certainly it is not unreasonable that the United States should ask us to discriminate in their favour to a corresponding extent; and if we decline to do this, why we are not ready and willing to make the reciprocal concessions upon our side for what we ask from them. We say to the people of that country: We ask you to admit the products of our farms, to admit the products of our forests, our mines and our fisheries free of duty; we ask you to do this for us, not for the world, but for us; we ask this special favour; we ask, to this extent, to be discriminated in favour of as against all other countries in the world with which you trade. And when the United States says: Very well, we will meet you upon that ground, and we ask you to discriminate in our favour to a certain extent that is to be agreed upon in the admission of a list of manufactures into your country, why it is simply a reciprocal discrimination that is asked for. Now, it is true that discrimination to the extent that may be absolutely necessary is, in my opinion, justifiable; and, in my opinion, it will be considered justifiable by the Colonial Office.

But, Sir, there is a large amount of misapprehension as well as of misrepresentation with regard to the question of discrimination. The truth is, Sir, that in agreeing upon a list of manufactured articles to be imported into this country from the United States free, it will not be necessary to discriminate against the English people to any considerable extent and it may not be necessary to discriminate against them to any appreciable extent even. I wish to draw attention to one peculiar feature of the trade between this country and the United States, and that between this country and England. I wish to point out that our dutiable imports from England are almost distinct in character from our dutiable imports from the United States. For instance, Sir, we imported last year of dutiable articles from the United States $25,795,000 worth. Now, there were 182 selected classes out of this list of which the importation from the United States was $14,716,000, and the importation from Great Britain of the same classes was $1,933,000. Or, if we extend the list and add 210 selected classes further, we find that of these we imported from the United States $21,796,000, and from England $3,094,000, or in this list embracing dutiable importations of $22,000,000 in round numbers, we imported from England but 14 per cent of the amount we imported from the United States. Now, if all these articles were placed upon the free list, our discrimination against England would amount to but 14 per cent of the total. But we can make a selection, Mr. Speaker, that will be even less objectionable than this. A great many of the minor articles that pay duty, we import almost exclusively from the United States; and I have a list in my hand which embraces articles to an extent fully as great, in my opinion, as it would be necessary to give in selecting

the list of manufactures for reciprocity, in which the discrimination against England would be practically nil. The importation from the United States of the articles on this list amounted to $5,390,000, while the importations of these articles from England amounted to $172,000, or 3½ per cent of the amount we imported from the United States. Now, if we were negotiating a treaty at Washington, and if we had agreed upon a list of manufactures for free mutual interchange made up of this list I hold in my hand, we would strike England's importations into this country to the extent of $170,000. This is a mere bagatelle. The English people would not oppose it, they would not even consider it. They would say: If this does you any good, go on without considering this paltry 3½ per cent that you import from England. This is the list:

Classification of certain manufactures, the importation of which from the United States exceeded the importation from Great Britain in 1895:

	United States.	Great Britain.
Bells and gongs	$ 17,003	$ 667
Carriages, drays, carts and wagons	40,101	645
Clocks	78,705	5,340
Cotton jeans	82,408	2,897
Yeast	84,162	.....
Electrical apparatus and motors	295,930	9,165
Carboys, flasks, bottles, insulators, lamps, chimneys, etc.	314,336	26,326
Boots and shoes, all kinds	307,100	18,084
Agricultural implements, all kinds	281,712	9,433
Locomotives	146,211	.....
Engines and boilers	30,000	133
Fittings of iron and steel pipe	49,281	1,967
Locks of all kinds	49,029	6,597
Threshers and separators	12,694	87
Sewing machines and parts of	110,287	1,564
Typewriters	44,468	67
Malleable iron castings	71,959	176
Pumps, steam and other	88,772	58
Stoves	36,080	703
Tubing, iron and steel, all kinds except boiler flues	346,473	15,398
Sole leather	127,024	3,737
Upper leather	164,313	12,963
Manufacturers' leather, waxed and glazed	292,122	11,652
Gas, oil and electric light fixtures	46,749	4,290
Pianos and parts of	160,179	2,400
Coal oil and products of	414,420	7
Cottonseed oil, crude and refined	149,825	.....
Lubricating oils	145,935	2,267
Spectacles, eyeglasses and frames	30,787	464
Wallpaper and borders	127,149	8,523
Printing presses and folders, etc.	134,430	1,338
Binder twine	123,315	39
Watches, cases and movements	219,585	4,317
Mfrs. of wood and veneers	330,919	15,910
Baking powder	86,863	48
Copper wire and manufactures of copper	$ 77,839	$ 4,610
Pearline and other soap powders	63,808	267
Glucose	51,599	10
Spirits of turpentine	156,469	25
	$5,390,051	$172,186

Proportion of the total of the above list imported from Great Britain, 3 1-10 per cent.

If we were to offer the United States that list as a compensation for the discrimination we ask them to make in our favour in the free admission of our natural products into their markets, England would not for a moment object, and that very list embraces a number of articles which I believe our own manufacturers can produce as cheaply, or more cheaply than they can be produced in the United States; and if such is the case the arrangement would simply open to them an extension of a market embracing seventy millions of people, in addition to the five million they now supply. I believe there would be a surprise in store for the people of this country and for the people of the United States if a free list for manufactured articles was arranged between the two countries, in the fact that Canada would be able to a large extent to avail herself of the reciprocal conditions and export largely in those lines. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is true, then the argument of my hon. friend from York about discrimination is simply a bogey; it is nothing more or less. The hon. gentleman has not examined into this question, he has not made himself aware of the fact that the importations from the United States into this country paying duty, are, as a rule, totally distinct in their nature from the importations coming to this country from England, and that the framing of a reciprocity tariff embracing an agreed list of manufactures, does not involve the necessity of discrimination against England. I assert that this is the case. When the Brown draft treaty was negotiated in 1874, that treaty placed upon the free list articles of natural produce sixty-one in number, the classifications embraced sixty-one kinds. It placed upon the list thirty-nine manufactured articles in the line of implements, and it placed upon the list thirty-nine classifications in the line of general manufactures. It was universally conceded that the Brown draft treaty would have been highly advantageous to Canada if we could have secured its ratification by the United States Senate; and I assert here to-day that the Brown draft treaty made greater concessions, in all human probability, in the line of placing manufactures upon the free list, than it would be necessary to make to-day. I assert that in all human probability a reciprocity treaty can be negotiated at Washington in the event of the McKinley party coming

into power, that will be more favourable to Canada as regards the free list of manufactures, than was the Brown draft treaty of 1874 which we were so anxious to obtain. There are many things we can offer to the United States. We concede freely to that country, of course, that the free admission of our natural products would be of great advantage to this country, and an advantage so great that it would be proper to make some concessions in other directions to compensate for it. And we have other things to offer. We have our fisheries. The opening of our fisheries to the United States would be a make-weight way of very great importance, and could be made to tell very greatly in our favour. Then we have the fact that we can partly compensate the United States for refraining from imposing a duty upon lumber, by refraining, on our part, from imposing an export duty upon logs. Sir, I am thoroughly impressed with the belief that if representatives of the Canadian Government go to Washington with a sincere desire to negotiate a reciprocity treaty upon lines mutually advantageous and mutually fair, such a treaty can be negotiated without difficulty, and upon lines that will be acceptable to the English Government, and acceptable to the people of Canada.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) in the course of his speech, charges various sins against members upon his side of the House. He says that in addition to being in favour of reciprocity, we have been in favour of commercial union, we have been in favour of continental free trade, we have been in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, and of straight reciprocity, and of free trade as they have it in England. I have not a list of all his grievances, but there are several more. Now, no doubt, when the question of reciprocity engaged the attention of our public men in Canada, as it did for a number of years, and when discussions were in order as to the proper methods of securing reciprocity in trade with the United States, many individual opinions were held and were expressed. I have no doubt that in the latitude that was allowable for the expression of opinion, many members of the Liberal party expressed opinions with regard to this matter that the party as a whole would never have accepted. I know that some expressed themselves in favour of commercial union, others in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, others in favour of a restricted measure of reciprocity. But whatever may have been the divergence of views existing among members of the party, whether prominent or not, a full discussion of the question and the presentation of those views were necessary in order to fuse the sentiment that existed in the party; and when that fusing of sentiment took place, we then came down to the basis upon which the party as a whole could agree. That basis was not commercial union, although many members of the party had advocated it; it was not unrestricted reciprocity, though many members of the party had advocated that; but the fusing of those sentiments and the basis agreed upon, was the palnk that exists in the Liberal platform adopted by the great Liberal convention at Ottawa, in June, 1893. And if any hon. gentleman on the Opposition side wants to know what the policy of the Liberal party is, let him turn, not to isolated expressions of sentiment prior to the adoption of that policy by the party, not to speeches made by individuals here and there, not to expressions of opinion which may have been wild or visionary, sound or unsound, and which were not accepted by the party, but let him turn to the policy formulated as the party's platform in its great convention and adopted, and upon which the party stands to-day. That is what any hon. gentleman should do; he should not deal with my sentiments prior to the adoption of that party platform, nor to the sentiments of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), nor even those of the leader of the party. Those sentiments have nothing to do with the case. Any remarks delivered at that time were only the expressions of opinion held by certain gentlemen, not the opinions accepted by the party, but we have now modified opinions adopted because those views were too visionary or too extreme. There was, of course, a great deal of discussion about this matter, and I am bound to say that so far as the views I presented, I have already declared that the party is not responsible for them and that I advocate them no longer, because the party has decided on a policy which does not go so far. Let me say that in considering this question as an abstract question, there were reasons to be urged in favour of all those phases that were presented. There were reasons to be urged in favour of commercial union.

Mr. MACLEAN. Was political union one of those phases?

Mr. CHARLTON. No. No one talked of political union except a few cranks, like the editor of a Sunday newspaper which is published in Toronto, by a man who talks about Yankees. The reasons urged by those who are in favour of commercial union, and it is only fair they should be placed before the House in order that the reasons presented may be understood, I will indicate. No man in Canada, I believe, advocated a scheme of commercial union where the tariff would not be arranged with our consent, where the tariff would not be arranged by the common consent of both countries. That was a sine qua non. No man advocated a system of commercial union or contemplated the possibility of effecting changes in a joint tariff without the concurrence of both parties to the arrangement. So the charge made that the policy was one favouring a tariff which

would be framed by the Yankees, or changed by the Yankees at their pleasure, was destitute of foundation. One of the other arguments advanced in favour of the scheme was that it would effect a large saving in expense by dispensing with the interior custom-houses. But the most potent point, and the one which had the greatest weight with those who favoured this policy, was that it would remove the revenue difficulty. That was a difficulty which stared us in the face in the case of negotiating a reciprocity treaty. Whatever goods may be placed on the free list there is that much reduction in the revenue, and the great argument in favour of commercial union was the fact that it would dispose of the revenue difficulty. How? The proposition was to have a common fund. The moneys collected in the custom-houses of both countries were to go into that fund. That fund would be distributed per capita, each nation drawing from the consolidated fund according to its population. If this scheme went into operation, and there were placed on the free list goods on which we had formerly collected $7,000,000 annually, and there were also placed on the free list goods on which the United States had collected an equal sum on those imports from Canada, we would lose, if we were shouldering the loss ourselves, $7,000,000, and the United States would, if shouldering the loss itself, lose $7,000,000; but under this arrangement the loss would be $14,000,000, taken from the whole population of both countries, and the United States would pay $13,000,000 out of the $14,000,000, and Canada $1,000,000; and the effect of this arrangement and readjustment would be the removal of the revenue difficulty and the saving of $6,000,000 to Canada. I must confess that at the time I looked favourably on this view of the case. That consideration alone had great weight with me. I recognized the difficulty confronting this country in placing a long list of articles on the free list and sacrificing a large amount of revenue, which would have to be made up in some other way; and I believed that if that arrangement could be obtained by which the United States would shoulder six-sevenths of our loss, it would be the best way of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. But these things are neither here nor there; these individual opinions expressed prior to the adoption of the party's platform have no bearing on the case whatever. Further than that individual members may be convinced that they were wrong, that they advocated some view not accepted by the party, these criticisms are useless; they do not compromise the position of the party and have nothing to do with its position or with the question as to whether the policy of the party on this subject is a prudent and judicious policy or not.

So much for that branch of the hon. gentleman's case. Then the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) proceeded to say: Of one thing now we are sure—this Government is in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, the hon. gentleman is not sure of that; the hon. gentleman if he makes that statement, is mistaken. This party is not advocating unrestricted reciprocity, quite the contrary; the party is advocating a reciprocity treaty, which will leave large discretion with the Government which advocates it and which will impose on the same Government the necessity of very carefully guarding the interests of Canada, and indeed every section of Canadian interests. It may be asked here: What kind of a treaty would the Liberal party, now that it is in power—I am only giving my individual opinion—be likely to seek to obtain if possible at Washington? My answer is that, in my opinion, the Liberal party would proceed as cautiously and carefully as may be, in the matter of making concessions; that we would insist to the full extent on the great value of what we have to offer, the enormous value of our fisheries, the value of our refraining from imposing an export duty, and various other advantages we have to offer. We could point out that the importations into the United States of our goods now paying duty was inconsiderable, and we would endeavour to secure reciprocity with as limited a list of manufactured articles on the free list as possible; and I assert in a general way, and as to what should govern the action of the party in this country, that we would never consent to negotiating or consummating a treaty with the United States that was not advantageous to Canada; and if it were found that the demands of the United States were too onerous, that their expectations as regards concessions to be made by this Dominion were too great, we would simply abandon the attempt, because unless the treaty were obtained upon terms advantageous to Canada and was thoroughly fair and reciprocal, I, for one, would hold that we should reject the treaty. I do not expect that we shall ever frame a treaty except one that will be satisfactory to the people and to the interests of this country. So much for this branch of the question.

Now, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) tells us that the leader of the Government is pledged to go to Washington. Well, Mr. Foster went once, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition went once, and I suppose in the light of their example it would not be a heinous sin for Mr. Laurier or a representative of the present Government to go also. I hope that if we ever send a representative to Washington, he will not find it necessary or convenient to leave that city on the day of his arrival, and that after the failure of his attempt, (if there should be a failure which I do not think there should be) we shall not find it necessary to make use of the good offices of the British Minister at Washing-

ton to implore the state department there, to have the kindness to grant our commissioners an interview.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) allow me to interrupt him for one moment to say, that there is not a word of truth in that statement. There is no foundation in truth for the statement. I was received in Washington in the most courteous manner possible by Mr. Blaine, and there was never any possible ground for any such statement as has been made now.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, of course I do not know that we could find in the official correspondence—in Mr. Blaine's return to the Senate, or in President Harrison's message transmitting Mr. Blaine's return to the Senate—I do not suppose we could find a reference made to that matter. There are a good many things that are matters of gossip in a city like Washington which you hear in diplomatic and congressional circles——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) should accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) unreservedly.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly, I am accepting it fully. I am just reminding the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), that it was a matter of common report in Washington by senators and representatives, that the British Minister felt deeply chagrined at the failure on the first occasion to secure an interview.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a word of truth in it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The manner in which President Harrison received, or rather, refused to receive the delegation, and the indignation of President Harrison at the confidence game played by the Canadian Government in making the United States a catspaw in the elections, and assuming to themselves the credit of being the Simon Pure advocates of reciprocity; all this was a matter of common report. It was stated that these things had made President Harrison most indignant and had produced a most unfavourable impression at Washington. I say, Sir, that it was the common talk in congressional circles that Sir Julian Pauncefote had used his influence with Mr. Blaine and with President Harrison to get these gentlemen—of course that is something my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) would not know anything about necessarily—to get these gentlemen to accord to the Canadian commissioners an interview. And the report—which my hon. friend apparently is perfectly ignorant of, whether true or false—the report amongst congressmen and senators in Washington was, that the result of Sir Julian Pauncefote's intercession and representations to the American Secretary of State, was the securing of that interview so barren of results, which took place in February, 1892.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me briefly to state just what took place?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that it is necessary. I have the statement of Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State, in my desk. All I am saying is, that the matter—which is not a matter of official correspondence—which was one of the incidents of this affair, or one of the episodes in the history of the Government with which my hon. friend was connected, was talked of in Washington, and was a matter of gossip in the corridors of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. I know myself that much indignation was felt in that city in regard to the management of the general elections of 1891 by the Conservative Government, in connection with the reciprocity matter.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will not be interrupted. I know that when Parliament was dissolved on February 3rd, 1891, and when the official reason was given for that dissolution in the "Empire" and in the Montreal "Gazette," which was that reciprocity negotiations were pending at Washington and that the Government dissolved Parliament because they were about to consummate a treaty, and because they did not desire to refer that treaty to a moribund House; I know, Sir, that when that declaration was made, five days after Secretary Blaine declared in a letter to Charles S. Baker, member of Congress from Rochester, that no negotiations whatever were pending, that the United States would never grant reciprocity upon the conditions that it was asserted this country was about to secure, that there was no foundation whatever for the assertion made by the Canadian Government as a reason for dissolution, and that the whole thing was utterly false.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say, that it had not been arranged between Mr. Blaine representing the government of the United States, and the Government of Canada, that on the 4th of March or on a particular day, a meeting was to be held between the representatives of Canada and the representatives of the United States for the purpose of considering the question of reciprocity?

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Bond of Newfoundland had been prosecuting negotiations with the state department at Washington with regard to a reciprocity treaty between that Island and the United States. The treaty was nearly consummated when the Canadian Government interposed, secured the intervention of the British Minister, and the setting aside of the negotiations, and the Cana-

dian Government expressed its desire to be made a party to any such convention or arrangement between Newfoundland and the United States. Now, Sir, Mr. Blaine, I presume made no objection to the reception of the Canadian delegate or the consideration of Canada's claim or desire for a reciprocity treaty in connection with Newfoundland.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. But such negotiations were not in progress. The point had not been reached when the Canadian commissioners and the British Minister, in conjunction with Mr. Bond of Newfoundland, had appeared upon the scene at Washington to negotiate a treaty which should embrace the interests of Newfoundland and Canada. The representations made in the press supporting the hon. gentleman's party, prior to the dissolution of the House in 1891, were evidently coached, and were designed, and were untruthful. We saw in the "Empire" and we saw in the "Gazette" in the month of December, intimation that reciprocity negotiations were in progress at Washington. It was these representations made in the Canadian press, that attracted the attention of Charles S. Baker, member of Congress for Rochester, and which led Mr. Baker to address this letter to Secretary Blaine:

Washington, D.C., 29th Jan., 1891.

Hon. James G. Blaine,
Secretary of State.

My dear Mr. Blaine,—

It is reported in the newspapers of Canada and along the northern border of my state, where my constituents are deeply interested in the subject, that negotiations are going on between this country and Great Britain with a view of partial reciprocity with Canada, including natural products only and not manufactures, and it is stated that Sir Charles Tupper is on his way here as commissioner to negotiate for such modification to our tariff. I would be very glad if you would enable me to answer my constituents.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd.) CHAS. S. BAKER.

Now, this letter from Mr. Baker had been called forth by the fact that Mr. Baker had noted these representations in the Canadian Tory press which led him to believe that possibly there might be some truth in it, that possibly negotiations might be in progress upon the basis mentioned; and believing and fearing that this was the case, Mr. Baker, representing a border constituency resting upon Lake Ontario, naturally felt anxious to know whether this statement was true, and in order to ascertain definitely the truth or falsehood of the statement he applied to the Secretary of State of the United States from whom he could get an authoritative answer. Now, what did Mr. Blaine reply? His reply was as follows:—

Washington, D.C., 29th Jan., 1891.

My dear Mr. Baker,—

I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on fcot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper's coming to Washington.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd.) JAMES G. BLAINE.

That is the reply of the American Secretary of State to the inquiry of Mr. Baker, an American congressman, made on the 29th day of January, 1891; and on the 3rd day of February, five days later, the Parliament of Canada was dissolved for the reason assigned, that the Government were negotiating a reciprocity treaty at Washington, that the consummation of the treaty was in sight, and that they did not desire to refer that treaty to a moribund House, but wanted a Parliament fresh from the people. Well, the House can decide for itself as to the character of these tactics. The House can decide for itself as to the truth of the statement that reciprocity negotiations were in progress; but my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition may come into collision on a question of veracity with the Hon. James G. Blaine, the American Secretary of State, who denied that negotiations were in progress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not the slightest in the world.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, our friends went to Washington.

Mr. MACLEAN. So did you.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, so did I, and I came back with something tangible, and our friends did not. The only trade concession we secured from the United States was free lumber. The Government gladly accepted it, and we have it yet; and, if I went to Washington and obtained that, I would rather have my record than the record of the hon. gentleman. Well, I must do our friends on the opposite side the credit of having managed matters with great astuteness and skill during the time they have been dealing with this question of trade with the United States. They have deceived or at least misled the people of this country time and again. They misled the people in 1891. Their success in that election was due, not to the National Policy, not to their general policy, but to the fact that they induced the people of Canada to believe that they were about to secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States.

In addition to the course they have pursued in this matter, they have amused the people very skilfully in various ways with proposals, which they asserted would give good substitutes for reciprocity with the United States. Among other things, they have always been harping upon the great advantages to be derived from trade with Australia, British Africa, and the West Indies, from Imperial Federation, and from differential duties between different parts

of the Empire. All these schemes have been used by hon. gentlemen, who now, for the good of the country, are sitting in Opposition, where the good of the country will require them to sit long; and in these ways the people have been diverted from a true knowledge of the position of affairs.

Mr. McNEILL. The true thing would be political annexation with the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, not at all.

Mr. McNEILL. It would suit you.

Mr. CHARLTON. This country does not want annexation with the United States.

Mr. MACLEAN. You want it.

Mr. CHARLTON. This country wants one thing—it wants a lot of cranks to come down to a position where they can give credit to men who are just as loyal as themselves. Now, if my hon. friend with the bee of Imperial Federation in his bonnet will allow me to proceed, it will be well enough to look at the magnitude of this trade which was offered to the country as a substitute for the advantages of reciprocal trade with the United States. In 1895 our exports of animals and their products to the West Indies were $75,487; to Australia they were $5; to British Africa they lacked ten mills of being one cent, and to the United States they were $3,713,000. The agricultural exports of this country for the same period were: to the British West Indies, $267,389; to Australia, $5,804; to British Africa, the same as the exports of animals and their products, nothing, and to the United States, $3,710,000. This paltry and miserable little fragment of trade, promoted by large subsidies to steamship lines, was offered as a substitute for the market of 70,000,000 people right at our doors, the magnitude of which is indicated by their immense internal commerce, in which we could share, if this Government would seek, by means of a reciprocity treaty, to obtain it.

The next question I shall answer is, why should the Liberal leader desire to go to Washington? What reason has he for going? What justification can he offer to the country for doing what I acknowledge the hon. member for York is right in asserting he intends to do—going to Washington to seek for a reciprocity treaty; and, perhaps, before I enter upon this branch of the subject, you would be kind enough to call it Six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

THE MATHER BRIDGE AND POWER COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 14,

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not intend to offer any opposition to this Bill, but I wish to suggest an amendment to the fourteenth clause, which, I think, will meet with the approval of the promoter of the Bill. The probability is that the work, the authority for erecting which is asked, will at first be confined to the erection of two piers—one at the Canadian shore and one at 150 to 200 feet into the river from that shore, for the purpose of an under undershot wheel. This undershot wheel will be chiefly dangerous to small boats, and I wish to suggest that the company be required to place a glance boom there to guard against loss of life. I suggest this amendment to section 14:

> And the company shall maintain a glance boom of timber from the shore 300 feet above the west shore pier to the second pier from the Canadian shore.

It will be comparatively inexpensive, and this provision would reconcile me to the passage of the Bill.

Mr. LOUNT. There is a clause in the Bill providing that the Governor General in Council may make provisions for all matters of that kind. I have no objection to this amendment, but it seems to me that the Governor General in Council will be able to deal with it in the interests of the public.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The judgment of the committee was to leave it to the Governor General in Council entirely to guard the rights of navigation in that particular part of the river. This amendment will take away the power of the Governor General in Council for this particular purpose.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; this merely provides as to the immediate construction.

Mr. McCREARY. Is the hon. gentleman sure that this dam will not obstruct a considerable part of the shore on the Canadian side? I should think it would be an impediment rather than a help, besides the Governor General in Council are to have control of these matters by this Bill, and they ought to be left to them.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the proposition that the Governor General in Council should attend to all the details is not the proper course for Parliament to take. The Governor in Council, when these matters are carefully threshed out in the Railway Committee, and still further investigated by Parliament, would naturally conclude that all the safeguards considered necessary have been thrown around this charter. They will, therefore, perform any further duties in a very perfunctory manner. I think it is of the utmost importance that this committee should provide, after we have investigated—and we have investigated very

closely—by specific enactments what we propose that company shall do and the safeguards that shall be thrown around for the protection of the interests of the people and the navigation as well. It has been proved before the Committee of Railways that this bridge—I do not suppose we should call it a bridge, because, although the charter asked for a bridge, it has now become apparent that it is not for a bridge at all; but for the purpose of taking advantage of the water power there and having a valuable water power franchise transferred to the company they, in the first place, proposed to build a bridge, and now it is not proposed to build a bridge at all. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this clause, as proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), should be incorporated in the Bill and that we should have other precautionary clauses in the Bill too, in order to give proper assurance that the interests of the people are protected and that the company will be compelled to pay a proper amount of compensation to the people of Canada for the transfer of such a valuable franchise.

Mr. TISDALE. As to the safeguards which we are discussing, I have just appealed to the hon. member for North Norfolk, who moved this——

Mr. FRASER. He has withdrawn it.

Mr. TISDALE. Has the hon. gentleman withdrawn it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no objection; it is in the hands of the committee.

Amendment withdrawn. Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 15) amalgamating the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company under the name of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 28) to revive and amend the Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Edwards.)

SUPPLY—TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, a few moments before recess, reference was made to the reciprocity negotiations, or rather to the lack of reciprocity negotiations at Washington, and I wish to refer to that question again for a moment before proceeding to discuss the reasons that I think may warrant the leader of the Government in attempting to re-open those negotiations and to send representatives of the Canadian Government to Washington again. I made the statement that prominent members of the Government had represented on the stump and prior to the dissolution of Parliament in 1891, that reciprocity negotiations were in progress and that the consummation of a reciprocity treaty was in the highest degree probable, so probable, indeed, that it was necessary in the estimation of the Government to dissolve Parliament, to hold an election, and to summon a Parliament fresh from the people to deal with this reciprocity treaty about to be consummated, and not to leave the consideration of that important measure to a moribund House. I find in an extract from a speech made by the Hon. Sir John Thompson in Toronto, on the 7th February, four days after the dissolution of Parliament, this statement, after he had been dealing with the question of negotiations between the United States and Newfoundland:

> We indicated at the same time that the proposed treaty with regard to Newfoundland did not seem to be upon lines so extensive as would suit the wants and interests of Canada, and that it might be better to avail ourselves at the same time of entering upon separate negotiations on behalf of Canada. Well, Sir, that intimation was promptly conveyed by Her Majesty's Government to Washington, and the answer made by Mr. Blaine was an overture with regard to reciprocity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will see what Mr. Blaine says about this matter. Mr. Blaine had had his attention called, probably, to the statement made by Sir John Thompson, and to similar statements made by leading politicians and members of the Government, and the matter was deemed by Mr. Blaine of sufficient importance to warrant him in sending a communication to the British Minister at Washington in regard to it. I have here the communication sent by Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote, on the 1st day of April following the election held in Canada. The letter is somewhat long, and I do not know that I will trouble the House with the whole of it, unless it is required. Mr. Blaine refers to the fact that a copy of a basis of negotiations was placed in his hands by Sir Julian on the 22nd December, and he says:

> You told me, if my memory is not in error, that you were instructed by Lord Salisbury to propose topics to the United States for discussion and, if possible, for agreement.

The overture, it would seem from this, did not come from Mr. Blaine but came from the British Minister.

> I answered that I felt sure that the President would be unwilling to appoint a commission to consider the propositions as they were stated, and, furthermore, that I should be unwilling to submit them to the President.

After some further conversation, in which you repeated that the propositions were merely the basis upon which a discussion might be instituted, I replied that in any event I had not a moment to give to the subject until after the adjournment of Congress in March, but that after that date I would be willing to respond to your request "to have a full but private conference with the British Minister and one or more agents from Canada, and go over every point of difference, and consider every subject upon which a mutual interest could be founded."

This was an overture, not from Mr. Blaine, but from the British Government, through the British Minister. Mr. Blaine continues:

If an agreement is reached, all well; if not, no official mention is to be made of the effort.

"Above all things, it is important to avoid public reference to the matter.

"This the President will insist upon."

While no notes were exchanged between us I carefully minuted my modification of the paper you left with me containing Lord Salisbury's proposition, and did so immediately after you left the department. You will observe the private character which I wished to impart to the conference is recognized by you a month later in your note of 27th January, when you called the correspondence "confidential."

In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us——

Not a proposition from Mr. Blaine, but Sir Julian Pauncefote had come to the State Department with the proposal, and the subject was then for the first time mentioned between them.

—and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my minute. I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

Now, is that correct? If it is not, the leader of the Opposition will inform me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The language in the paper was that I insisted that the negotiations originated with the United States. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I was not in the country at the date at which this took place. When I arrived in Canada, if I remember aright, the dissolution had taken place, and the election was going on; therefore, I could be no party to anything that had occurred, nor was I informed of what had occurred up to that time. The hon. gentleman seems to attach great importance to the word "overture," but Sir John Thompson seems to have correctly stated, as read by the hon. gentleman, that the proposed arrangement with Newfoundland was of a reciprocal trade character, to which Canada objected. That is quite right, and Canada had requested to be allowed to take part, if that negotiation went on, and to present her views. That was assented to by the United States, and Mr. Blaine, speaking on behalf of the United States, appears to have said that he would be prepared to take that question up with Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, and a gentleman named by Canada to assist in those negotiations, some time, I think, after the 4th of March. That was the position. As I say, I had no knowledge of what the previous correspondence had been, but I do not think I stated at any time that this matter was initiated by the United States. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State, seems, by the communication, to have attached great importance to the fact that he had not initiated the negotiations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was quite right in that.

Mr. CHARLTON. And he also states in that letter that he had seen with surprise the statements made with regard to this matter by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, and I have quoted a statement made in the same line by Sir John Thompson. The memory of the leader of the Opposition seems to be somewhat at fault. I am aware he was not in the country during all these transactions. He was, however, in Washington, I think, on the 11th April, 1891, for in a letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote his attention was called to it, and he makes reference in that letter to an official communication, which is found in the Sessional Papers for 1891, vol. 24, No. 38, page 67. In this communication he said:

I told Mr. Blaine in reference to these charges that I wished at the outset to recognize the accuracy of the statements contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote and which I had sent in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding the reciprocity arrangements between the two countries.

He acknowledges in the communication to Sir John A. Macdonald that the statement made by Mr. Blaine in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote was correct: and if that statement was correct, then Mr. James G. Blaine, who stated that this assertion had been made by my hon. friend and by Sir John A. Macdonald, was correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me, as this is a matter of some importance, to state my recollection of what occurred. I was commissioned by His Excellency the Governor General and by the Canadian Government to go to Washington on this mission. I went to Sir Julian Pauncefote, who very kindly invited me to stay at his house during my residence there. Sir Julian wrote a note to Mr. Blaine to say I had arrived and would be glad to know when it would be convenient to receive me. Sir Julian received an immediate answer from Mr. Blaine to say he would be most happy to receive us at eleven or twelve o'clock that day, and he

mentioned incidentally, if my memory serves me, that the proceedings had not been initiated by him, but by the Government of Canada, and, as is correctly stated there, that is my judgment. That was the letter to which I was referring, for at that time I had no knowledge of the letter referred to signed by Mr. Blaine. I was referring to the letter in which he stated that he was entirely ready to receive me; and I was received accordingly. Mr. Blaine at once accepted my statement as to the accuracy of his statement that he had not initiated the proceedings, because, as Sir John Thompson detailed in that speech, the initiation was made by Canada, and not by Mr. Blaine. I may say that Mr. Blaine, then and there fixed a time at which he would be prepared to take up with myself and my colleagues who would join me on the mission, the consideration of this question. The day was fixed, I think the following Monday. On that day, if my memory serves me, Sir John Thompson, the then Finance Minister, Mr. Foster, and myself waited on Mr. Blaine, who had in the meantime sent a telegram to Ottawa, which passed us on the road, informing us that he deeply regretted to find that the President, who was most anxious to be in Washington at the time of the negotiations, could not be there at that time, and he would be exceedingly glad if the meeting could be postponed until October. This communication had passed us, as I have stated. Mr. Blaine made this explanation, and the adjournment of the proceedings took place accordingly. That, so far as I can remember, is the exact position of the whole affair.

Mr. CHARLTON. There seems to be, although there may not be, a conflict with respect to dates. This letter is dated 1st April. It seems the commissioners arrived on the 11th April and left Washington on that day, and whatever there may be said with respect to that matter, the salient points here are that the members of the Canadian Government in 1891 asserted, and led the people of Canada to believe, that at the suggestion of Mr. Blaine reciprocity negotiations were in progress, that Mr. Blaine had made overtures leading up to reciprocity, that the United States were initiating proceedings with respect to this question. The position I take is that such statement was incorrect; that the people of Canada were deceived, that the reasons assigned for the dissolution on 3rd February were not valid, that no reciprocity negotiations were in progress, that no immediate confirmation of the report that reciprocity negotiations were in progress could then be given, or has since been given and that there was no prospect that the House would be called on to pass upon a reciprocity treaty, whether the Parliament was fresh from the people or whether it was a moribund Parliament, that the whole thing was a political game of deception, which saved the Government and gave them a majority. If this question had been dealt with fairly, if the Government had not attempted to make the people think they were acting in a way they were not acting, if they had not made those assertions and representations, the result of the elections of 1891 would have been different from the results that were achieved. So much for this question.

Now, Sir, we have arrived at a point where we are confronted with this question again. The Government of 1891 did not deny that reciprocity would be advantageous to Canada; they recognized the demand on the part of the people, that an attempt to negotiate a treaty should be made at Washington. They played on the susceptibility and credulity of the people by representing that they were taking that action in furtherance of the public interest by seeking to obtain a reciprocity treaty while in reality they were making no such attempt, and the professed desire to have a House fresh from the people, rather than a moribund House, to deal with this question was a deception. These are facts beyond controversy. I do not ask the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Charles Tupper) to vindicate his course or approve the conduct of the Government at that time, but I compliment him on the great success of the unscrupulous policy adopted, although I can say very little with regard to its honesty. We are confronted, I say, with the same question again. A new Government is in power: this Government has to look after the interests of the people of Canada, and the question which confronts this Government is this: shall a new attempt be made to secure that great boon which the late Government pretended to wish to secure? Shall that attempt be insincere and a mere political dodge, or shall a truthful, honest and sincere attempt be put forward to secure reciprocity, with the determination of using every proper effort to obtain it? The Government of Canada has decided that this is a matter of sufficient importance to engage their attention. They have decided in the interest of the people of the country, to make an earnest and honest effort to obtain such a treaty, and if that earnest and honest effort fails, if we cannot obtain an advantageous treaty, if we cannot obtain a treaty that is truly reciprocal, if we have to give too much for the privilege of entering the American market, the Government will then have done its duty, and can go no further, and they will refuse to accept any treaty that will not be advantageous, or, at least, they should do so. So it is reasonable to inquire, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has dealt with the question so fully, and made it so prominent a part of his address delivered yesterday, whether in reality there are sufficient reasons for the course which the Government propose to pursue in regard to this matter. Is the attainment of a reciprocity treaty a

matter of importance, or is it a trifling matter, one of the minor issues that confront the Government? I claim it is a matter of importance. I claim that no other issue will confront the Government exceeding in importance this one regarding the attaining of better trade relations with the United States of America.

We are not under the necessity of theorizing as to what the probable result of such a treaty will be; we have had experience drawn from the results of a reciprocity treaty with that country extended over a period of twelve years, from 1854 to 1866. Those hon. members who have examined the trade relations of the two countries during that period, know that the influence of the treaty on Canada was a most salutary one. The truth is that our exports to the United States during the continuance of the treaty increased nearly 400 per cent. For the first year of the treaty our exports were of the value of $10,500,000; in 1886 they were of the value of $39,950,000. If the result of that treaty was to quadruple our trade with the United States in the brief period of twelve years, unquestionably no further proof is necessary to show that the operation of the treaty was a beneficial one. When that treaty was abrogated, when the policy of repression was resumed and the United States again imposed duties, our trade was brought to a standstill, and our exports in 1895 were but of the value of $41,297,000, being $1,347,000 more than twenty-nine years previous, or an increase during those twenty-nine years of 3½ per cent, while under reciprocity our exports increased during the twelve years nearly 400 per cent. These few facts laid before the people are sufficient to prove to any candid mind that reciprocity is desirable. Many facts may be cited to illustrate the deleterious influence of duties on trade between the two countries. From 1866 a repressive policy was pursued by the United States. In 1890 the character of that policy was intensified by the McKinley Bill, and, to show the particular influence of the intensification of a repressive policy, I have but to quote the figures showing the exports to the United States of certain leading articles for the year before the McKinley Bill went into operation and last year. The figures are as follows, as regards the articles of cattle, sheep, poultry, eggs, fruit, potatoes, malt, horses. The value of these exports in 1890 was $9,572,205; in 1895, $1,911,362. If we omit horses, the exports in 1890 were of the value of $7,684,895, as compared with $1,400,597 last year. The particulars are as follows:—

EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Horned cattle	$ 104,623	$ 19,216
Sheep	761,565	346,746
Poultry	105,612	36,574
Eggs	1,793,104	275,827
Barley	4,582,661	706,586
Split peas	74,205	5,616
Rye	113,320	5,493
Malt	149,310	4,470
Horses	1,887,895	510,765
	$9,572,205	$1,911,362
Without horses	1,887,895	510,765
	$7,684,310	$1,400,597

Unquestionably, Sir, the present burdens on trade are undesirable and not in the interest of Canada. I have here a list of the duties levied under the Wilson Bill:

UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL DUTIES.

Horses	20 per cent.
Cattle	20 "
Sheep	20 "
Poultry, alive	2 cts. per lb.
Poultry, dressed	3 "
Fresh meats	20 cts. per lb.
Butter	4 "
Cheese	4 "
Rye	20 per cent.
Wheat	20 "
Oats	20 "
Buckwheat	20 "
Rye wheat flour	20 "
Oatmeal	15 "
Barley	30 "
Malt	40 "
Beans	20 "
Onions	20 cts. per bush.
Peas	20 "
Split peas	50 "
Apples	20 per cent.
Potatoes	15 cts. per bush.
Eggs	3 cts. per doz.
Honey	10 cts. per gall.
Hops	8 cts. per lb.
Hay	$2 per ton.
Straw	15 per cent.

Those duties, under the conditions of trade that exist between the two countries, diminished the prices received by the Canadian farmers to the extent of the duties, and the boon that would be conferred on the agricultural interest of Canada would be great indeed, if those duties were removed. The natural tendency between these two countries is to have an enormous trade. The two countries lie side by side, across the continent. The barriers that separate these two countries, the lakes and rivers, are means of communication that invite intercommunication and trade, and our list of exports to the United States, which is already large, would be vastly increased, if those trade restrictions were removed, and the leader of the Liberal party realizes full well how great is the importance of removing those restrictions. It is often stated by hon: gentlemen opposite that the markets of the United States are really of no very great importance to us; that our trade with that country is inconsiderable, that it does not matter in regard to that trade whether we have free trade or not. If we compare the volume of the trade between Canada and the United States the amount of exports to that country in certain lines, in excess of our exports of the same articles to all the rest of the world, this view of the

case will illustrate the great importance of this trade. I have in my hand a table which shows the extent of our exports to the United States, in excess of our exports to Great Britain, and in excess of our exports to Great Britain and all the rest of the world in the lines covered by it, which table is a very suggestive one, and is as follows :—

Exports the Produce of Canada.

	United States.	Great Britain.	Other Countries.*
Product of mines	$ 6,271,397	$ 606,935	$ 711,830
do forest	12,482,969	10,295,995	11,408,197
Fresh fish and products of fisheries	1,361,638	....	18,782

*Exclusive of U.S., but including G.B.

Animals and their Products.

Lambs	$ 233,979	$17,712	$18,531
Poultry	36,574	5,021	9,274
Swine	4,666	1,280	2,866
Bones	66,013	100	100
Furs, dressed	14,168	6,182	6,442
Glue stock	2,929	696	711
Hair	22,476	4,860	4,876
Hides	868,062	12,000	14,790
Horns and hoofs	7,639	624	778
Mutton	3,526	....	2,147
Poultry and game, N.E.S.	11,167	1,824	8,924
Sheep pelts	69,998	....	....
Tallow	19,978	....	4,039
Wool	1,046,726	2,091	2,733
Total	$2,407,931	$52,390	$76,211

Agricultural Products.

Balsam	$ 13,815	$ 2,609	$ 2,609
Flax	99,526	52,041	52,041
Berries	107,331	219	487
Barley	706,586	11,961	12,132
Beans	422,521	....	2,762
Hay	979,914	492,683	559,779
Maple sugar	8,082	958	958
Straw	17,207	65	162
Tobacco leaf	3,648	496	496
Trees, plants and shrubs	7,732	90	620
Vegetables	103,599	31	14,852
Other articles	48,209	4	334
Total	$2,518,170	$561,157	$647,170

Summary of classification of articles in preceding lists :—

	United States.	Great Britain.	Other Countries.*
Product of mines	$ 6,271,397	$ 606,939	$ 711,830
do forest	12,482,969	10,295,995	11,408,197
Fresh fish and products of fisheries	1,361,638	....	18,782
Animals and their products	2,407,931	52,390	76,211
Products of agriculture	2,518,170	561,157	647,170
Total	$25,042,105	$11,516,481	$12,862,190

*Exclusive of U.S., but including G.B.

When these figures are summarized, we find that the aggregate value of the export of these articles to the United States was $25,000,000, to England $11,516,000, and to all the world, including Great Britain, $12,862,000, or, in these articles our exports to the United States were more than twice as great as our exports to all the rest of the world. Remember, Sir, this trade with the United States is secured under the operation of high duties which were intended to operate as a bar to trade at all. If we are exporting to the United States in various lines $25,000,000 worth, and to all the rest of the world a little over $12,000,000, does it not suggest to a person conversant with business that the removal of the fetters upon trade would have the effect of vastly increasing the volume of trade between Canada and the United States, and would be productive of excellent results so far as Canada is concerned ?

Now, the Liberal party have a desire to increase the volume of this trade, and they have that desire for the reason that they believe it would be conducive to the interests of Canada to do so. We have besides the articles which we export, many lines in which a vast business might be built up and in which scarcely any business at all is done at the present time. Take, for instance, the article of iron ore. One-third of the trade of the upper lakes is in iron ore, and on an average over 8,000,000 tons of iron ore are transported from the mines of the Lake Superior region to Lake Erie to be smelted in the furnaces in that section. We scarcely participate in that trade at all now. We have the iron mines. We have in the disputed territory which fell to the share of Ontario probably a finer iron supply than is to be found in Michigan and Minnesota, and yet our export of iron ore last year to the States was the paltry amount of 4,729 tons, and 2,414 tons of that was chromic iron ore. The value of that trade in the lake region is over 8,000,000 tons a year, equal to at least $30,000,000. With duties removed from iron ore, there is no reason why we should not share it with them. There is no reason why, out of that 8,000,000 tons of iron, we might not supply three or four million tons, and yet at the present day we have practically no trade in that line at all. Then, with regard to structural material, $25,000,000 worth of quarry products are used in the States annually, and yet we furnish of that supply only $44,502 worth. We have on the shores of our great lakes, and especially on the north shore of Lake Superior, quarries of all kinds ; unlimited quantities of freestone, granite, sandstone and marble, right alongside the deep water where the products of these quarries could be loaded on vessels and transported to Chicago, Milwaukee and Cleveland, and to Buffalo, to be there transhipped and sent by the Erie Canal to New York. In that alone we could build up a trade of millions of dollars. And nearly the entire amount of the value

of the trade in these two lines—iron ore and quarry products—would be represented in labour and in farmers' supplies to keep that labour. Nothing could be imagined which would add more greatly to the prosperity of this country than to secure an arrangement by which 4,000,000 tons of our iron ore and a corresponding amount of our structural materials would be sent to the United States. We scarcely appreciate that we have these opportunities in our grasp. We do not know to what extent our resources might be developed, and our wealth and prosperity increased.

There is one leading business interest of Canada that has felt the beneficial effects of free trade; I refer to the lumber interest. The duty on lumber was removed when the Wilson Bill went into operation in August, 1894. Almost immediately afterwards came a depression in the lumber trade of the United States; and if the lumber interest of Canada had continued to pay a duty of $2 a thousand on the lumber exported to the United States in the latter part of 1894, in 1895, and during the season of 1896, every practical lumberman will tell you that the effect would have been simply ruinous. The lumber interest of Canada has been saved from ruin by the removal of the American duties on lumber under the Wilson Bill, and the full effect of the removal of those duties will be felt by Canadian lumbermen when the time comes for a revival of the lumber trade in the United States, and when the business is again on a prosperous basis.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that our farmers do not need reciprocity, that they are as prosperous as the farmers of the United States, and will gain nothing by access to the American market. Away out in central Illinois, 150 miles from Chicago, the ordinary price of farms is $100 per acre. Across the Mississippi, throughout the state of Iowa the ordinary price of farms is from $50 to $75 per acre. The fact that our population is leaving us, and that those who leave us do not return, militates considerably against the doctrine that the American farmer is no more prosperous than ours, and that our farmer has nothing to gain by free access to that market, where there are 6,000,000 people in the centres of population within easy reach of the farmers of Ontario and Quebec. The census revelations do not agree with the statement made by our hon. friends. The census revelations contradict the statement that this country has been prosperous under the policy which our hon. friends have pursued. In the decade from 1871 to 1881 we had an increase of population amounting to 18·97 per cent while in the decade from 1881 to 1891 we had an increase of only 11·76 per cent. This is not a satisfactory increase of population, especially under the circumstances, as we had been at the same time receiving large numbers of immigrants. The census returns of the United States show that from 1790 to 1850, when the conditions of that country were similar to our own, with an ample supply of public lands and ample room, and when it was an easy matter to obtain farms—that during that period of sixty years the increase in population in the United States for each decade averaged 31·5, exclusive of immigration; and we had an increase in the last decade of only 11·76 per cent. If we had retained our native population, increased by the excess of the birth rate over the death rate, the natural increase in Canada would be 25 per cent in each decade; and if this is a correct basis on which to make the calculation, our census returns for 1891 should have shown this. We started in 1881 with a population 4,324,000. A 25 per cent increase for ten years, representing the excess of the birth rate over the death rate, would have given us an addition of 1,131,000 souls. We received 915,000 immigrant settlers from 1881 to 1890 inclusive. Adding these figures together, we should have had in 1891 a population of 6,370,000. We had, in fact, a population of 4,833,000. We fell 1,537,000 short of the number we should have had with a natural increase of 25 per cent for the ten years and the retention of the immigrant settlers who came to our shores. And yet gentlemen will stand up in the face of this astounding revelation and contend that the condition of business in this country is satisfactory, that the country is prosperous, that we have been blessed with a policy better than the one the Liberal party propose to substitute for it, that the condition of things cannot be improved. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is a stupendous piece of cheek to assert anything of the kind. The census returns are unanswerable. They show that something is wrong, that something needs to be done, that the old policy is an utter, blank failure, and that it is time something else should be tried; and these men who cling to the old policy, who retail the old platitudes about the National Policy and about protection are trifling with the people. They are clinging to the old discarded, worn-out, senseless policy which had inflicted on this country nameless evils during the last eighteen years.

Now, the leaders of the Liberal party, I think I may say, realize the propriety, the necessity, of striving to secure for this country prosperity. Canada is a vast country, a country with vast resources, as fine a country as is found in the world, stretching from ocean to ocean, with room for fifty million people, with prairies unsettled and uncultivated, with mineral resources undeveloped, with timber resources undeveloped. With all these potential resources which are awaiting development, this country ought to be increasing more rapidly in population than any other country on the face of the globe. The United States is further advanced towards the limit of its

growth ; its public lands are well nigh exhausted ; there is a plethora of people in its centres of population. Canada possesses millions of acres of unoccupied lands ; and yet in the decade from 1881 to 1891 it presents the beggarly return of less than 12 per cent increase of population, with 915,000 immigrants landing during that time, or 400,000 more immigrants than the total increase of population—such a blank and utter failure that any man with a sense of decency ought to hide his head before he attempts to justify the policy under which these results have been obtained.

There is another consideration in connection with the policy which the Liberal party proposes to inaugurate which is by no means the least important of the numerous reasons for seeking to secure more extended trade relations with the American people. That consideration is the probable effect that the inauguration of this policy would have on international relations between Great Britain and the United States. Every man must realize the great importance of having these two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family living together on terms of peace and unity. Every man must realize how great would be the gain to humanity if these two great nations would act in concert. If these two nations, Mr. Speaker, were to act in concert, that dismal, horrible record of murder and rapine and rape, and every imaginable and nameless horror that has been enacted by Turk and by Kurd upon the Christian population of Armenia, would not have been permitted to continue to blot the annals of civilization. But the two nations cannot unite. Jealousies and mutual distrusts keep them apart, and so the Turk plunders and murders at pleasure, and the unhappy Armenians are harried by these demons month after month. And if Canada could be instrumental in bringing about relations between these two countries that might lead to concerted action, would that not be something worthy of the ambition of the public men of Canada ? Is not that something that every good citizen of Canada should pray for and hope for ? And where, as a rule, do the difficulties that lead to friction and trouble between these two great nations originate ? Almost invariably in Canada. If we can arrange our relation with the United States so as to live on good terms, on terms of amity and friendship, with these people, the potency of that fact in the relations that may be established and continued between the two great nations themselves can be scarcely over-estimated. This branch of the subject should present sufficient incentive to the leader of the Government of Canada to make the utmost effort to secure the consummation of such a treaty as we hope for, with the great republic to the south. I do not know that I have anything more to say on the reciprocity branch of this subject.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) last night entered into a general disquisition of many matters. He covered almost all branches of public questions, whether pertaining to the probable future tariff policy of the Government or not. He gave us something about protection, competition, economic conditions, capital, raw material, labour and wages. He made one almost dizzy by the many divergencies in the course of his speech. He went over the commercial, financial and political world, and laid before us the stale remnants of a hundred speeches made on the stump and asked us to feast on them.

The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, pointed us to the United States. It is disloyal on this side to illustrate anything by reference to the United States, but it is the privilege of the hon. gentleman to do it. He said that the United States came to their present proud position through protection. These were his exact words. Now, I do not know that my hon. friend is aware that the golden age in the fiscal history of the United States was that period between the years 1846 and 1861, which was a revenue tariff period. During that period, the progress in manufactures was so rapid, the increase in the wealth and population of the country was so rapid, that the foundations of the future prosperity were being laid broadly and securely, and at no period was the United States so happy and prosperous as during that revenue tariff period. It is true the United States, as it exists to-day, has been built up by protection. But what is the result ? Why, we find there monopolies upon the most gigantic scale that ever existed in the world. We find trusts and combines, we find that the business of the United States is controlled by these trusts, we find that one-half the property in the United States is owned by 25,000 men, and that one-fourth of the property in that country is owned by 500 men. We find that the result of protection has been to create vast fortunes and those inequalities in the conditions of the citizens of that country, which have led to the condition of things in which they are. What is the condition of things there ? The Populist party, the Socialist party, the Anarchist party, the Free Silver repudiation party—all these discordant, unwholesome, dangerous elements called into existence by inequality created by the system of protection. These enormous fortunes, this inequality of conditions has thrown influence and power in the United States into the hands of very few men. The Senate has become a club of millionaires, the Supreme Court is accused of having annulled the income law two years ago because it was controlled by men who would have to pay the income tax, that country is drifting on to serious difficulties which must be settled within the near future, and that result has been produced by a policy of extremely high protection. We do not want to copy that policy,

we do not want to place Canada in the same category as the United States, as regards the fiscal policies of the two countries. What has been the effect of protection in that country? Are the interests in that country that are highly protected really in need of protection? Last spring the Bethlehem Ironworks, belonging to Mr. Carnegie, took a contract to supply ten thousand tons of steel rails to Japan at $21.40 free on board. They supplied these at nearly a dollar less than their English competitors could supply them at. And at the moment they were supplying steel rails at that rate to Japan, the price to the consumers in Chicago was $29, and at Bethlehem $28. And yet the makers of steel rails, possessing the ability to undersell England in the open markets of the world, are protected by a duty of $6 per ton, to enable them to charge a higher price for the steel rails they produce to the home consumer, and rob him to the extent of the difference between the two rates.

Take the article of cotton bands. These are protected by a duty of $1.35 per 100 pounds. The American producers of cotton bands in Cleveland are supplying Japan, India, Egypt, and other markets of the world wherever cotton bands were required in competition against outside manufacturers, and yet a duty of $1.35 per 100 pounds enables them to sell to the American consumer at over a dollar per 100 pounds more than they are charging the foreign consumer.

Now, these are illustrations of the practical operation of protection. We have not reached that point of activity of development, but in the United States protection is not needed. In the United States the existence of protective duties, in nine cases out of ten, simply enables the manufacturer to add that amount to the price of the articles which he can sell in the open markets of the world without protection at all. And when the Government, now in power in Canada, comes to deal with that question, they want to deal with it, not in forty days, as my hon. friend from York requires of them, but with caution. They want to proceed with care, they want to examine all the circumstances, they want to consider every interest in the country, they want to do justice, they intend to do it, and in order to do it they want time and information. They must have it, and they will have it, and when they do have it, when they have examined into the conditions of trade, then they will be ready to present a measure for the criticism of the Opposition.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster was guilty of an unfairness, which has characterized almost all the speakers on that side, in giving quotations made from speeches delivered by the leader of the Government. Now the garbled extract, Mr. Speaker, the extract which goes just so far but does not go far enough to take in the defining part of the speech, which does not take in enough to show exactly what is meant—such an extract is more than unfair, it is dishonest. He made an extract from the speech of the leader of the Government about our aim being to have free trade as they have it in England. Up and down throughout this country, from every rostrum, from every stump, the attempt has been made to impress the people of Canada with the belief that the leader of the Liberal Government proposes to establish at once the fiscal system that exists in England. Why, every man who makes the assertion knows that it is unfair, knows that the extract is garbled, knows that the statement is essentially untrue. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) did say something about free trade as it exists in England, he set that before him far in the future as something to be sought, something to be reached, a consummation to be desired when the thing could be done. When the people of Canada could be relieved from the burdens that now press upon them, when we can, step by step, inaugurate a better system of fiscal legislation, when we can, item by item, drop the burdens that rest upon the people, when we can at last dispense with the system that exists now and adopt that system which has produced such beneficent results in England and made that country the first commercial nation, the great manufacturing nation, the centre of the potential resources of humanity—when we can reach that goal he proposed that we make this change complete. But he did not present that as something that could be done now, as something that was to be the immediate result of the Liberal policy, but only presented it as something that we might hope for in the time to come. Well, Sir, to go about the country and repeat that the hon. gentleman proposed at once to adopt the English system is a prevarication of the facts, is inconsistent with his statement and is essentially untrue; and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) if he is a man of ordinary intelligence must have been aware that that was the case.

I suppose that the Government, when all the facts are sought for that are to govern its action in the formation of a new tariff, will probably consider the interests of the farmer to some extent. The great mass of the people of this country are farmers. Now, the farmer is a manufacturer. It may not strike people that such is the case at first sight, but not the less the farmer is a manufacturer. He has his capital, he has his raw material and his finished product; and his manufacturing operations are the most important that are carried on by any class. His capital is his investment in farm and stock and plant; his raw material is the seed he casts into the earth, the food that he eats the goods that he requires to buy for the transaction of his business, everything that is necessary for his use in order to transact his business. He calls into operation processes, not the processes of the

manufacturer, not the throwing of the shuttle and the operation of the loom, not the operation of the spinning jenny—he uses the processes of nature. He casts the seed into the ground and waits for nature to cause that food to germinate. And in time it appears, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear and when this process which a beneficent Maker puts into operation is completed, the farmer presents to us his finished products. His finished products are waving fields of golden grain, cattle in the stall, flocks in the fold, all the fruits of the earth. All things that contribute to the sustenance and maintenance of human life are the products of the farmer. Now that manufacturer deserves consideration. He is selling his products in the open markets of the world; he is selling his products where he meets the competition of all races and all nations, and he has a right to ask and he does ask this Government that the cost of the raw material for his business shall be minimized so far as the Government can adopt a policy that will lead to that result. As he has to sell cheap, he asks that he may be enabled to buy cheap; and the Government is bound, not to give him all he asks, perhaps, but to take his interests into account and give to him the same consideration it gives to other interests in Canada.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) had something to say about the manufacturing industries of this country and the protection afforded them. He said that the $350,000,000 invested in manufacturing operations in Canada would be lost capital when the policy of my hon. friend the leader of the Government was brought down. This indicates a singular oblivion on the part of hon. gentlemen to facts. Does the hon. gentleman claim that the protective policy created the manufacturing industries of Canada? Does he claim that until the inauguration of this policy in 1879 this country was destitute of manufacturing industries? One would imagine so from his statement that when the policy of my hon. friend is brought down this vast sum of money will be lost money. But what are the facts of the case? Did we have manufactures at the inception of the protective system, or did we not? I answer, We did. We produced in 1871, $221,000,000 of manufactured goods. We produced in 1881, $309,000,000 worth. In 1891, according to the census returns we produced $476,000,000 worth. Now the production of these $221,000,000 was under a revenue tariff policy, and the increase of production of 1881 was 41 per cent. Under the protective policy, the increase from 1881 to 1891 was 54 per cent. But bear in mind that the apparent increase is not a real one. Bear in mind the peculiar manipulation of the census returns of 1891. Bear in mind the fact that branches of business were returned as manufacturing industries in 1891 that were not so treated in 1881, that thousands and tens of thousands of nominal manufacturing concerns were coopers and dressmakers and blacksmiths, who were employing, each one or one and a half hands, and who were not included as manufacturers in the census of 1881. And when that stuffing of the returns is eliminated, I doubt whether the percentage of increase from 1881 to 1891 was greater than that from 1871 to 1881. There is naturally a tendency to increase under any policy, and I fully believe that the increase in manufacturing operations in Canada are not in any large degree attributable to the system of protection, but that, as from 1871 to 1881, a large steady, healthy growth and increase in the manufacturing industries of this country took place, so it would have continued to be with a revenue tariff.

Then the hon. member for York, in lauding this policy of protection, says that it has been accepted by the country in election after election, that the electors of Canada time and time again have endorsed this policy and returned the exponents of it to power. And he says that but for side issues this policy would have triumphed again in the elections of this year. Well, Sir, in reply to this I have to say that the National Policy did not carry the election in 1891, any more than it did in 1896. The election in 1891 was attributable largely, as I have said, to the stealing on the part of the Government of the reciprocity issue which properly belongs to the Liberal party. But for that piece of political chicanery, I verily believe that the Liberal party would have scored a success in 1891. But there are some other influences that have been at work besides the National Policy. The Government relied for success in 1882, in 1887, in 1891, and in 1896, upon that triune list of political infamies, the gerrymander, the Franchise Bill, and boodling. These are the trinity of infamies upon which the Government has planted itself, by which the Government has sustained itself, to which the Government owed its success in these various elections. The Gerrymander Act gave to the Government at least sixteen seats. The Franchise Act, manipulated as it has been by the Government, was equivalent to fifteen seats more; and the money derived from Quebec harbour contracts, from sweating contracts of various kinds, from tolling railway subsidies, and from various improper methods of securing money—I say the money secured in this way has enabled the Government, with the aid of the gerrymander and with the aid of the Franchise Act, to score victories which they never could have scored in this country, resting upon the character of their policy and the true, unbiassed wishes of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have much to say about this issue. I wish I could compliment my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and those associated with him, upon their skill in leading an Opposi-

tion. But evidently they are new to the work. They would be called, in vulgar parlance, greenhorns at the job. When they remain there eighteen years, as I hope they may, they will know more about it, probably, but they have given very little evidence of their skill so far this session. I hope they will improve, I think very likely they will. There is no lack of talent, no lack of ability there, but there is lack of experience in that particular line of work. They have already made several messes in the management of affairs this session. It was a very bad mess they made of things when they attacked Governor General's warrants. They got the country into a scrape, they got the country into difficulties, from which to extricate it a certain line of conduct had to be taken. The Government of the day took that line of conduct; and these gentlemen, oblivious of the fact that they were responsible for the condition of things, that they caused it, and ought to have hidden their heads and kept as quiet as possible, attacked the Government for doing the very thing, and the only thing the Government could do, to extricate itself from the difficulties into which these hon. gentlemen had plunged it. That was mistake No. 1. Then they made a second mistake when they made that attack upon the Governor General for adding another course to the edifice of British liberty, for having decided that a moribund Government, a worse than moribund Government, that had been rejected by the people, that had ceased to have a right to exist as a Government, or to exercise the functions of a Government, should not be allowed to perform certain acts. When the Governor General decided that such a Government should not make certain classes of appointments, he was setting a precedent that will live in history, he was setting a precedent that will be right in the lines of that advance that has been made since the days of Magna Charta in 1215, since, step by step, the structure of British liberty has been erected by one thing after another, being wrung from the hand of arbitrary power. The last and not the least of these great triumphs in the line of building up the structure of British liberty, was the action of the Governor General of Canada when he decided that a boodling Government which had ceased to deserve the confidence of the people of Canada, and which was under the ban of the people of Canada, should cease to usurp the functions of a Government, and fill offices to the embarrassment of their successors. All praise to the representative of Her Majesty who set that wholesome, healthy and honest precedent. But it is certainly a striking illustration of the bungling incapacity of an Opposition that attacked the Governor General for the exercise of such salutary principles and prerogatives. Then we have this last evidence furnished by the resolution before the House. My hon. friend from York and his colleagues put me in mind of that passage in the Apocalypse where the great red dragon with seven heads and ten horns, is standing ready to devour the woman's child when it is born. This child that they are making a movement against, is not born yet. They are not content with waiting to devour the child when it is born, but they are making an attack upon it in advance. My hon. friend from York has formulated his resolution against a policy that is not yet formulated; he has brought a resolution against the Government for a policy when he does not know what the policy of the Government is. Why, it is the most astounding piece of humbuggery and foolery I have ever seen in this House.

I conclude by advising my hon. friends opposite to keep cool for a while. It is quite possible that mistakes will be made after a time that will enable them to criticise freely, but that time has not come yet. They have been a little premature. In the course they have taken in this regard, they have certainly succeeded in making the task of the Government now upon the Treasury benches, a very difficult one. No person underrates these difficulties upon this side of the House, all realize them. We have had eighteen years of misrule, we have had extravagance, we have got the affairs of this Government in a sad muddle indeed; we are loaded with responsibilities and burdens that are very serious ones; and the Government is confronting difficulties of the most gigantic character, difficulties they are not responsible for, difficulties that they never created. The Government must have some consideration in grappling with these difficulties. They have a herculean task to perform, and it would be more in consonance with representative government and fair-play if the Opposition were just to keep quiet for a while, and see whether the Government were able to grapple with the great problems placed before them. I hope to be able to assist them somewhat in doing the work that lies before them, and I certainly shall look with displeasure, I shall look with aversion, upon that class of tactics pursued by the Opposition during this session in the course they have seen fit to take with regard to a Government that met this House when they had been only forty days in office, met this House under emergencies that compelled them to call the House together for the purpose of securing the money to pay the bread of the officials of the Government, for the purpose of extricating the country from the difficulties in which their incompetent predecessors had placed them. I venture to think that the Government will strive to do the best they can. I can venture to say that their methods will be good, that their desires will be good, that their aims will be high, that, in the language of my hon. friend the leader of the Government, they will seek to make this a Government of the people, for the people and by the people. Believing that to be the case, I conclude by saying

that the resolution of my hon. friend the member for York is most inopportune, and is entirely unworthy of the reputation that hon. gentleman has as a statesman, as a politician, and as a tactician.

Mr. KLOEPFER. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House very long, but I desire to say a few words upon this question. In my opinion the Government should have been prepared to deal with the tariff this session, or at least should have been prepared to state the course they intended to pursue with regard to their tariff policy. By delaying to announce their policy, the trade of this country is being seriously injured. Now, I believe that the Government could have brought their tariff down very easily at this session. They had been discussing the matter for eighteen years, and surely by this time must have made up their minds as to what policy they are going to pursue. I think I am able to explain why the Government did not bring down their tariff policy this session. In the beginning of the election contest in my county, my opponents started out stating that their policy was "free trade as it is in England." But when that was threshed out and the fallacy of it was shown up, they denied that policy, and they made an outcry for a tariff for revenue only. They did not succeed apparently with the electors, and so a few days afterwards, when speaking in the city, the Liberal campaigners stated, that they would take the tariff the same as it was under the Conservative Government, and they would only revise it a little. That was all very well in the city, but when they went in the rural districts to the farmers they said: Now, gentlemen, the manufacturers are robbing you, their tariff is altogether exorbitant, and they have had it their own way long enough. I do not believe, Sir, it is a patriotic thing for the members of any political party to go to the country and endeavour to array the farmers against the inhabitants of the city. Living in the same country, the citizens and the farmers have the same interests, and they should be taught to work harmoniously together, rather than to be antagonistic to each other. Let me ask, are the manufacturers better protected than the farmers of Canada? It is my contention that the farmers are better protected under our National Policy than are our manufacturers. Take oats at 10 cents a bushel, peas at 10 cents a bushel, wheat at 15 cents a bushel and barley at 30 per cent, which is the protection accorded to the farmer in these lines. Take the import duty on lamb and mutton at 35 per cent, and pork and beef at 3 cents a pound, and figure these out, and I think you will find that the farmers have a better tariff than the manufacturers have. But when the Liberal orators in the last campaign came into a city constituency they told the people that they were not going to interfere with the tariff, while at the same time they were telling the farmers that the tariff was too high, and it appears to me that these two statements do not at all coincide. I have already said that the manufacturers are not so well protected as the farmers, and I state now that under our present tariff the manufacturers have hardly enough protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. KLOEPFER. Yes, I make that assertion and I can prove it to hon. gentlemen opposite if they wish to be convinced. Take for instance the duties in the carriage hardware line, and I say that the manufacturers in this industry are not protected enough. Before 1894, on carriage hardware there was a duty of 35 per cent, but they reduced that in 1894 to 32½ per cent. Instead of taking off 2½ they should have added it and made the duty 37½ per cent. Take also the duties on sewing machines. It used to be $3 specific and 20 per cent ad valorem, but it was reduced to 30 per cent, and that, I contend, is not sufficient protection. In the manufacture of sewing machines, the japans, the castings, and a special kind of pig iron, have to be imported into Canada. It does not pay to manufacture the attachments in this country because our population is not very large, and consequently the demand is not so great as in populous countries. Duty has to be paid on these attachments which are the raw material of the trade. The duty on sewing machines was lessened and it does not keep out machines from the other side. Now, there are only two manufacturers of sewing machines in Canada. There are imported into this country $108,000 worth of sewing machines every year. If the machines were kept out, and if the Canadian sewing machine factories could manufacture this $108,000 worth, they would run to their full capacity, turn out a larger quantity, and consequently produce and sell their machines at a much lower price. If the tariff were left as it was on sewing machines, the Canadian factories would be running all the time, and the Canadian user of sewing machines would get the article cheaper than he does now. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if the duty on sewing machines is increased, our Canadian manufacturers even under that high duty could sell their sewing machines cheaper than they do at present, and cheaper than the American machines are sold. Let me again refer to carriage hardware. About one-third of the carriage hardware is imported into Canada, and would it not be better that the duty should be higher so as to keep out this importation and give the work to Canadians in Canadian factories? More hands would be employed; our people would be kept in this country, and our money would be kept to be spent in this country, instead of being sent to a foreign country. I can assure hon. gentlemen that when we send our money out of the coun-

try to the United States it is gone from us for ever. The more people you employ in this country, the more people you have to consume the products of the farm, and the better is the market for the farmer.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the first time I ever heard a gentleman addressing this House for the first time, attempted to be interrupted by anybody.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I do not wish to interrupt, I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. KLOEPFER. What is the question ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The question is this. How many sewing machine factories were there in Canada when the National Policy commenced and how many are there to-day ?

Mr. KLOEPFER. Well, I can answer that question easily, but I thought any intelligent man would know it. At that time the sewing machine industry was a new enterprise, and there were few machines in the households of the country. But every one has a sewing machine to-day, and it is only here and there you can sell a machine to replace the old ones when they get worn out.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That is not an answer.

Mr. KLOEPFER. It is a very good answer. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that if the tariff was taken off, prices would be lower and the people could live cheaper. Well, I can assure hon. gentlemen that competition will regulate prices and will reduce them, for if a factory in Canada is making a large profit there is sure to be another one started up, and so the competition will settle the price. Common sense will tell any man that we should not have a lower tariff than our neighbours to the south of us have. Canada has only 5,000,000 people and the United States has from 65,000,000 to 70,000,000. Do not we want as high tariff as they do ? In the United States the average tariff is 40 per cent while our tariff hardly averages 30 per cent. Their tariff, according to the population of the countries, should be less than that of Canada. We must be a very intelligent and thrifty people to be able to compete with a nation having the population of the United States, and with a lower tariff than theirs, to keep their goods out of our market. I hope the Government will not meddle with the tariff, for undoubtedly their action will come back on them. In my constituency the statement is constantly made that the Government are not going to touch the tariff, but, at all events, their supporters do not like to hear about the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt, will find that their best course to follow is to borrow our tariff policy and label it with another name. I desire now to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman has stated that a long time was required to revise the tariff. I think this should not be the case, because hon. gentlemen opposite professed to know all about it when the elections were in progress. One would imagine they could bring it down at once, for they told the people everything they were going to do. The hon. member also said that it took the Democrats in the United States a long time to change their tariff. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not occupy so long a time, for I believe the Democrats were occupied in this work during eighteen months, and the result was that the manufacturers were afraid to proceed with their operations, wholesale men would not lay in stocks, every one was waiting until the tariff was settled, and thus ruin was brought on the manufacturing industries, hundreds of manufacturers and wholesalers failed, and we all know the number of bank failures reported. The practice followed by the American manufacturers during slack times is to turn out special lots of goods and send them to Canada, where they dispose of them at very much less than the usual wholesale prices. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), who is in the same line of business as I follow, knows it well.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I know a good deal better than that.

Mr. KLOEPFER. American manufacturers are selling sewing-machins to wholesale agents in Canada $4 or $5 less than they are selling them to their own agents in the United States. The reason is that they do not want to lose the wholesale price in their own markets, because they feel they would be unable to raise the price afterwards, but they are willing to send machines over to Canada and cut the price here. It has been urged that, if the Canadian Government would reduce the tariff on agricultural implements, the Americans would follow a like policy. Why have they not done so already ? The duty on agricultural implements in the United States is 45 per cent, as compared with 20 per cent in this country. If a reduction of 20 per cent were made, implements would be free here, but there would still remain a duty of 25 per cent on the other side. I do not believe the people of the Dominion desire such a reduction. When we look across the boundary line, we see that the Republicans have chosen the strongest protectionist for their presidential candidate, Mr. McKinley. The Democrats have taken up Mr. Bryan, and he is worse than a protectionist. Why, there is no nation in the world which can keep on selling goods and pay for them at the

rate of 52½ cents on the dollar. I thank hon. members for the attention they have given me, and I resume my seat.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time since I entered Parliament, and I, therefore, ask the indulgence of hon. members on both sides while I say a few words in connection with this important matter now under consideration. I have listened to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have replied to the very able and exhaustive address of the late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), and I am free to say that, although I have not been in Parliament before, as have been some hon. members, in my opinion, the hon. member for York had far the best of the argument, and no reply was made to the powerful argument he made on the floor of this House. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), an old, experienced member, and a very able speaker, whose leanings for many years have been more friendly to the United States than to our own land, has taken up the time of this House in delivering an admirable essay on the great benefits that would arise, if we had closer relations with the United States. He charged the hon. member for York with wasting the time of this House in discussing matters foreign to the amendment which he moved. I submit, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members on both sides, that, if the hon. member for York did stick very closely to the matter in hand, as he always does, the hon. member for North Norfolk, in replying, wandered all over the United States, and said very little in connection with the tariff of this Dominion. He was not satisfied with rebuking members on this side of the House for all their alleged shortcomings during many years, but he said the way in which our party was led by the leader of the Opposition was very unfortunate. Well, all I can say is that it will be a long time before hon. members on this side will ask that hon. gentleman to assist us in any way, shape or form. It contained a little reflection on his own intelligence, I think, for this old campaigner and very old debater, and a man of very great intelligence, to find fault with the way in which the Opposition is led. Let me say to him that we are a unit on this side of the House, and that we intend to stand by our leader, whether he sits on that side of the House or on this side.

The hon. member for North Norfolk was not satisfied with finding fault with the Government of Canada; but he thought that if the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada united, they could put a stop to the Turkish troubles and the destruction of the Armenians. He has a very exalted opinion of his power, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the United States and Canada negotiated a treaty, the hon. gentleman would be quite willing, if appointed ambassador to undertake to put a stop to those atrocities which are regretted by every civilized country in the world. But if Great Britain, Russia, France, Italy, and Germany, with all their armed forces, if the skilled diplomats and the trained statesmen of Great Britain, are unable to cope with that difficulty, I fear it would be a long time before it would be settled if left to my hon. friend from North Norfolk.

Then, the hon. gentleman, not satisfied with saying very unpleasant things about the living on this side of the House, had to attack the memory of the dead. In connection with the reciprocity negotiations of 1891, which he dealt with at such length, he preferred to believe the Hon. James Blaine, of American fame, a gentleman of great ability, and no doubt a very truthful man, and some gentleman of the name of Baker—he preferred to believe their statements to the statements of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper. We on this side believe that the majority of men on both sides of this House would rather trust the statements of our own leaders and our own statesmen than the statements of those gentlemen in Washington, much as we respect them; and I may say in passing that the hon. member for North Norfolk has always used very strong language against the late Sir John A. Macdonald. In season and out of season, on the floor of this House and on the hustings, he has charged corruption and boodling against Sir John A. Macdonald and those associated with him; but he has never yet proved a single case against those gentlemen, and it ill becomes a gentleman with the leanings of the hon. member for North Norfolk, a gentleman whom I respect, to take up the time of this House for an hour or two in advocating American institutions and the advanced views of American statesmen, and in decrying the greatest statesman that this country ever produced, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. There is one thing to be said of Sir John A. Macdonald, that he was always true to the interests of Canada; and he and those associated with him in the negotiations with the government at Washington, did more to guard the interests of Canada and the interests of the Canadian people than the Reform leaders have ever done during the whole period since confederation.

The hon. member for North Norfolk blamed the late Government for staying in power to the very last day that they could remain in power under the law, and he also tried to blame them for introducing a Bill which could not be carried. I can only say, so far as that is concerned, that if the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches had been as careful to husband the resources of this country as those on this side of the House, they would have given away to the very reasonable request of the leader of the late Government, and granted the supplies, and thus spared the expense to this country of this session of

Parliament. It has been said by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that they knew better than to pass the supplies, for they could not trust the leaders of the Conservative party with the expenditure of the public money. I regard that, Mr. Speaker, as an insult to the intelligence of this House and an insult to the people of this country, because the moneys voted by Parliament were just as safely guarded in the hands of gentlemen on this side of the House as they will be guarded by the gentlemen on the opposite side.

Now, with regard to the Remedial Bill, the House was kept in session with the view of passing that Bill, if at all possible. I think it rather unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have referred to that question at all. During this session the taunt has been thrown across the floor of the House that Sir Charles Tupper and those associated with him in leading the party on this side have endeavoured to fan the flames of religious strife in this country. We assert the very opposite. We say that the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, in 1891, through Premier Greenway and Attorney General Martin, took away the rights of the minority in the province of Manitoba for the purpose of making political capital, and those gentlemen have kept that question in the field ever since, not for the good of the country, but for the sake of serving the interest of themselves and their party. I do not desire to dwell on that question. It is a question on which men on both sides differ. All honour to the men who did differ on it. I hope the Conservative party will never be such a unit but that on great questions, such as those affecting the state or the church, there will be found some independent men ready to do what is best for the country. If the Conservative party were divided on that question, some on the other side were divided also. But they were not divided in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government preached one doctrine in the province of Ontario and another in the province of Quebec; and all I can say is that when the history of that question is written, the Conservative party will appear to much greater advantage than hon. gentlemen opposite. For my part, in the campaign I supported the Remedial Bill; I did so conscientiously, and I will do so again, because I believe the rights of the minority were trampled under foot by hon. gentlemen opposite. At the same time, I respect those gentlemen on either side of the House who differ with me on that question.

My hon. friend from North Norfolk found fault with the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) for charging the Government with some short comings in connection with their tariff policy. As I understood the speech of the hon. member for York, he made no charge against their policy, because they have no policy. He simply laid down the principle that inasmuch as the mercantile and manufacturing interests of this country were disturbed because of the change of Government, if hon. gentlemen opposite were not able to bring down the details of their policy, they should at least take the House into their confidence so far as to let them know what great principle they intended adopting in connection with this important question. The hon. gentleman further said that it took a long time for the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald to frame their policy. It is true it took them some months; but it was said in connection with the elections of 1878 that Sir John A. Macdonald, and those associated with him, were trying to draw wool over the eyes of the people, and had no intention of bringing in a National Policy. But as soon as they got into power, they applied themselves, with all their energy and ability, to bringing in a National Policy, and they established it against the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite; and for eighteen years that policy has done for Canada what no other policy had ever done. But, Sir, the case is very different now. That was a new policy; it had to be carefully gone into, and the greatest precautions had to be taken. It is not so with hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. First Minister, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and those who have been associated with them in Parliament had been proclaiming for eighteen years to the people of this country, on every hustings and platform, that they knew what the wants of this country were, and that if the people would only place their trust in them, they would give them a policy which would be far better for the country than the Conservative policy. Were they deceiving the people then, or are they deceiving the people now? They are not deceiving the people now, because they will not say what their policy is.

I look upon the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) as a gentleman whom both sides of the House respect. But when he heard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce last night say pointedly, with all his warmth, zeal and old time eloquence, which he has used for the last seventeen years, say he was death to protection, we could see the change on the countenance of the hon. member for North Leeds. As a matter of fact, what have these hon. gentlemen being doing? They know that the manufacturers are in favour of protection; and yet the only gleam of hope that has come into this House came from the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost), who was bold enough to declare that the policy of the Government is protection to manufacturers. How did he get the information? Was it whispered into his ear, as it has been to other manufacturers throughout the Dominion? It seems to me that it would be more statesmanlike on the part of hon. gentlemen in office to take the people into their confidence and proclaim their policy in this House and not whisper

it in the ears of their friends throughout the country.

Let me refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The United States will be very much pleased to hear of another great effort to boom that country, made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), but, in his closing utterances, he was not so friendly as he was at the opening of his remarks. He condemned their system of protection, he said that the whole wealth of the country was in a few hands, and one would think he was the greatest enemy they have. But he is not their enemy, he is their friend, and has had correspondence with secretary Carlisle, in the interests of the United States, against the interests of Canada. If I may be permitted, let me turn my attention to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who went through this country proclaiming that, as in the Mackenzie Administration, he would have to set himself in this House to the difficult task of Minister of Finance. Now, we find that he has not attained the height of his ambition. We can readily imagine, in the Privy Council Chamber, that there might have been some little feeling about the matter, and that the First Minister plainly said to the hon. gentleman: you have not been a success in the past, we had better have a new and untried man and a premier of one of the provinces, and we will not allow the hon. member to speak on the trade question, but will give you all the honour and glory of criticising the late Finance Minister. Of course, I do not say that that is the case but it points that way, and I think that the Privy Council acted wisely in compromising the difficulty by allowing the gentleman that wanted to be Finance Minister do the work and make the real Finance Minister in name remain silent on financial questions because, judging from what I have heard and seen, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is to-day the ablest man on that side, and I fear the First Minister will be somewhat disappointed with his provincial premiers unless they take up and do the work as the hon. member for South Oxford has done it for years past. That hon. gentleman could not reply to the convincing arguments of my hon. friend from York, and he had to fall back on that old familiar cry, which has resounded for years through the concession lines and streets of our towns and cities—the cry of corruption. I merely say this, that it is not in the interests of the morality of this country to have leading men whose only stock in trade is the cry of corruption, which they are never able to prove. I am one of those who believe that public life should be surrounded with certain safeguards. There are just as honest Reformers as Conservatives, just as honest Conservatives as Reformers; and when this cry of corruption is raised so often and dwelt upon so long, the public pay no heed because they believe it is used for selfish purposes not in the intersts of the public at all.

Then the gerrymander came in, of which we have all heard. That took place a long time ago, and we ought to be called on to discuss something new. If they had a trade policy to discuss, the hon. gentleman could have taken up his time with that, but they had none.

The hon. gentleman said it was a very unfortunate thing that the leader of the Opposition, and those associated with him, had touched the question of the civil service. Now, I listened to that discussion with a great deal of interest, and in the hope that good might come from it. I believe that there are civil servants in Ottawa and all over the Dominion who are upright, honourable men and men of great ability, and as long as they do their work properly and exercise their franchise as British subjects, they ought to be retained in their place. But on the other hand, I am free to say that if a civil servant is offensive on a public platform or to any of his fellow men and transgresses the rules of decency, he takes his life into his hands and has no reason to remain longer in the service. Allusion was made to the civil service of the country. I can only say that the province of Ontario, so far as the provincial legislature is concerned, protects them and puts every safeguard round them. Every office it is possible for the Ontario government to fill is filled by their own political supporters; and even the present Minister of Justice in this House has interfered with the administration of justice to achieve party ends. Years ago, in the days of the Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald, you will remember that the ablest men at the bar were retained by him and his cabinet to prosecute public criminals of the country. But since that time, every gentleman belonging to the legal profession, who can speak on the hustings, no matter how imperfectly, is a civil servant in every sense of the word, and is rewarded for his zeal on the hustings by having confided to him the most sacred of all things, the prosecution of public criminals. What has been the result? For some years past public criminals have escaped and the Minister of Justice in this last year went back to the principles of the late John Sandfield Macdonald because more recently he has been appointing the ablest men at the bar of Canada for the prosecution of public criminals.

I was very much astonished to hear, for the first time, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), a gentleman who is very much respected in his own province, and who has had not only a provincial but a Dominion reputation, promulgate a doctrine such as I have never heard before promulgated by a Minister of the Crown. I say that nothing has done more to injure the position of the Government, than that proclamation of the Minister of Railways, supported as he was

by the Ministers and by the hon. gentlemen behind him. When he was asked by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) if he dismissed certain men belonging to the Intercolonial, he said that because a certain gentleman named McDonald, who had been the opponent of the hon. member for Pictou, had requested their dismissal, he had dismissed them. The hon. member for Pictou spoke again and the hon. gentleman the Minister of Railways went a little further.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going a little too far, he must confine himself to the discussion of the amendment and he cannot refer to a previous debate.

Mr. HENRY. At the same time, I may say, without reference to the Minister of Railways and Canals, without reference to a past debate, that when the principle is laid down by an hon. gentleman in this House, who is placed in a position of trust and responsibility, that, when the opportunity arises, when information has been given him by a defeated candidate or by a member of this House on his own side, he will dismiss the common labourer of this country in connection with the public works, without investigation, I say it is a blot upon the fame of this country to have such a proposition made.

Now, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) intimated in this debate that the reason the tariff was not brought down was to satisfy the importer, and that the importers urged that no action be taken on the tariff or the new tariff be brought down until their stocks of goods were exhausted. What does that mean? Does it mean that the importers had a consultation with the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Government, and that they are going to remove these duties from imported goods? It looks much like it, because I do not see why the importers should ask that the tariff be not interfered with until they had disposed of their stocks, unless the duties are to be taken off, and they do not wish to have stocks on hand that have paid the duty. I hope that that is not the case. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has proclaimed everywhere throughout this country that he is in favour of doing away with the National Policy. He has proclaimed on every hustings that his policy is death to protection. There is no use wearying the House with reading extracts from his utterances, because they are well known to every hon. member. If he says he is death to protection, he must either retire from the Government of the day or carry with him those who are associated with him, and do away with protection and establish something else. I hope, as the hon. member for York said, at the close of his eloquent speech, that he will change his views and that the tariff will not be disturbed to any extent, and that the National Policy will be carried on with such variations from time to time as may be needed to suit the requirements of the time. But, if they continue the system of protection, what shall we say? I am sure we shall feel disposed to forgive them. While I am not the leader and not authorized to speak for gentlemen on this side, if the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce would come down with a policy on the lines laid down by the late Minister of Finance, I, for one, believe in supporting him, on the ground that his action would be in the best interests of the country. Representing, as I do, the riding of South Brant, and the large manufacturing interests of Brantford and Paris, as well as the agricultural district surrounding, I wish to say that some of the manufacturers of the city of Brantford have every confidence that the tariff now in existence will be maintained. It is evident to me they have faith in what is whispered in their ears by hon. gentlemen opposite, but they have no faith in the public utterances of those gentlemen. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has said that the National Policy was the curse of this country, and that ever since it has been established, it has done a great deal of harm, that it has been a load upon the neck of the people of this country. I will just read a few statistics to show that, instead of going backward, the country has gone forward by leaps and bounds:

In 1878 the Government and post office savings banks' deposits were $8,197,000; in 1895 they were $45,362,244.

In 1878 the public deposits in the chartered banks were $70,856,000; in 1895 they were $184,000,000.

In 1878 the amount of bank notes in circulation was $20,475,000; in 1895 it was $32,774,442.

In 1878 the amount of bank loans to business men was $119,682,659; in 1895 it was $214,000,000.

In 1878 the amount of life assurance written by companies doing business in Canada was $84,751,000; in 1894 it was $308,061,000.

In 1878 Canadian loan companies had a capital of $17,287,538; in 1895 they had a capital of $35,445,252.

In 1878 the amount of fire insurance in force in Canada was $409,899,000; in 1895 it was $836,067,000.

In 1878 Canada shipped from Montreal to Great Britain 15,963 cattle and 31,841 sheep; in 1895 there were shipped 96,564 cattle and 215,508 sheep.

In 1878 Canada shipped to Great Britain less than fifty horses; in 1895 there were shipped from Montreal alone to Great Britain 13,000 horses.

In 1878 Canada shipped to Great Britain cheese, valued at $3,997,521; in 1894 she shipped cheese, valued at $15,488,191.

In 1878 Canada shipped to Great Britain $168,000 worth of apples; in 1894 she shipped $907,397 worth.

In 1878 the value of hog meats exported from Canada was $998,409; in 1894 it was $2,976,501.

In 1878 the total exports from Canada amounted to $79,323,000; in 1894 they amounted to $117,524,949.

In 1878 the total imports into Canada were $93,081,787; in 1894 they had grown to $123,474,940.

In 1878 Canadian railroads carried 6,443,924 passengers; in 1894 they carried 14,462,498 passengers.

In 1878 the length of Canadian railways in operation was 6,143½ miles; in 1894 it was 15,625 miles.

Now, I submit that, if the larger figures applied to 1878 and the smaller figures to 1895, the hon. Minister would have been justified in coming to the conclusions he reached. But the very reverse was the case. In the city of Brantford and the town of Paris, manufacturing industries have largely increased, and the manufacturers themselves admit that, were it not for the National Policy and for the protection afforded by the Conservative Government, they would not have developed to the extent they have. The manufacturing interests of Brantford and Paris are far larger than what they were in 1878. While they give steady employment to mechanics and labour—not quite so steady as we would like to see, they also help the agriculturists in the surrounding country. On every market day in Brantford, Toronto, Hamilton, Chatham, Windsor, and other manufacturing places, you see hundreds of farmers' wagons laden with products which could not be sold were it not for the market afforded by the workmen employed in the manufacturing industries that exist by reason of protection. Notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite may say, if the stove manufacturers, the agricultural implement manufacturers, the engine and boiler manufacturers, the bicycle manufacturers, the plough manufacturers, the woollen and cotton manufacturers, and other manufacturing industries were not protected, there would not be a single manufacturing industry in Brantford or Paris, or anywhere else to speak of, of great magnitude. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the National Policy will be the policy of the party in power. I sincerely hope that nothing will be done to carry out the campaign speeches of the First Minister and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If they carry out the policy of the late Administration, the country will have more or less confidence in them, although it will not have much confidence in their promises. I can assure our hon. friends opposite that the Conservative party, and especially the new members of it in this House, are more thoroughly determined to stand to their Conservative principles than they have ever been before. We are true to our leaders, and we will fight for the National Policy, because we believe it to be in the best interests of Canada.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution proposed to censure the Government for having a trade policy ready in four weeks, I would cheerfully support it; but as it proposes to censure the Government for not having a trade policy ready in four weeks, I must reluctantly oppose it. I am not now, I never was, and I never shall be, in sympathy with the trade policy of the Liberal party as enunciated in the speeches of its leaders. The Liberal party did not win its election on its trade policy, and I am hopeful that the Government will be mindful of this in framing their tariff changes. At all events, only a Government of fools would undertake to bring down a ready-made tariff policy for a country like this, inside of four or six weeks. I think that the Government, which I expect generally to oppose, is a Government of Canadians. They may think that their campaign promises are important, but more important still are the interests that would be ruined by the hasty and rash fulfilment of these campaign promises. I cannot see myself that a reasonable delay is objectionable. I do not think that the country is taking alarm at the delay. Delay, I think, in this case is a sign of wisdom, and the country would rightly have reason to be alarmed if a new Government, like the present one, undertook to bring down a ready-made tariff policy inside of four weeks. Haste in such a case would, I think, be a sure sign of folly. I represent a constituency in which the industrial interests are large; and I would tell the Government that it is better to be inconsistent than to be unjust. The country does not expect the Government to prove the consistency of its party at the expense of closed factories and unemployed men. The Government are dealing with industries in which millions of dollars are invested, in industries in which thousands of men are employed; and I think the country will overlook the inconsistency which spares these industries rather than it would pardon any inconsistency which might bring ruin to many capitalists, and starvation to others. I may be wrong, but I say again that the Liberal party did not win this last election, in my opinion, on its trade policy; and this House needs no assurance from me to learn that the same people who put the Liberal party in power are competent to put them out of power if they trifle with the industries of Canada. The hon. member for York, in his address yesterday afternoon, was, I think,—and I say this with a great deal of respect for the ex-Finance Minister—was, I think, injudicious in making his plaint concerning the Government bringing down their tariff policy. It occurs to me that in making that speech, he may have forgotten a certain contingency: that the very speech he was making on behalf of certain classes, might produce a feeling of distrust and unrest amongst those very classes. I do not credit the statement that the $400,000,000 of capital alleged to be invested in the industries of this country, are in the state of tremour so graphically depicted in the verbal pyrotechnics of the hon. the ex-Fin-

ance Minister. As for his statement about capitalists being kept on a ragged edge for eight or nine months, with consequent loss of business, and his appeal concerning the axe which the First Minister is supposed to brandish in the day time, and to keep under his pillow in the night time, I must say that such talk may be mighty good politics from the regular Opposition standpoint, but, in my humble judgment, and in the interest of the country, it is mighty bad policy. The statement that doubt and unrest in the country are paralysing business and clouding hope, may read all right in "Hansard," but I do not think it will avail in the Dominion of Canada, certainly not in the province of Ontario. I regret exceedingly that I cannot see eye to eye with many of my hon. friends upon this side of the House with whom I am in general sympathy. In considering this resolution, it is my privilege not to forget that I am a Conservative, representing a Conservative constituency; but it is my duty to remember that I represent a constituency which has shown its independence, and expects me to show mine. I know that in speaking as I do, I reflect the views of the leading and prominent Conservatives of East Toronto —not the political machine men that I buried beneath an avalanche of votes on the 23rd June, but the men who compose the bone and sinew of the Liberal-Conservative party, the thinking men of the Conservative party, who have not only the interests of the party at heart, but also the general welfare of the entire country. It is because my conclusions, after listening attentively to this debate, are fixed, that I am thus frank and do not hesitate in expressing my opinion. In this House I hope that my voice will always be heard on the side of right. My hand is free. Above my head I shall never hear the crack of the party whip. My responsibility is lodged, not here, but in another place. To the electors of East Toronto I am responsible, and to them I shall render an account.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to express my hearty approval of the motion which has been made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). I fail to read in that motion that the hon. member for York seeks to condemn the Government for not bringing down a tariff in detail within forty days, or in a short time. In fact I think the resolution itself declares that the member for York did not expect, and could not expect, the Government to be prepared at this early date with a tariff in detail, but that it reasonably expected, in the interests of the people of this country, that some declaration of policy should be made so that the people of Canada, from one end to the other, would have some idea of what was to be expected from the Government when they did bring down their tariff policy at a session in the early part of next year. I believe that would be the true policy for the Government to pursue, and for that reason I heartily endorse the motion which has been moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). True, the Minister of Trade and Commerce in reply to the hon. member for York, said:

> Sir, the hon. gentleman above all things is desirous of knowing what our policy is on this same trade question. I propose to give the hon. gentleman in detail what our policy was and what our policy is on this question, as formulated by the Liberal party in full convention where all sections of Canada were represented.

We do not ask the details of the trade policy of the Government. We simply asked for a declaration of its general principles; but, strange to say, although the Minister of Trade and Commerce declared he was prepared to give even the details, what did he give this House? He immediately launched out into a declaration against the National Policy and what it has done for the country. He said it had decreased the value of farms. But the hon. gentleman did not give one iota of evidence to show that any depression in land values was on account of the National Policy. He next said it had oppressed the masses. But he failed to bring forward any evidence to show that the masses had been oppressed. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce had visited the exhibition at Ottawa, which many hon. members have done, or if he had gone to Toronto exhibition and seen there all classes of the community, he would have found evidence to the contrary. The hon. member next declared that the National Policy had checked immigration. He produced no evidence to show that even a single individual had been prevented from coming into this country by reason of this policy. Then he told the House that we had lost trade through the National Policy. He produced no evidence, and if he examined the returns of his own department he would find they show the reverse. Further, he declared that the National Policy discriminated against trade with Great Britain. But he failed to adduce any evidence of a single instance in which the tariff of this country is higher on goods coming from Great Britain than from the United States or any other country. This is about the gist of the detailed statement with respect to the policy that the Government propose to pursue. But we had a more explicit statement contained in a declaration made by the leader of the Government himself in 1893, when he spoke at the Liberal convention at Ottawa, and made use of these words:

> Let it be well understood that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power. Their ideal is protection, our ideal is free trade. Their immediate object is protection; ours a tariff for revenue only. Upon this issue we engage the battle from this moment forward.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce has told the House that the issue was decided

on 23rd June last. Like my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Robertson). I question whether that issue was decided then or not. I do not believe for one moment that the National Policy or the trade policy of the Conservative party which had existed for eighteen years was condemned on the 23rd of June by the people. I am satisfied that such is not the case, and no doubt the members of the Administration are well aware of the fact that the issue which brought the Liberal party to power on that occasion was another issue than that of the National Policy. With respect to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I desire to draw attention to the fact that hon. members opposite are not united on their trade policy. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, being a member of the Government, was supposed to answer for the Administration, and he stated what he considered their policy is. Their policy was formulated by the Liberal party in 1893; but, strange to say, the hon. member for North Norfolk rose in his place and told the House that the trade policy of the Government is not yet formulated. The hon. gentleman is not a member of the Government. True, he stands very near to them, and possibly might have been nearer still had it not been for an important communication sent to the present leader of the Government not many years ago; but these circumstances go to show that hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches at the present time, and their near supporters are not a unit even on the trade question. While the one declared that the trade policy was formulated in 1893, the other told the House that it is not yet formulated. While referring to the hon. member for North Norfolk, I desire to say a few words with regard to his remarks on the question of reciprocity. I confess I was surprised that hon. gentleman occupied so much of the time of the House in discussing that question. That question, to my mind, may be rightly called a dead issue; I do not regard the question of reciprocity as a live issue at the present time. On the other side of the line there is now going on a severe contest. In all probability, Hon. William McKinley will be elected President of the United States, and if he is elected, I have no doubt there will be a McKinley Bill, with a high tariff wall, higher than ever, spiked all along the top so that it will be impossible for us to get over it. I see no possibility in the near future of securing reciprocity with the people of the United States. I therefore dismiss that matter as one of no consideration, and not worthy of discussion. The hon. gentleman, while dealing with this question, brought out an old friend, that I have heard of time and again, and from his frequent reference to the letter written by Congressman Baker to Mr. Secretary Blaine in 1891, and the reply which was sent by Mr. Blaine to Mr. Baker, I am almost led to believe that the hon. gentleman had some very near relations to that letter. I desire to make this statement, and it adds to the evidence I have suggested. I remember years ago meeting a friend from Rochester, who was well acquainted with Congressman Baker—a gentleman who was a near neighbour and in intimate communication with him informed me that the letter from Mr. Baker to Mr. Blaine and the letter from Mr. Blaine in reply were both written and conceived by the hon. member for North Norfolk—or, if they were not written by him, they were written at the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton), for the purpose of influencing the elections at that time going on in Canada. He has, to-day, and repeatedly on previous occasions, trotted out these letters in his speeches, and the great care with which he deals with them leads me to believe that the evidence I have received from a gentleman who was a neighbour of Congressman Baker, is true indeed, and that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) had a great deal more to do with these two famous letters than many of us had reason to suppose.

Now, Sir, let us take a look on the other side of the line. We talk about reciprocity with the United States, and we talk about their reducing their tariff in order to meet us. But the experience of the people of the United States in reducing their tariff has not been the most satisfactory. In 1894, the McKinley Bill was in force, but in 1895 they had what was known as the Wilson-Gorman Bill, and it is a fact that during that latter year the importation of goods into the United States from Great Britain was $47,000,000 worth more than under the McKinley Bill in 1894. The people of the United States did not believe that any advantage could accrue to them in reducing their tariff, because, knowing that on that account they lost the manufacture of $47,000,000 worth of goods in 1895, they are not likely to repeat the same mistake. Even if we secured reciprocity with the United States, what advantage would it be to us? Is the home market that we would in consequence lose not of greater advantage to us than all we can expect to get from reciprocity? The estimated value of the farm products of Canada is about $400,000,000, and of these products about $350,000,000 worth are consumed in the Dominion, because only $50,000,000 worth are exported. At that rate, the city of Toronto, with a population of about 200,000, would consume about $14,000,000 worth of the products of our farms, and the city of Montreal, with its great population, would consume about $21,000,000 worth; or, in other words, the market of the city of Toronto is equal to three times the entire export of agricultural products from Canada to the United States, and the home market of the city of Montreal is equal to about four times the entire of this export. Are we, then, going to surrender

the valuable market of these large cities for the purpose of accepting such a small return, a return which might prove of no value whatever; I believe it is better for us to retain our own home market and to allow the Americans to do the same. Certainly we are going to have no advantage by surrendering markets like the cities of Toronto and Montreal for the consumption of the products of the farmers of this country, and accept in return something of no value.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will return to the question of the National Policy. Yesterday, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) raised the question of the origin of the protective system. My recollection is that it did originate about the year 1876, and it originated something in his way. The farmers of this country were the originators of it. They found that they were depressed; they found that the products of the United States were flooding this country, and that they were unable to procure a suitable market for their products. They appealed to the Government then in power. They appealed to the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and to the then Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright), and it is a matter of history that a petition representing 100,000 of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, was presented to the Government. The petition reads in the following words:—

> Whereas agriculture is a prominent interest of this Dominion, and the prosperity of all classes depends largely upon the success of the farmer, it is desirable to enact such laws as shall insure that success.
>
> As practical farmers we cannot but view with regret our markets filled with the United States produce free of duty, while Canadian produce is heavily taxed when sent to the United States' markets.
>
> Your petitioners respectfully pray for such protection as will secure the home market for the home producer; or that the same rate of duty be levied on all agricultural products coming into the Dominion from foreign countries that is imposed by said foreign countries upon our produce.

This petition, however, was not considered by the Government of the day. At that time the late Sir John Macdonald placed upon the records of Parliament a resolution declaring in favour of the principle of protection. He repeated that resolution in 1877, and in 1878 he went to the country on the same declaration of policy, and the country returned him to power. In 1882 the principle of protection was re-endorsed. In 1887 and in 1891 it was again affirmed, and, like the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Robertson), I hold that in 1896 the people of Canada have not declared against the protective system. If hon. gentlemen opposite did succeed in obtaining power, it was on account of another question, and not on the trade question, and not on a condemnation of the protective principle. I wish to show for a few moments, in support of the resolution of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), why a declaration of the principle on which these hon. gentlemen opposite intend to regulate the tariff ought to be made at the present time. Every class of the community demands it. It is in the interests of the business man, it is in the interests of the manufacturer, it is in the interests of the farmer, it is in the interests of the miller. They should know something of the line along which the Government proposes to go in formulating their policy; whether it is to be free trade, whether it is to be tariff for revenue only, or whether—as has been hinted throughout the country—only a slight change would be made, and that really we shall retain the protective principle, after all. I know that in the county which I have the honour to represent, which is largely an industrial county, it was no uncommon thing for gentlemen opposed to me to hint to the manufacturers that they need not be afraid to support the Liberal party, because the existing protective policy would not be interfered with. I have said that it is in the interest of the millers of this country that a declaration should now be made by the Government. During the elections, I was informed by millers in western Ontario that they were utterly unable to make sales of flour in the east. Their business was paralysed then, and to-day it is in very much the same condition. Where they obtained orders for thousands of barrels of flour before the election, now they are obtaining orders for hundreds. These men were unable to pay the farmers the prices for wheat which they formerly paid. That is a loss to the miller on his business, and a loss to the farmer on the grain he has to sell. For instance, on the 26th of April last, the day after the House rose, the price of wheat in the city of Toronto was 80 cents a bushel, and that same day the price of wheat in Liverpool was 81 cents, only 1 cent higher for No. 1 California wheat, showing the high price relatively that the farmers of this country were obtaining here for their produce. But on the 15th of June the price in the city of Toronto had fallen to 72 cents, and the price in Liverpool had fallen to only 78 cents, a decrease in the price at Liverpool of three cents and in the city of Toronto of eight cents; showing that relatively the price was decreasing. On September 21st, only a day or two ago, in Toronto the same wheat is quoted at 67 cents, whereas at Liverpool it has risen to 85 cents. This is evidence sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind that the farmers of this country are not realizing to-day the prices they would have realized had there been no change of Government; and had we to-day the assurance from the Government that the same policy of protection would be observed with reference to agricultural products, that the same measure of protection would be afforded to the farmers of this country that has been afforded to them in years past. I have

not the slightest hesitation in saying that the price of wheat would take the same level, as compared with the price in Liverpool, that it had on the 26th of April, when the House was dissolved.

The same argument would apply to other articles, for instance, pork. The pork packers at the present time are not prepared to pay the prices they formerly paid. Were they assured that the same protection now given to the pork industry would be continued, I have no doubt they would again pay their former prices. But realizing that in a few months hence the product they are buying may be placed on the free list, and that this country may be flooded with the hog products of the United States, they are not willing to pay the price they would if they had such an assurance. I appeal to the Government on behalf of the great agricultural classes of this country, whom I represent. We do not ask them to give us the details of their policy ; we do not ask them to say whether the duty on pork is to be 2 cents, 3 cents or 4 cents per pound ; but I do ask them to say whether or not the principle of protection is to be continued, so that the agriculturists of the country will know what to do. This is the season of the year when the farmers are placing their grains on the market. What shall they do with them ? Shall they sell them for what they will bring, or shall they, as in past years, feed their course grains to their hogs, and sell their hogs later on ? The leader of the Government can now by one word tell the farmers of this country what would put hundreds and thousands of dollars into their pockets. It is certainly desirable that such should be done in the interest of the pepole of this country.

I hope that before this Parliament rises, at all events, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will give us more definite information as to what the policy of the Government shall be, so that the people of this country may know how to direct their course in their business transactions. The tenant farmers throughout this country at the present time, hundreds and thousands of them in every section of the country, are entering into contracts of five or six years tenancy. What are these men going to do ? Are they going to enter into such contracts ? No, they are going to wait. They want to see what the policy of the Government is going to be. If the policy of the Government is to be the downfall of protection, as we have been told over and over again it was going to be, then these people do not want to rent farms ; they do not want to enter into engagements. Consequently, to every class of the community, the agricultural class largely, but the business and manufacturing classes especially, it is important—not that we should have the details of the plan of the Government ; we do not ask that ; it would not be reasonable to expect hon. gentlemen to give that. But throughout the length and breadth of this country there will be disappointment if the Government decline to make some more definite declaration as to what policy they will pursue in the formation of the tariff which is to be brought down at the next meeting of Parliament.

Having emphasized this matter, I do not wish to detain the House longer. It was not my intention, when I rose, to do so. I have drawn attention to the most pertinent point, and I desire again to express my hope that either during this discussion, before this resolution is voted upon, or before the House rises, some declaration of policy may be made by which the people of the country will be enabled so to direct their affairs that the losses which they may sustain by reason of the uncertainty and disquietude that exists at the present time may be reduced to as small a minimum as possible. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for your courteous hearing.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this hour of the evening or at this stage of the debate to make a lengthy speech ; but I feel, as representing a county in which everything depends on a continuance of the policy adopted by the late Government, that I would be recreant to my duty if I did not call the attention of the Government to the fact that in that county at least, the great mining and iron manufacturing industries are in a great state of uncertainty, I may say jeopardy, so long as the Government do not give the country to understand what their policy is likely to be. Great stress has been laid in the course of this discussion on the fact that the Government could not be expected to be prepared to meet the House at this time with a tariff framed in all its details. I have to say that such remarks from speakers on the other side of the House are clearly evasions of the point made by the Opposition, as set forth in the resolution proposed by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). That resolution is so worded as to guard carefully against such an impression being taken from it. It sets forth in the various " whereases " in the body of the resolution the fact that the public utterances of the gentlemen who constitute the Government, going back over a number of years, have varied so much, have been so indefinite, have expressed so many different opinions, that at this moment it is impossible for any member of this House or any citizen of this country to form any reasonable conclusion as to what the present opinion of the Government is. That being the case—and that state of affairs was carefully elaborated and brought out in the speech delivered by the hon. member for York—I am sure that no hon. member at this moment can pretend to so misunderstand the nature of that resolution as to think that it calls on the Government at this time to elaborate a tariff. It asks nothing of the kind. It simply asks the Government to do

away with the uncertainty in which this country stands, and to let the country know whether their policy is to be free trade or protection. Between these two there is a very wide difference. I think it is not asking the First Minister of Canada too much to ask him to say whether he is a free trader or a protectionist; and if he should go so far as to say he is the one or the other, he would still leave to himself—he would at least, if he said he was a protectionist—a wide room to frame the tariff afterwards. It is true, if he said that the Government were for free trade, then the plea for delay would lose a good deal of its force; then the Government could not ask the House to give much time for the preparation of a tariff measure. It would be a simple matter. It would do away with all tariff duties and provide the revenue from some other source. Now, although this debate has continued for a considerable time, unfortunately the longer speeches have been made by the Opposition, and the Government have not given the information we desire to receive. Even those remarks that have fallen from the Government side of the House have not been satisfactory at all. Why? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce stated definitely that the policy of the Government was to be found in the resolutions laid down in Ottawa in 1893, which was, as nearly as I can recollect, a tariff for revenue only, but on the other hand, we have had the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who addressed this House at great length, rather contradicting that statement, because he asked this House to believe that all the various opinions which have been made public during the last number of years by the Liberal party were to be held as merely expressions of opinion advanced by various gentlemen attached to the Liberal party, and not to be received as expressing the views of the Liberal party as a whole, so that at this moment we are just in the same position that we stood in when the debate began. Thus after we have been sitting here a month, we are still face to face with the Government occupying the same position of indefiniteness as did their candidates during the late campaign, when you could not tie any one of them to any fixed line of policy. We felt that to be a very serious disadvantage, when discussing public matters throughout the constituencies of Canada, but we did not believe it possible that after Parliament had sat for a month the Government should have managed to evade the direct question to which they should have been prepared to give a straight answer. Their policy, however, is still unknown, and we are still just as much in the dark as when the constituencies were being contested by the contending parties. It may be that that is creditable to the Government, but I am sure that it is exceedingly unsatisfactory to the country, and I do not think it is at all worthy of any hon. gentleman occupying a seat in this House to endeavour to fasten on the Opposition the charge that they are seeking to create uneasiness and a spirit of unrest, and are anxious to disturb business, because they endeavour to obtain information from the Government which it should be most ready to make known. The people's representatives are kept in the dark, and when we ask for light, we are told that we are seeking to create uneasiness and distrust in business circles. That is an exceedingly unfair charge, and a still more absurd one. For if there is one thing more calculated to create uneasiness among business men than another, it is uncertainty as to the trade policy which is to govern the country.

If this House closes in a few days, as we expect it will, I shall go back to Pictou where there are millions of dollars invested in mines and other industries, giving employment to thousands of men, women and children, whose living depends on the continuance of these great industries, brought into operation by the National Policy. And when my constituents ask me what guarantee they have that this state of affairs, established by the late Government, is to continue and the prosperity now enjoyed to continue, I am to be compelled to say that, in spite of every effort, made in the most legitimate fashion, after the protracted interview we have had with the Government, we are still in complete ignorance of their purposes and intentions.

It may be considered creditable to the Government to so evade direct replies, and so trifle with the questions before this House as to send away the representatives of the people absolutely in the dark, but they must surely understand that such conduct is most unsatisfactory to the people. I implore them to take the advice given them by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Robertson), and if they are deterred by the fear of any charge of inconsistency, so far as this side of the House is concerned, if they will continue in the course followed by the late Government during the last eighteen years, and not disturb what is practically a settled issue under which the people have made such steady if not phenomenal progress, we shall give them our support, and there will be no difficulty finding other issues on which we can oppose them in the country. But when a policy has been deliberately adopted by the country and endorsed, over and over again, every few years, and when the country has made rapid progress under that policy, there can be no good reason for disturbing it. Not a reason has been advanced in the course of the debate to show why that policy should be changed. In view of these facts, it would be well for the country if we could agree to adopt and continue the policy of the late Government and accept the principle of protection—that principle which declares that the business of Canada shall belong to Canadians, that we will

meet hostile tariffs with hostile tariffs. The country would then be relieved from the uncertainty which now prevails. I do not know that the Government is not going to agree to this. There are indications that they are. For instance, there is the declaration made to us not long ago by a gentleman representing a large manufacturing centre, in which he expressed himself as certain that the Government would do nothing to injure the manufacturers. If that means anything, it means that they are going to continue the National Policy. Why, then, can they not say so? They need not give details, but simply declare that they are going to be protectionists. It would be difficult for us, however, to accept that opinion without a declaration, because we cannot forget that for years past they have been declaring on every platform that they are free traders. I wish to impress this fact on the Government, that if they are prepared to allow us to retain the advantages we have enjoyed under the policy of protection, continuing that policy with only such light, modifications as they may think necessary, I am in a position to say that they will obtain the support of many hon. gentlemen on this side.

We have never bound ourselves down, as a party, to any particular tariff. We adopted protection as a system and we have arranged duties so as practically to protect the industries of the country, but we have never bound ourselves to any list of duties. And the great changes made three years ago, by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance, showed that we were perfectly prepared to modify and change the tariff, as the changed circumstances of the country required. In respect of that point, should the Government come down and propose modifications and changes merely, they would be going on in the line pursued by the Liberal-Conservative party, and in such a case the Liberal-Conservative party could not challenge them, and would be bound to support them. But what we ask, and what we have a right to ask, is that the Government should say to us and through us to the country, whether they are free traders or whether they are for protection, or whether they are for free trade as it is in England, or whether they are for some other policy. Let us have some kind of security, some kind of information, some intelligent answer to give to our people when we return to them, and they ask us what the Government is going to do.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Foster):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Beattie,	LaRivière,
Bell (Addington),	Macdonald (King's),
Bell (Pictou),	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bennett,	Maclean,
Bergeron,	McAlister,
Bethune,	McCleary,
Blanchard,	McCormick,
Boisvert,	McDougall,
Borden (Halifax),	McGillivray,
Broder,	McInerney,
Cargill,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Carscallen,	Marcotte,
Casgrain,	Martin,
Clancy,	Mills,
Clarke,	Monk,
Cochrane,	Montague,
Corby,	Moore,
Costigan,	Morin,
Craig,	Osler,
Davin,	Powell,
Dimock,	Prior,
Dugas,	Quinn,
Dupont,	Reid,
Earle,	Robinson,
Foster,	Roche,
Ganong,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Seagram,
Gilmour,	Sproule,
Guillet,	Taylor,
Hackett,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hale,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt,
Henry,	Wallace,
Hodgins,	Wilson,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville).—76.
Klock,	
Kloepfer,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Landerkin,
Bain,	Lang,
Bazinet,	Laurier,
Beausoleil,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Legris,
Belcourt,	Lemieux,
Bernier,	Lewis,
Blair,	Lister,
Borden (King's),	Livingston,
Bostock,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Lount,
Bourbonnais,	Macdonald (Huron),
Britton,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Brodeur,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacPherson,
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Burnett,	McGugan,
Calvert,	McHugh,
Cameron,	McInnes,
Carroll,	McIsaac,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McLennan (Inverness),
Casey,	McMillan,
Charlton,	McMullen,
Choquette,	Madore,
Christie,	Maxwell,
Copp,	Meigs,
Davies,	Migneault,
Dechene,	Monet,
Desmarais,	Morrison,
Devlin,	Mulock,
Dobell,	Oliver,
Domville,	Parmalee,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dupré,	Penny,
Dyment,	Pettet,
Ellis,	Préfontaine,
Erb,	Ratz,
Ethier,	Richardson,
Fauvel,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Robertson,
Fielding,	Rogers,
Fiset,	Russell,

Fisher,	Savard,
Fitzpatrick,	Scriver,
Flint,	Semple,
Fraser (Guysboro'),	Somerville,
Fraser (Lambton),	Stenson,
Frost,	Stubbs,
Gauthier,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Talbot,
Gibson,	Tarte,
Godbout,	Tolmie,
Guay,	Tucker,
Haley,	Turcot,
Harwood,	Wood (Hamilton),
Hurley,	Yeo.—113.
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
McCarthy,	Ingram,
Langelier,	Poupore,
Pouliot,	Hughes,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Edwards,	Roddick,
Cowan,	MacLaren,
Hutchison,	Boyd,
Fortin,	Chauvin,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) has voted. He is recorded as being paired every evening during the session after ten o'clock with the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont asked to have that pair cancelled, and I thought that was understood by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). If there is any fault, it is mine, because I informed the hon. member for Hamilton that it was the wish of the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont that the pair should be cancelled since last Monday—that is before the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont was taken sick.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will leave it to the hon. member for Hamilton himself. Was he paired or not ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I was paired every night after ten o'clock, but I understood from the hon. whip that the gentleman with whom I was paired had requested that the pair be cancelled.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Chair can have nothing to do with pairs. This is a matter for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) himself. Does the hon. gentleman desire to vote ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If the pair is off I desire to vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not off. This is a matter between the whips.

Mr. SPEAKER. I know nothing about the whips. The hon. gentleman will have to make his decision, and he can vote or not, as he wishes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman requested me to strike it off, and it is struck off.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did you mention that to the other whip ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not on the list furnished by the hon. gentleman's clerk to-day. I wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think there can be any proper discussion on this question. I must leave it to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that I may have omitted, through my clerk, to notify the whip.

Mr. FOSTER. That would leave the whip without an opportunity to arrange for another pair.

Mr. TAYLOR. The pair was declared off for one night only.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was an arrangement made for one night with another hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must put an end to this irregular discussion. Does the hon. member for Hamilton desire his vote recorded ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I desire to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) voted, although he was not in the House when the motion was put.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) hear the whole of the question within the walls of this House ?

Mr. REID. In French alone.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman heard the whole question in either language, he is entitled to vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) and the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) did not vote.

Mr. LISTER. This other matter is not settled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am paired with the hon. member for St. Antoine Division, Montreal (Mr. Roddick). Had I been free to vote, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was paired with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Kendry). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. GUAY. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) did not vote..

Mr. FORTIN. I was paired with the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin). Had I not been paired, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. POUPORE. I was paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MACLAREN. I was paired with the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan). Had I been free to vote, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) did not state that he had heard——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman answered me that he had heard the resolution.

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

(In the Committee.)

(Some hon. gentlemen sang the first verse of the National Anthem.)

Mr. TISDALE. I want to know if it is in order to sing and cheer when the Speaker is in the Chair, or when the House is in committee, with the Deputy Speaker in the Chair? I think it is out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think there are exceptional reasons why we might be allowed to sing "God Save the Queen" on this day. I propose that we take up item 9:

The Department of the Interior, including $1,800 each to two astronomers, William Ogilvie and Otto J. Klotz, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $104,444

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible for us to vote supplies when the House is very nearly a mob.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. I appeal to the Chair if the hon. gentleman has a right to call this House a mob.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that unless you keep order, Mr. Chairman, and unless the Government who, in conjunction with you, certainly have a very large share in that duty, can, when we are in Committee of Supply, assist you in maintaining order, we ought not to be asked to go on with the Estimates. But if we are going to reduce ourselves to order, I want to take the opportunity to object to any item being passed in the Estimates with reference to the Department of the Interior until the Prime Minister has given satisfactory statements to this House as to when that office is to be filled.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Take your seat, and it will be given now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask for the protection of the Chair. If an hon. gentleman is to come out in front of the Chair, and is to stand there and order me to take my seat whilst I am on my feet, and doing what I have a perfect right to do as a member of this House, I want to know it. I want to know definitely whether this mob-rule is going to be continued. The Opposition have some rights in this House, and one right is not to be insulted in the presence of the Chair.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no occasion at all for this display of feeling by my hon. friend. He forgets that this is an exceptional day. The exuberance of feeling which is manifested by hon. members, is quite pardonable in view of the fact that to-day Her Majesty has completed the longest reign in the history of England. Now, there will be no trouble at all in getting down to business. The hon. gentleman says that he objects to any item being taken in the Estimates for the Interior Department until he knows what is the policy of the Government with regard to this department. I have to say to the hon. gentleman that for the present, and perhaps, for a few days more, or a few weeks, at most, the Government thinks this department, for good reasons, ought to remain as it is, in abeyance. The position of affairs, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a peculiar one at the present time. It is not at all extraordinary for a Government taking office, to leave a portfolio open for a few days. The hon. gentleman knows that there are good precedents for this course. If the hon. gentleman will look back through the history of his own party, he will remember that in the Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald a most important portfolio, that of Railways, was kept open for ten or twelve months. When the hon. gentleman, the present leader of the Opposition, was appointed High Commissioner, he vacated the portfolio of Railways. He vacated it on the 24th May, 1884. Parliament met on the 29th January, 1885. As every body will remember, that session of 1885 was a most important session, it lasted for nearly six months. It opened on the 29th January and did not conclude, if my memory serves me right, until the 23rd July. During all that time the portfolio of Railways was vacant, and it was not until the following month of September that it was filled by the appointment of the Hon. J. H. Pope. That portfolio of Railways remained vacant under circumstances which were not at all parallel to the present circumstances and were not as favourable. Surely my hon. friend can allow the present Administration to keep this portfolio vacant for a few weeks more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I remember the case stated by the First Minister, but I think the circumstances are widely different. The committee will remember that when I first assumed the duties of High Commissioner, I retained the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, in 1883, and the committee will remember that the late Mr. Pope was discharging, in my absence, the duties of that office, and that he continued to discharge those duties, being thoroughly familiar with the whole subject, and in a better position to do so than any other member of the Government, or than any person that could be brought into the office. The case, therefore, was entirely different from the present case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Ha, ha, ha.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman laughs, but I want to ask him if, when statements are made in the press of the country, day after day, that the office is being held open for bargain and sale—I want to know if any such condition of things existed in that day as exists at the present time. I say that in my judgment a more scandalous state of things has never existed in relation to any portfolio. This country has been treated to a discussion in the press throughout the country for months as to the means the Government might be able to adopt by the disposal of this vacant portfolio in order to deal with an important public question. In my parliamentary experience I know of no similar case. There are conferences taking place, delegations rushing down from Winnipeg and the far west to support some gentleman's claim for the position and then other delegations coming to support the claims of some other individual. It is stated that the disposal which the Government of the day wish to make of the office is to enable them to meet the emergency, because one claimant for the office threatens to take the field against them. I have never seen in any country with which I am acquainted where parliamentary government exists such a condition of things as has existed and now exists, and which I have no hesitation in saying is becoming a scandal, one calculated to throw great discredit on the Government in connection with this office. The Government has no right to make a matter of bargain and sale, however great their necessities may be, the appointment to a portfolio. That is the position this question is now assuming in the presence of the people of this country and of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to say in answer to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman says the Government has no right to make a bargain and sale of this portfolio. The Government has no intention to make it a matter of bargain or sale; but if the hon. gentleman is going to accept press rumours as facts, he will find himself much mistaken. What matters it if delegations come here, what matters it if delegations go there, or the press reports this or that? The Government will be prepared when the portfolio is filled to lay the whole matter before Parliament, and will invite the most severe criticism of friends and foes on this question. The hon. gentleman says he has never seen any such a scandalous matter before. He states that there is a great difference between the position in 1884 and that of to-day. The hon. gentleman says there is no bargain and sale at the present time, I will not say there was then; but everybody knows that there was a vacant portfolio because there was a race between one member and another member for the position. It is well known that if it was not filled at once because the legitimate claims of Mr. Chapleau to fill the office were not acknowledged. I have, therefore, only to say this, that the remarks of the hon. gentleman were entirely uncalled for, that he has no right, no authority and no reason to assume there is anything wrong going on at the present time. There is no right or authority for a single moment which would warrant the statement he made a moment ago that the Government were making the appointment to the vacant portfolio a matter of bargain and sale. At the present time the portfolio is not filled: but so soon as the position is filled and the name given to the House, the Government will be prepared to meet any criticism, and then, and not before, it will be open to the hon. gentleman to offer any criticism which he may think the occasion demands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that the Government were holding out this portfolio as a matter of bargain or sale; but I said the course taken by the Government and the notorious facts, which are patent to the whole country, are creating that impression among the people. I affirm that this action is calculated to be injurious to the system of parliamentary government. I say more, that the House knows that for a long period the constituency of Brandon has been disfranchised. The House knows that with Parliament in session the people of Brandon were entitled to have a prompt decision as to whether the hon. gentleman elected to represent that constituency, decided to elect to sit for that or another constituency, for they were entitled not to be prevented from having a representative in this House. It may suit the convenience of the Government, but the fact that no measures are taken by the Government to give to the electors of two constituencies the representation to which they are entitled under the constitution is an additional reason why this matter should not be interminably kept in a position that I say, causes it to be regarded. It is a matter of public notoriety, taken in connection with the statements in the press and the negotia-

tion going on in reference to this matter and the grounds for those negotiations, all of which have so strong an air of probability, that intelligent people of the country entertain no doubt as to why it is that the portfolio of the Department of the Interior, one of the most important portfolios in the Cabinet, especially at the present, should remain unfilled, and that a constituency, which may furnish a seat at some future day for some person who may be able to secure the position, should be in the meantime kept open. There is another fact, and that is that we have had an authentic statement made by the First Minister in this House that the Manitoba school question was on the eve of settlement. We have had in the press the announcement, made in the most distinct and emphatic terms when it was very useful to the Government to have such a statement made by the leading organ of the Government, that the question was absolutely settled ; yet the last time I asked for information on this matter the hon. Prime Minister had no intimation to give except that the matter is now open and unsettled and he could give no further information to the House. When I asked when the constituencies to which I referred would have an opportunity of being represented in this House, the hon. gentleman gave what I think was an answer scarcely to be expected from the First Minister of the Crown, that at some day beyond the present, elections would be held—an answer entirely evasive, containing no information except an intimation that so long as it suited the convenience of the Government and their political purposes they would disfranchise an important constituency and prevent the people having that representation in this House to which they are entitled.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Notwithstanding the explanation which has been given by the leader of the Government, I still object to any Estimates being passed for the Interior Department while the portfolio of the Minister of the Interior remains without a holder. My hon. friend has endeavoured to cite a precedent in the case, of the Minister of Railways in the session of 1884-85. I contend that the two cases are not at all parallel. In that case the portfolio was filled by a member of the Government who represented a province which had more than one representative in the Cabinet, whereas in this case, so long as the portfolio remains vacant, the great western portion of this country extending from Lake Superior to the Pacific coast remains without Cabinet representation. And particularly is this the case, when my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has not seen fit to give any of the representatives of the Pacific province a seat in this Cabinet, so that the great province of British Columbia, as well as the prairie section of the country is at present without a representative. Even, as acting Minister of the Interior, we have a gentleman who does not occupy a seat in this House, and the member of the Cabinet who does act for the Department of the Interior here, and who undertakes to answer any question asked by members respecting matters relating to that department, and who takes up any motions referring to that department, knows nothing whatever of the western country, and I venture to think cares nothing for it.

Under these circumstances I believe that I am acting in the interest not only of Canada in general, but of the western section of the country in particular, in asking, that before any money is voted for the service of that department, a Minister should be named. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) cannot say that he has no men to choose from who could competently fill that position. We have representatives in this House supporting him from Manitoba, from the Northwest Territories, and from British Columbia, and from what I know of some of these gentlemen, and from what I have heard of others, I have no doubt that they would fill the position as well as new men could be expected to do, and certainly as well as some of the colleagues of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) are likely to fill the departments which they at present control. And, if none of the members in the House possess the requirements which the Prime Minister considers necessary for his Minister of the Interior, why should not my late opponent (Mr. Martin) be given that portfolio ? He is certainly a gentleman who deserves it, as having fought harder for his party in the west than any man at present living in that part of the country. I believe, from remarks that I have seen quoted as being made by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), that he possesses a high opinion of Mr. Martin's ability, and Mr. Martin certainly possesses an intimate knowledge of the wants and requirements of the western country. Besides that, Mr. Martin has a claim on the gratitude of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) ; for had it not been for Mr. Martin's action, my hon. friend and his party would not now be occupying the Treasury benches. Had not Mr. Martin introduced the school question in Manitoba and by so doing excited the feelings of race and creed throughout Canada, the result of the last elections would have been very different from what it was. Unless the sense of gratitude of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is like what has been described as a lively sense of favours to come, and unless he considers that Mr. Martin's usefulness is gone; I think that from motives of gratitude alone, he ought not pass over the claims of that gentleman.

But if he does, we have heard mentioned the name of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, the Attorney General of Manitoba. Mr. Sifton also knows the country well, and although I am not advocating his claims as I think they are vastly inferior from a party stand-

point to those of Mr. Martin, still he knows the country well, and in his own interests if he were in this House would doubtless look after the interests of the western portion of Canada. But he, too, is left to attend to his duties in a lower sphere, and to act in the future as he has done for some years in the past, as Attorney General for the province of Manitoba. Such being the case, it is hardly fair we should be asked to pass these Estimates; to vote large sums of money to be expended by men who know nothing of the country, know nothing of its needs or requirements, and who must be guided by the advice of men of whom, they being new in office, can know personally very little. I do not wish for one moment to cast any aspersions or to excite any suspicion against the officers of the Department of the Interior or of the Indian Department, over both of which the Minister of the Interior presides. But I know this: that no man stepping newly into office can of necessity have such an intimate knowledge of the qualifications of these gentlemen as to justify him in acting on their advice, when he has no knowledge of his own to show whether that advice leads him in the right line or not. It is, therefore, only fair that we should press my hon. friend the leader of the Government to fill this portfolio before he asks us to vote the very large sum of money required to meet the wants of the Department of the Interior. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House longer at this late hour of the night, but I trust that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) will give this matter his immediate attention, and will not press for the adoption of these Estimates until he is ready to tell us who is to have the disposal of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. FOSTER. We are not ready to pass the item. The weakness of the case presented to us is this: that my hon. friend the Prime Minister has not intimated one single difficulty which lies in his way to prevent him from filling the portfolio of the Interior. He has simply stated that he has not been able to fill it, and that private and confidential negotiations are going on, but he has not indicated any reason why it is difficult, or why the House should grant him further delay in the matter. Since I have been in Parliament, I recollect that probably no stronger denunciation has been hurled by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) against the Liberal-Conservative party, than that for a single day while Parliament was in session there should be any constituency in Canada which was not represented on the floor of Parliament. These denunciations arising out of the very principles of Liberalism and constitutional government, were hurled by the hon. gentleman and his friends across the floor of the House. It is the very first principle of well-founded Liberalism and of constitutional government, that the people's representatives shall have an opportunity of making their wants known in the High Court of Parliament. More especially is that the case, when the supplies for the service of the country are being criticised, and when, as in the present instance, we find, geographically speaking, the larger half of the Dominion unrepresented in the Government. In the province of Manitoba and North-west two constituencies have been absolutely unrepresented during this entire Parliament, without the Government making the least motion towards giving the electors a chance of sending their representatives to this House. Now, sometimes a Prime Minister may find a difficulty in choosing a man upon whom his eye falls for a representative position like this; not so much perhaps from choosing his as to secure for the time being a constituency in which he can run and be elected. In this case there is no difficulty of that kind. The constituency of Brandon, a most important constituency, has not been represented in this House during this whole Parliament, and has been confessedly standing open as the probable seat, the Prime Minister thinks, of the gentleman who is to be the Minister of the Interior. So that there is the constituency: it has been kept unrepresented. There is no difficulty, then, in finding the place for the candidate, when he may be selected. There is no difficulty in that. What difficulty is in the way? My hon. friend has not given a single public reason why that office has not been filled, or a reason which should stand as a difficulty in his way or should pave the way for his plea that indefinite delay shall be given; more than that, it was the intention of the Prime Minister himself at the beginning of this session evidently was that no lengthened delay should occur. My hon. friend will recollect that the matter was brought up in the discussion on the Address, and that the question was then raised why a full Cabinet had not met Parliament. No difficulties having been represented by the Prime Minister as standing in the way of the selection of a Minister of the Interior, a short time afterwards, when the Estimates were under review, on the item of Civil Government, I made objection myself to the item being passed without a responsible head for the department; and the objection seemed to be so well taken that my hon. friend assented to it and promised that he would soon be in a position to make his announcement, when the items could be taken up and passed in the regular order. My hon. friend felt at that time that it was a reasonable objection, because he would have it in his power in a short time to take away from the force of that objection, and he actually set the day on one occasion when he should make the announcement. What has happened since? Now, my hon. friend presses that the item shall pass. There is still no Minister. The

portfolio is still vacant. What has happened to change my hon. friend's views? You cannot help the conclusion which the country will come to, and is coming to. The country is coming to the conclusion that my hon. friend is holding and dangling the office of Minister of the Interior for party and political purposes. What is the party and political purpose? Is it that he cannot choose a man of sufficient weight and capability to fill the office? Not at all. My hon. friend and late colleague has pointed out two or three whose merits and claims are evidently being canvassed before my hon. friend, who would amply fill that office —one of them a gentleman who has supported my hon. friend, and supported him strongly, to whom he owes in many ways a very great debt of gratitude; and the other a capable man, I am told, and who lies somewhat in the line of the preferments which my hon. friend is showering in other parts of the Dominion. He has rewarded the different friendly provincial governments one by one. He picks out the premier of one province, he picks out the premier of another, and for services well and truly rendered they get their reward. When he cannot find a portfolio with which to reward another, he goes back upon the principle which he has enunciated in this House and in the country, that, when a Government has a strong Minister of Justice and a strong Solicitor General, they have no business feeing lawyers for political purposes and giving them hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money, when those two officers are amply sufficient to do the legal work of the country. But the rewards have to be given; and as Prince Edward Island, for services rendered, has not, so far as its local government is concerned, had the proper reward, a very nice, very fat, and very remunerative office, it is said, has been given to the provincial premier; and we have to-day the spectacle in Canada from the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, who with his party thundered on all the high-roads and by-roads of Canada that there should be a complete severance of political dealing between the Dominion Government and the different provincial governments—we have this hon. gentleman going back on his record and the record of his party; and, when he cannot find portfolios with which to reward provincial governments that put their whole force into his contests and rallied the whole force of their civil service employees to his aid, he gives them legal perquisites, bringing the premier of one of the provinces, who has served him well, and placing him where he shall receive large fees for services which ought to be performed by a Minister of Justice who is well able to perform them, and by a Solicitor General who stands second to none, I believe, of the lawyers of Quebec in legal ability. Now, my hon. friend has one more provincial government to look after, that is the provincial government of Manitoba. He has a special reason for regarding with favour that government. That government, as my hon. friend has said, set the ball in motion which has been kicked and tossed, and kicked, for these last five or six years, for party purposes, and for party purposes only —started by the Liberal party and kept up by the Liberal party, until the game is won, and my hon. friend, as he said a while ago, sits there, whilst we sit here. He has good reason to bestow favours upon that government. He has been waiting to settle a great question. Will the hon. gentleman say that he has not filled his portfolio of Minister of the Interior because the Manitoba school question is still unsettled? What other question is there that should cause inconvenience? He has the constituency: it is crying to be represented here. It is a shame that it is not represented here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen do not think it is now. The spirit of Canadian and English Liberalism no longer animates them. Now that they are on the Treasury benches, they forget all about principles. They are bound together by the cement of office and emolument; principles do not count any longer. But, when they were on this side of the House, the principles of the old English Liberal school were the principles for which they fought, for which they were willing to bleed, for which if need be they were willing to die. These hold no longer. The constituency is still there. It cries to be represented. My hon. friend stops both ears to the cry. But there is a question in view: it is the Manitoba school question. Last year, my hon. friend sat in that seat, and the policy of my hon. friend, the alternative policy to all the other policies, was that before the Manitoba school question was attempted to be settled, information was absolutely necessary for the people of the country, as well as for the Parliament of the country. He said for the people of the country. He declared that you could not force matters. He said he had to rely on the moral sentiment of the people. Ministers might know of this question; but the people had to be informed. How? They could only be informed by a commission, and his policy was to appoint a commission to look into the matter, to get the facts of the case, to spread them, not merely before the Government and Parliament, but before the people; so that, after this gathering of the facts and spreading them, the calmer sense and good feeling of the people might settle this question by moral suasion, and there would be no occasion for bringing it before Parliament. He has not whimpered about a commission since he sat on that side of the House. Does he intend to appoint a commission? The information was absolutely necessary then. My hon. friend who sits behind him

(Mr. Tarte) was also in favour of a commission, but he wanted it to issue and make its findings and its report at the last session before it closed. My hon. friend who leads the Government rose in opposition to that. He wanted a commission, but it was not to report its findings just then, as the elections were intervening. To-day there is no commission and no information needed, and we are justified in supposing that it is the school question which is the trouble now. Is he trying to settle it and square himself with the province at the same time? Is he trying to make everything smooth? Is he trying to get some coign of vantage on which the late member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) may safely be placed, so that when the portfolio is given, it may bring the peace and quietness which will flow from a school question so settled? Is that the difficulty which lies in his path? If that be the line he is pursuing, this country will look upon the settlement as a matter of bargain and sale, and the sooner the hon. gentleman opposite gets his portfolio filled, the sooner he will rid himself of that imputation and the better by far it will be for the country. He has not given one reason why he has revised his opinion of a fortnight ago, when he said that on Thursday of a certain week he would make the announcement. He has given no intimation to the House of what his difficulties are and has not appealed to the House for more delay. Then he comes down and asks us to vote estimates for the Department of the Interior, to be administered by whom? No one in this House that we know of will be responsible for it. There is to be a new policy in that great Northwest, and that policy is not stated in the House and there is no Minister here to state it. But still he asks for the Estimates. I ask him if it is fair that he should call upon us to vote nearly a million of dollars for the expenditure of which there is no Minister responsible, and when there is no one to explain or carry out the new policy about which he spoke so hopefully. But is my hon. friend courting delay for another reason? Can it be possible that the Abbé Proulx has been sent on a mission by him to Rome? And is it because he has not yet made his entry into the Holy City, that we have this delay? And how long is the delay to last? How many more embassies are there to be? How many more people remain to be squared? How many more favours are to be conferred? Does he not see that while he delays in this way he is damaging public interests?

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to an incident which makes his conduct appear as a scandal before the country. The hon. gentleman and those supporting him have charged the bishops of the province of Quebec with undue interference in the recent elections in the matter of the school question. We have been told, in a leading organ, that an embassy has been sent to Rome to discipline those bishops for their conduct in the recent election. If that be the case and the portfolio is to be vacant until that discipline is administered, the Government are committing a scandal. If the bishops have done wrong, and the Government propose to discipline them by appealing to a foreign court, ignoring Canadian law, they are taking a step which is unprecedented and which no free people should stand? If the bishops have done wrong, let them be disciplined here and now. The people are under the impression that one reason why the school question is not settled and the portfolio held open is because the Government are afraid to vindicate Canadian law, and go instead to a foreign country to discipline men who, they say, have done wrong against Canadian law. In that case their conduct is scandalous, and as long as they keep the portfolio vacant they lay themselves open to such imputations.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No one can possibly object to legitimate criticism on the part of the Opposition when any Estimate of supply is proposed. The line taken by the leader of the Opposition, supported by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), is one to which no objection can be taken. But there is a ludicrous side, and when we hear sane men, respectable gentlemen, leaders of public opinion, editors of newspapers, stand up and broach an utterly absurd theory which no one believes, we can come to no other conclusion but that the debate is being carried on for the mere purpose of postponing Supply. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) took twenty-five minutes by the clock in repeating arguments which were better advanced by his leader and by our gentlemanly friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald). He dragged in a reference to the employment of leading counsel on behalf of the Behring Sea Claims Commission. Knowing the motives which, I suppose, prompted him when in the Government, he implied that the legal gentleman retained had been bought and was being paid for services rendered. I suppose that was his high idea of public life when a member of the Government. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the gentleman from Prince Edward Island who was selected as leading counsel on the Behring Sea Claims Commission, was selected for his legal abilities and those only. He is one of the most able and distinguished lawyers in the Dominion, who, I am confident, will acquit himself ably before that distinguished tribunal. The hon. gentleman suggested that the Solicitor General and Attorney General should be employed. I can assure the hon. gentleman

that his Government left such a maze of law-suits—I am told they range at present in the neighbourhood of four hundred—behind them, that while the Minister of Justice is precluded practising before the courts the Solicitor General will be employed many a long day trying to get through the arrears of law business which hon. gentlemen opposite, for their own purposes, created. In reply to one or two remarks which fell from the hon. member for Winnipeg, I have no criticism to make, either as to the tone, the manner or the matter of his speech. I acknowledge that if he had been chosen, as a large section of his party desired he should be chosen as leader of his party—and a very creditable leader he would make—and if his party had been in power, he would have had a perfect right to make a selection of a Minister of the Interior. He gave us some intimation of what he would do. He weighed in the balance the gentlemen who had been named, he considered Mr. Clifford Sifton's claims, Mr. Joseph Martin's claims and the claims of other hon. gentlemen, and intimated that if he were premier—as he may be some day—his ideal of a Minister would be Mr. Joseph Martin. But the hon. gentleman is not first Minister, and the time for making a selection has not yet come to him. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) holds that distinguished position, and he tells the House that he is weighing most carefully the circumstances and hopes to be able in a few weeks at most, perhaps in a few days, to take the House into his confidence. What could be more reasonable or more fair. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said he did not give a reason, and then he went on to give one himself. His reason was: I fear the hon. gentleman is engaging in a diabolical attempt to smooth matters out. He resented it because in this school question, by means of which he sought to creep into power and by means of which he sought to break up this Dominion of Canada and to put class against class and creed against creed, and tramped from one end of the country to the other in his ignoble attempt—he is afraid my hon. friend may settle that question smoothly to the perfect satisfaction of all classes, races and creeds, and he cries out in horror at this attempt of my hon. friend. Let him possess his soul in patience. Sir, I had a good deal of sympathy with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to-night. Anybody who saw him when that vote was taken to-night, who saw the patent chagrin and rage expressed in his face, when the announcement of the vote was made and he began to feel that he was indeed utterly and beyond doubt in the cold shades of Opposition—anybody who watched the hon. gentleman could well understand the reason why he got up and, for twenty-five minutes poured out that long stream of words in repeating with amplifications the arguments his leader had put in a very terse way before. He may possess his soul in patience. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) gave the best answer that any Premier could give—that he is weighing all the circumstances, that he is progressing favourably, and that he hopes to make an announcement in a few days, and in doing it hopes to smooth out one of the greatest questions that have been known in this country. As to the vacancy in Brandon, of which the hon. gentleman speaks, the Government did not know and could not know before the House met that that vacancy would take place, and by no means can Brandon be represented here before the House is likely to rise. Of course the Opposition can keep the House here until October, or perhaps until November. But assuming they are going to act as a reasonable opposition would and take up only such time as they ought to take up in reasonable criticism of the propositions of the Government, the House will prorogue in about a week. Brandon could not be represented here within that time. So that the wailing cry which the hon. member for York, alone of all the people of Canada, hears is a figment of his own imagination. Brandon will be represented in proper time. I hope it will be represented by a Liberal, perhaps it will be represented by the Minister of the Interior and, possibly, by one of the gentlemen whose names he has mentioned.

Mr. DAVIN. We have been sitting here for a long time, and some members from the North-west and Manitoba would like to express their views upon this important question. I will, therefore, suggest that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that very grave and important reasons have been given already why we should not pass any Estimates for the Interior until a Minister has been appointed. There is a rumour abroad that has not been stated. And it would in my opinion, be more serious than any of the probabilities that have been mentioned, and the closing words of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would seem to confirm it. That rumour is this—that an arrangement having been made to give the Department of the Interior to Mr. Sifton, the school question has been settled on the basis of the alternative that was proposed by the Manitoba government at the Winnipeg conference, but the Government is afraid to meet Parliament under such circumstances; the Government is afraid to give Mr. Sifton the portfolio of the Interior, and, having surrendered to Mr. Sifton's view on the school question, the Government are afraid of its Quebec following to meet what possibly may take place. That is one of the positions that is placed before us. And if, under these circumstances, the Prime Minister has arranged to give the portfolio to

Mr. Sifton, if every arrangement is made and he is keeping back that fact from Parliament he, as a statesman, knows he is guilty of a very grave breach of constitutional decorum. Now, Sir, circumstances have arisen within a few days past that would seem to suggest that rumour is correct, but that difficulties have arisen and pressure is being brought to bear from various quarters. I have heard that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has had a conference on this subject with an eminent prelate. If he has had a conference on this subject with an eminent prelate and any arrangement has been come to, Parliament ought to know that too. Now, the hon. gentleman who has just sopken (Mr. Davies) taxed my hon. friend from York with irrelevancy in referring to the employment of Mr. Peters, the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island. But, Sir, that was strictly proper on the part of the hon. member for York, and for this reason —he was pointing out that it seemed to be the plan of the Prime Minister, the leader of the Liberal party, to have secured the influence in the various provinces by making an arrangement with the leading men in each province. Mr. Sifton was made one of the vice-presidents of the convention at the Rideau Rink, as Mr. Peters was and as, also, were others, for instance, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was one of the vice-presidents and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) also was one. And, as we have had these vice-presidents brought into important portfolios, and as Mr. Sifton is about to be brought in, there was no room for the other vice-presidents, and so it was perfectly proper for the hon. memebr for York in making his argument to comment on the fact that this gentleman was also provided for. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) sought to ridicule the position taken by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). The hon. member for East York, no doubt, speaks by the book as to the sentiment in Ontario at the present time on the subejct to which he referred, and if there be such a sentiment, if there be such a feeling in Ontario, it is a very important thing to bring before the House and it is a thing that, I apprehend, the Prime Minister would feel he ought to take notice of. Now, the "Globe" states that the school question has been settled, and if it had been settled, is it right to keep this House from the information that has been given to an eminent journalist? If it it has been settled, and if Mr. Sifton is to be the Minister of the Interior, is it right to keep that from the House? What authority has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that it will probably go to one of these two gentlemen?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say that; I said either one would suit.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the language was that it will probably be one of these two gentlemen. But suppose it might be one of these two gentlemen, and I think there cannot be any doubt that the idea is to give it to Mr. Sifton. Well, the position of Mr. Sifton, we know, is this, that he cannot come in except on the basis of the settlement suggested at the Winnipeg conference, and if he comes in on any other basis, he cannot be elected for any constituency in Manitoba. Now, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries seem to think that it is right that a whole session of Parliament should pass away without a Minister of the Interior being in this House. We have all the vast interest connected with that greater Canada in the North-west, and there should be a Minister here to deal with them. Take the subject I brought before the House yesterday. It is said that Mr. Forget, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, has sent out circulars to all the agents telling them that they must deal only with the friends of the Government. Then we have a letter in the press in regard to another department which shows that the Minister of Public Works has sent out letters in a case where there were two tenders of the same amount for a given work. Well, we have a Minister of Public Works here to give us information on that point, and it is one on precisely the same level with what was done by Mr. Forget in the North-west Territories. If Mr. Forget does that, I need hardly say that it is a most improper thing to do; but we have no Minister here to tell us whether he has done that with the authority of the department, or whether, having done it, he will be called to account. Now, I remember the First Minister saying about a week ago that in a few days, one or two days, and I think he named the day, he would be able to give us the name of the Minister. As he has not done that yet, I think it is not unreasonable that we should expect him to give us the positive reasons why he is unable to name the Minister. I repeat that it does look as if this department was being used as a huckstering machine to effect ends that should be effected in another way: it does look as if the department and its emoluments were being dangled as temptations before certain minds. But I think it also looks as if the hypothesis I first stated was correct, namely, that all arrangements had been made, but that hon. gentlemen are afraid to meet Parliament. For suppose the hon. gentleman has settled the school question on the basis of the alternative suggested at the Winnipeg conference, and if it is settled on that basis, it will have my entire approval. I suggested that basis myself in 1895, before that suggestion ever came from the Greenway government. But if that be so, I am told that the hon. gentleman might be in a very dangerous position in this House, because every man of his large majority of 35 from Quebec, is pledged

against that basis, and if the hon. gentleman were to bring Mr. Sifton into this House as Minister of the Interior, and if Mr. Sifton had to state what his position was on that burning question in Manitoba, we might have from behind the hon. gentleman himself a very embarrassing motion that would shear quite away his Quebec following. But if all the arrangements are completed, that is no reason why Parliament should be treated with want of confidence in regard to a matter all the particulars of which the House is entitled to know. Once more I appeal to the hon. leader of the House to let the committee rise, so that other hon. gentlemen who come from the North-west and Manitoba may be able to express their opinions upon this important question under more favourable circumstances than they can do at this hour of the night, when it is nearly two o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that I have unwittingly done an injustice to the hon. leader of the Government, and, if so, I am anxious to explain it. The hon. gentleman will remember that I asked him a question as to when the writ for Brandon would issue. I complained just now of the evasiveness of the answer which the hon. gentleman gave me. I confess I did not hear the answer, because it was accompanied by such great laughter on the part of the hon. gentleman's friends, and I asked some of my friends what the answer was, and they stated it as they understood it and as I mentioned it a little while ago. I looked at the newspaper next morning, and I was confirmed in that statement, because the "Citizen" of 23rd September said: "As to the writ for Brandon, we expect to have it issued some time from to-day." I think my hon. friend will consider that I was justified in treating that as a very evasive answer. I found, on looking at "Hansard," for confirmation of that statement, that the answer is not open to my objection. The answer, as reported in "Hansard," is: "As to the writ for Brandon, we expect to have it issued some time—probably to-day." If that was the answer, then I am certainly not in a position to charge my hon. friend with having evaded my question or treated it with such unbecoming levity. I shall be very glad to learn from the hon. gentleman which statement is correct.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not exactly remember the statement I made. The answer in the official report of the debates is not correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, I am afraid I shall not be able to withdraw my comment. We will all agree that there is no desire to protract the work of the session—we are all equally anxious to get through; but the hon. gentleman will see that under the circumstances which I have stated, the House is entitled to obtain from him, as leader of the Government, an intimation whether there is a reasonable prospect that at an early date this matter will be brought to a conclusion and the portfolio of the Interior filled. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to give the assurance that he will, at all events before Parliament rises, furnish that information.

The PRIME MINISTER. The question is a reasonable one. I am not prepared at this moment to give the hon. gentleman the answer he asks for. What is the position to-day? We are voting the Supplies. I do not see that any of the reasons adduced so far are cogent reasons why we should not proceed with the consideration of Supplies in the committee. When we come to a later stage, and the position taken by the Government is found not to be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, it will be open to him to move any motion he thinks the circumstances warrant, but, in the meantime, I tell my hon. friend frankly that I cannot give him an answer to the question he has put. Under the circumstances, the committee should proceed with the consideration of Supplies. Moreover, I would remind my hon. friend that it was understood that we would go on with Supply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, I expect the arrangement will be carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman should not endeavour to force that understanding so that it should apply to the estimates of the Department of the Interior, which we have asked to stand for the very reason that the leader of the Government has not made the statement desired. I think the leader of the Government ought to be able to say that before the House rises a satisfactory statement will be given to Parliament. This vote is for Civil Government, and is not the large vote for carrying on the service. Whatever may be said as to the latter vote, I suppose it follows, as a matter of course, that the officials of Ottawa must be paid and must be continued. I would not have any particular objection to this item passing to-night, but with the observation that before we are asked to pass the main estimates of the Interior Department, we must have some more definite statement from the Prime Minister. It is now very late, and my suggestion would be that, if the hon. gentleman could accede to this proposition, and it is only treating Parliament fairly, we should pass this item, and then the committee could rise.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must rely on the agreement I made yesterday. I agreed readily to the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, to have the debate adjourned until to-day, with the distinct understanding that the balance of the Estimates—those were the words used—would be carried, with such fair criticism as might be warranted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the members of the House have some rights in regard to this matter. It appears to me that the leader of the House is not treating it with that respect due in regard to so important a matter as this.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed for a few moments, he will no doubt understand my remarks. Of course, I know nothing of the negotiations going on yesterday, to which the hon. gentleman refers, but I am aware that time after time, when the Interior estimates have come up, the leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has at once taken objection to these items being dealt with until the announcement promised by the leader of the Government as to the portfolio of the Interior had been given to the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and none more readily than the Minister of Finance acquiesced most readily. I only speak for myself, but I am sure I express the opinion of hon. members on this side of the House, that we clearly understood that we would not be asked to vote the Interior estimates until it was known in whose hands the department would be placed, or, at least, understood the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to that portfolio. The hon. leader of the Government does not deny that time after time he told the House: "Yes, in a few hours," or "In a few days," or "In a very short time," he would be able to give the information. On one occasion the hon. gentleman fixed the time at Thursday. If the hon. gentleman takes the point that he was not bound to give the committee this information as to the Department of the Interior before he asked a vote for that department, I think he will not deny this, that, having promised time and time again, and having stated specifically on one occasion, at least, the date when he would give that information, he should, in all fairness, tell the House why he has broken his promise.

He has not intentionally done it, I suppose, but why is he unable at this stage of the session to give us the information which he then promised, and which he fully intended to give to the House. Sir, it is a most important question. We have a party on the other side of the House fresh from the people, and as we saw to-night filled with the flush of victory. We have a party there with a majority of 37 at their back to-night—larger of course than the majority which they should have owing to some absentees on this side of the House—but we have a party there with 37 majority to-night, and yet, with 37 majority, with a new Premier, a new leader of the Government in Canada, he is unable, after two months premiership to tell this House whether he is to complete his Government or not. I say it is a question which the country will seriously consider, and a question which this House ought to consider. I leave it to the judgment of the House, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has given us one single reason to-night why he is not able to fill that department. He has not suggested the shadow of a reason nor has he even said that he has tried to fill the position. And yet, not being in the position to say to the House that he has ever asked any one to take that office, he asks us to vote $1,400,000 for the Department of the Interior when we are absolutely without a declaration of policy, and absolutely without a man to discharge the duties ordinarily devolving upon the Minister of the Interior. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) what he would have said had the position been reversed? I ask my hon. friend what he would have said, standing upon this side of the House and having before him the Conservative leader of a Conservative Government, unable after two months, after the flush of victory, to fill so important a department, and what is worse still, unable to give a single shadow of a reason why he had not filled the position, or why he was not able to keep his arrangement with the House to give the information with regard to it. It is an extraordinary position. To my mind it is the most extraordinary thing that has occurred in this House for many a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) might as well be respectful.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not saying anything about him. I am not calling attention to any of the denunciations which he made of the Conservative Government when we deviated from the strict rule in connection with these matters. I say to my hon. friend the Prime Minister that it is a spectacle, that a party with 37 majority to-night is unable after two months' labour to complete its Government. Certainly there must be a reason for it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). You say there are too many members in the Government now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) is far away from the question. If there are too many members in the Government, then why not make the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) the Minister of the Interior in reality instead of the Minister of the Interior in shadow. Instead of asking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) to come here to answer these questions as the shadow for a Minister who does not exist, make him the real Minister. We won't object to it; we have no right to object to it. But, Sir, out of respect to the House, as well for the hon. gentleman's position as our own, we ought to have the information to-night as to why a Minister of the Interior has not been appointed.

Mr. CLANCY. It does seem to any new member of the House that the First Minister and his colleagues who surround him, ought fairly to be bound by the rule laid down by themselves. Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) to a question which was raised last session. It was proposed to go on with the supplies, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) opposed it, giving as one reason that Parliament met for a certain purpose which purpose was not carried out, namely, the bringing down of a Bill relating to the very province for which this vote is now being asked. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) took precisely the same ground, that no supplies should be voted until grievances had been redressed. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) says that no pertinent objection has been taken on this occasion. I desire to point out the importance of having a Minister of the Interior representing the province where this difficulty arose, in order that we may have a proper settlement of that question. That we should pass supplies now would be entirely out of accord with the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last session. They propose now that supplies should be voted for that department, when the same question still remains unsettled, when the same difficulty urged by hon. gentlemen opposite last session remains, and when no reason is given why a Minister is not appointed. We are told that we are not to pay attention to what the newspapers may say. I grant that there is much in that, but when newspapers have been publishing these things, day after day, and month after month, and when hon. gentlemen opposite are unable to do more than to say: well, the newspapers are not quite correct; is the House not entitled to the information as to what is the correct statement that ought to be made? The House has a right to demand some information as to the possibilities of the settlement of that question, and as to why the Department of the Interior has not been filled. If hon. gentlemen opposite are at all to be bound by their conduct in the past it does not lie with them this evening to say that this objection is improperly taken. It is precisely the objection that was taken by them last session with regard to voting supplies. It does seem to me that our objection is a valid one, and that a vote should not be asked for a department, which is unrepresented for the very reason, so far as the House and the country knows, that this very school question stands in the way of the filling of it.

The PRIME MINISTER. What took place on the occasion last year when the House was moved into Committee of Supply?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman consented to the passage of the bare item for the salary of the secretary of the Governor General, and no more.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item is carried.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, that this item is passed, I would suggest that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are you going to break the agreement?

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the Prime Minister will not say that we should sit up all night to pass these Estimates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The agreement was to pass all these Estimates to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. Such an arrangement was not made. I appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and to the leader of the Government, if I made any arrangement by which to-night, after the vote was taken, the rest of the supplies would go through.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman's words were that at to-day's sitting of the House the balance of the Estimates would be passed.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to-day?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are still in to-day's sitting, but the understanding was that if that discussion took place, then the hon. gentleman should ask his friends to concur in agreeing, at his suggestion, that the balance of the Estimates should go through.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend has the whole afternoon and the whole evening's sitting. I must distinctly say that my statement was not that the Estimates should be passed directly supervening upon the vote. I said that the Estimates would be allowed to go through with simply fair criticism. My hon. friend surely did not understand me to say that it was all to be done to-night directly after the vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly. It had no other meaning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not understand that it was to be done to-night. I understood that it was to be done this afternoon. I did not understand that the debate was to be kept up to a late hour. The hon. gentleman's suggestion was that if we adjourned the debate, it would be closed to-morrow, that is to-day, and that after the vote was taken the balance of the Estimates would be taken at that day's sitting.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a complete misunderstanding. I never did make or intended to make such an arrangement as that. It would be simply absurd. My hon. friend

remembers me telling him that several of our side wished to speak. Several did speak but one hon. gentleman on that side spoke for two hours to-day.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I postponed my motion for concurrence in the report of the Debates Committee because it was quite understood that the debate on the motion of the hon. member for York was going to be brought to a conclusion, and that after that the balance of the Estimates would be passed.

Mr. SPROULE. It was well known to the ex-Finance Minister as well as to many other members on this side of the House, that when the House met to-day there were some ten or twelve on this side who expected to speak, and at least half that number on the other side. Under these circumstances, it could not be expected that the debate would close until late in the night, and I believe it was understood that the vote would not be taken until some time in the morning. I did not expect that after that we should continue to sit and pass the remainder of these Estimates. But whatever bargain may have been entered into between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, that does not bind the other members of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. If any hon. members of this House think that fair criticism is necessary, it is their right to give that criticism if they see fit; and it would be asking too much of the Opposition to pass the balance of these Estimates to-night without criticism, as they must be passed, if we get through with them to-night. It is now two o'clock in the morning, and it seems a reasonable thing to ask that the committee should rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is quite obvious from the explanations which have been made across the House that a great misunderstanding exists between my hon. friend who sits beside me and my hon. friend opposite. But I suppose there is no doubt to this extent, that the understanding was that if the motion were withdrawn, and the debate went on and was brought to a conclusion, we should facilitate the passage of the Estimates. That, I think, we are all agreed upon, and it is very important that these arrangements made across the House should have effect. But I would suggest to my hon. friends whether under the circumstances, one or two items having been passed, it would not be well to adjourn with the understanding that these Estimates shall be facilitated when we meet again at the next sitting.

The PRIME MINISTER. We made an agreement yesterday, and I have no reason to be satisfied that another would be carried out any better. If we are to make an agreement, I want it to be perfectly clear. I understand that the hon. gentleman asks us to adjourn with a view to the passage of the Estimates at the next sitting. If that is to be the understanding, let it be so understood, and I will be prepared to agree to it. But if we are to have to-morrow a repetition of what we have had to-day, and more wrangling, I cannot agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. In all conscience it is entirely unreasonable to ask men to sit here after two o'clock. We have had a debate on a most important question, which we have compassed within the short space of a day and a half. When we undertook to bring the matter forward on Tuesday, our proposition to our members was that we should take the vote on Thursday night. Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday would not have been an inordinate time for a debate on one of the most important questions that could occupy the attention of this House. Yesterday, however, we came to the conclusion that if possible we would shorten it, and the understanding certainly with which I came away from my hon. friend was that we should try to get the vote on Wednesday. He wished to have the vote on Tuesday night. I pointed out to him that a good many of our people wished to speak, and it would be impossible to reach the vote without sitting to all hours, that we had no disposition to obstruct the Estimates at all, and that if we finished this debate on Wednesday, the Estimates would go through without any more than a fair criticism. Now, my hon. friend says that he understood from that, that the Estimates were to be passed at the same sitting at which we concluded the debate on the trade question. That was not my understanding, certainly, and I put it to my hon. friend whether it was not an unreasonable interpretation. Suppose that to-night we passed every item here. Supplementary Estimates are not yet down, and if they are brought down to-morrow, a day or two must elapse under the rules of the House before the committee can get at them. Taking all these things into account, cannot my hon. friend see that there is as likely to be a misunderstanding on his part as on my part?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Assuming that there is ground for the opinion that there was a misunderstanding, I have no hesitation in saying that, when the Minister of Finance spoke to me at the time, what he said was so clear and distinct that I cannot understand how a misunderstanding could have arisen. Every facility was to be given for the passing of the Estimates. Has that agreement been kept in the spirit or letter, when only one item is passed? If a considerable portion had been passed, and one or a few were reserved for the purposes of

discussion, then we could have no objection to allowing the committee to rise, but certainly, when only one little item has been passed, it cannot be said that every facility was given to pass the items.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So far as the understanding involved reasonable facilities for the passage of the Estimates, no one would pretend that that did not leave room for fair criticism, and that it did not imply reasonable explanations in connection with any items on the part of the Government. It could not be implied that the Government would be privileged to sit mute and decline to give any information, citing the agreement as an excuse. The Government want supplies, and the Opposition are justified, so far as they can, in compelling the Government to give reasonable explanations connected with any of these items before allowing them to pass, agreement or no agreement.

The PRIME MINISTER. The speech of the hon. member for Pictou is just an evidence of what we will have to-morrow, if we consent to this adjournment. Yesterday we made an agreement, and supposed there was a misunderstanding, what did take place? I am free to say that I do not impute any blame to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster)), but certainly, if we did not agree upon the terms within which the supplies would be voted, we agreed that they would be allowed to go through with only fair criticism and without any intention to obstruct. What is the proposition at present? Am I to understand that, if we agree to this adjournment, the supplies will be passed to-morrow with fair criticism, or are we to have another wrangle such as we have had this evening?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend behind me will agree, as there was a misunderstanding, and as I think it is extremely desirable that the two sides of the House should observe those relations which will enable us to make those agreements, that, if we adjourn after passing this item, we shall be disposed to facilitate the passage of the remaining Estimates with such reasonable criticism as must be reserved to hon. members.

Resolutions reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) to authorize the appointment of temporary judges of the Supreme Court in certain cases—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Bill (No. 35) for the relief of Albert Nordheimer—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Lount.)

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we adjourn I desire to ask when the Supplementary Estimates will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Very shortly—to-morrow, or next day at latest.

Mr. FOSTER. We will be getting ahead of you if you do not look out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is not much indication of it now.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 34) to amend the Railway Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Bain.)

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House be concurred in.

Mr. DAVIN. We should have an explanation of this from the Chairman of the committee (Mr. Choquette).

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Mr. Speaker, the matter is very clear and simple, and I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House in explaining it. The report of the committee containing the facts has been printed and placed before every member of this House. At the second sitting of our committee complaints were lodged by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau), and the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet), against three translators employed by this House, namely, Lucien Lasalle, Peter McLeod and J. B. Vanasse, and at a subsequent sitting of the committee another complaint was lodged against Mr. Joseph Bouchard, also a translator. The complaints against these four gentlemen were to the effect, that while occupying their position as employees of this House, they took an active and prominent part in politics since 1891. No doubt it was the precedent established some years ago by hon. gentlemen opposite, in discharging three translators which led the hon. members to lodge this complaint. On the motion of the hon. mem-

ber for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) in the committee, it was agreed that copies of the complaints be sent to each of the above named translators, with the request to attend, if they saw fit, at the next meeting of the committee when an opportunity would be afforded them of making explanations. These four men were accused of having taken an active and offensive part in the elections. Some of them came personally before the committee, and others sent letters of explanation. I may say at the outset that the complaint against Mr. Lasalle was dropped, or at least was not pressed, and no report was made against him because it was proved before the committee that he did not take any part in politics since the revision of the list of 1894. The majority of the committee thought, that as Mr. Lasalle had not taken any part, especially during the last election campaign, that the committee would let him off. As to the three others, two of them, Mr. McLeod and Mr. Vanasse came before the committee and they in fact pleaded guilty to the accusation. It was indeed very hard for them to do otherwise so clear was the proof against them. Mr. Vanasse acknowledged before the committee that he had taken part in the last election, that he wrote articles in the newspapers against the Liberal party, that he went on the hustings, and that while on the hustings he opposed the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau), calling him a "traitor to his race and to his religion," and also calling the esteemed leader of the Liberal party, then leader of the Opposition and now Premier of this Dominion, a "renegade and a traitor to his race and his religion." Mr. Vanasse pleaded guilty and he could not do otherwise. As for Mr. McLeod he acknowledged that during last session of Parliament, and while employed as translator by this House he had written parliamentary letters to the "Trifluvien" under the nom de plume of "E. Liane," and they were not only ridiculous articles but they were offensive articles as well. Those who read the report and who see some of these articles set forth there will see at once that they are most offensive. On the 5th of March, 1896, after having charged Mr. Laurier with nearly every crime in the calendar, Mr. McLeod wrote :

> What a moral ruin is the leader of the Liberal party in this country, who calls himself French and Catholic. Then what is left standing in him ; what is left of his national and religious convictions ? What has he done with the national feelings of honour, of patriotic pride, of the ideas of duty and of responsibility which they tried to inculcate on him in one of those humble houses, the character of which he is ready to lay bare, out of complaisance for English surroundings ?
>
> We are lost in conjecture to find the motive of a determination just as silly as shameful. Has he acted by calculation, by interest ? The event will prove that he has very badly worked his plans. Is it irritation against an authority to which he has to obey as the humblest of his followers ? In this case, some diplomatic sense would have made him understand that at least he should have dissembled his dissatisfaction and not provoked such a big influence. Was he pressed by the desire of not losing a command which was threatening to escape him ? But while appearing to rule, he has known, up to the present, but the weight of chains and the livery of servitude. He was only commanding on condition of obeying. Strange situation, if you will, but which is not the less real.
>
> What he has said of the clergy means this : "In politics, there is neither faith nor morality," a word dear to the school of l'Enfant terrible. In politics should we discuss about a question in which the rights of conscience are concerned ? I have as much authority as the Pope and the bishops.

And later on he says :

> I do not believe Mr. Laurier capable of putting his threat into execution. He will pocket it as he has pocketed his political honour as a party leader, &c.

During the session, when Mr. McLeod was employed by the House to do his duty rightly for the country, he sent to the press most insulting, most ridiculous and most offensive letters. With regard to these two men, I do not think there is a doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman that they have been guilty, and ought to be dismissed. An offer was made in the committee to agree to the dismissal of these two men if the majority of the committee were willing that the other two should be retained. So that it now remains only to consider Bouchard's case.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I object to this. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to refer to what took place in the committee. Moreover, I deny the allegation altogether.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. If it was not said in the committee, it was said outside of the committee ; but in fact it was said in both places. Everybody knows that. As to Mr. Bouchard, the case against him is perhaps not so strong as that against the others. But he took the stump on behalf of the Tory party, and hon. gentlemen will see in the report of the committee a report of a meeting taken from the Ottawa "Citizen" at which meeting Mr. Bouchard was present, and made a strong speech on behalf of the Tory party and against the Liberal candidates, advocating the policy of the then Government, especially their trade policy and their policy on the school question. Mr. Bouchard came before the committee, and he also addressed a letter to the committee, in which he claimed that he had a right to do as he had done. These are the facts that were placed before the committee, showing that these gentlemen had taken an active and offensive part in the election ; and as these facts are set out in the report now before the House, hon. members will be able to judge the matter for themselves.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Chairman of the Committee say shortly what was the offensive part taken by Bouchard, in his opinion ?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. He attended several meetings. It was proven conclusively that he had attended three meetings. He admitted it himself, but he said that he had only spoken at one meeting. He was on the platform in the presence of the Tory candidate, and was asked to make a speech. He made a speech, advocating in strong terms the policy of the Tory party, asking the electors to give their votes to the Tory candidates, and denouncing the policy of the Liberal party.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman does not mean, then, by the word "offensive" anything insulting. He merely characterizes the conduct as offensive, because it was active.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Let us say aggressive, if the hon. gentleman prefers the word. At any rate, he was taking an active part in politics; and if we are to be guided by the measure of justice which was given to some Liberal translators in 1887, we must accept this report. At that time complaints were sent by Mr. Chapleau and Mr. Ives to the Speaker in regard to those men, and the Speaker referred the complaints to the Debates Committee, holding that it was the proper place to lodge such complaints. So the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) and the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet) lodged their complaints before the Debates Committee, and we thought it was our duty to take notice of them and inquire into the charges, instead of shirking our duty and sending the charges to the Speaker, as was done in 1887. We thought it was more in accordance with our duty as a committee to take up the complaints, hold an investigation into them, and make a report to the House. Therefore we made this report. The report, after relating the facts, in the same manner that I have done just now, gives the following conclusion:—

In view of the above related facts, which, in the opinion of your committee, convict the said Joseph Bouchard, Peter McLeod and J. B. Vanasse of having improperly interfered in politics, your committee recommend their dismissal from the staff of translators of the debates.

The committee was not divided at all as to the fact that these men had taken an active part in politics. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) made a motion in the committee, not asserting that they were not mixed up in politics or that they were not guilty of being offensive partisans; but his motion was to the following effect:—

That after hearing the charges and the evidence in the cases of Messrs. Vanasse, McLeod and Bouchard, this committee is of the opinion that no charge or complaint having been made against any of the above named officials in regard to the proper and impartial discharge of their duties, as official translators of the debates, during the session, and that the charges brought against them being purely of a political character, and not of such a nature as would justify the interference of this committee, acting impartially, be it resolved that the order be discharged and the business of the committee be proceeded with.

The hon. member for Provencher and his friends on the committee took the position that this was merely a political affair. I deny that entirely. The complaint made against these gentlemen was that they had mixed up in politics, which they had no right to do, especially after the precedent was set some years ago, and of which they knew. They were engaged to take the places of men who had been dismissed by hon. gentleman opposite just because they had taken a part in politics; so they knew what their duty was. The translators who were dismissed in 1887 did not know before that time that they were not to engage in politics; but after that precedent these gentlemen knew very well that they had no right to do so. So they were doubly guilty, and there was no excuse for them. The only excuse offered was that mentioned in the motion of the hon. member for Provencher, that there was no charge against them in regard to their capacity as translators. That was not the accusation; there was no complaint before us as to their capacity, and it was not our duty to inquire as to that. The complaint was that these men had been acting most improperly and offensively, that they had been abusing the Liberal candidates and the Liberal leader on the hustings. It was our duty to inquire into this complaint and make a report to the House. We have done so, and I hope the House will concur in the report. It is not necessary for me to take up more of the time of the House. The report is there, and I move that it be concurred in.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has hardly stated the case as it commends itself to my memory. I am rather surprised, knowing, as I do, what the sentiments of the committee are, that the name of Bouchard appears in the report as one of those that the House is invited to condemn. Now, the charge made against these gentlemen, including one who no longer appears in the indictment, concluded with these words:

In consequence of the above related facts, the committee, having in view the preservation of the integrity and impartiality of the translation of the debates, recommend the dismissal of Messrs. Joseph Bouchard, Lucien Lasalle, Peter McLeod and J. B. Vanasse from the staff of the official translators of the debates.

That sentence, which concludes the motion of the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet), who moved the adoption of the report, raises the real issue that we have to consider, when these men are charged with improper conduct of such a character that this House should endorse the report advising their dismissal. Now, when we raised the question whether or not these gentlemen had been guilty of partiality, in other

words, whether they had failed in their duty as translators of the debates in this House, in consequence of their partisanship, there was no evidence forthcoming, and, when we suggested that the chief translator should be called before us and examined, with the view of giving evidence as to whether this, the sting, the gist, the main portion, the operative part, of the resolution of the hon. member was well founded, the majority of the committee decided that it was not necessary to call the chief translator. Now, the position of these men is such that it seems to me this House, after considering it, will come to the conclusion that not one of them should be dismissed, as recommended by this committee. In 1883, when the late Hon. Thomas White was Chairman of the Debates Committee, the question of the efficiency of the translation was brought up before the Debates Committee, and, in order to secure efficiency, Mr. Béchard and other gentlemen interested in the translation of the debates into French, contended—I may tell you that up to that time the debates had been most inefficiently translated—that those gentlemen who translated the debates and who seemed to have been employed intermittently and at haphazard, at that time, by the chief translator, should be made permanent officers of the House, and permanent officers they were made. Things went on very well until, in 1887, the Hon. Mr. Chapleau brought a charge against Mr. Poirier and the two Tremblays, not of inefficiency as translators, not of taking part in elections, or of exercising their right as citizens, but of using violent, insulting language with regard to himself; and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) also complained that his sentiments, as a man, had been grievously wounded by the conduct of these men. It seemed that there was no doubt whatever that these gentlemen, in the heat and passion of political controversy, had used most insulting language with regard to Mr. Chapleau and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). And what did Mr. Chapleau say, in my own hearing, from his place in the House? He said that he had been so grievously insulted by those gentlemen that he could not meet them in the passage. They were an offence to him, and it is palpable that they had committed a very much more serious and grievous offence than the offence which was charged in the original indictment of the hon. member who brought the present matter before the committee. Now, we have a great authority to guide us. The present leader of the House took up the case of Tremblay and others and discussed it. What happened was this. The Speaker of the House dismissed the translators. The Debates Committee made no recommendation to have them dismissed, yet the Speaker of the House dismissed them. The matter came before the House, and the leader of this Government pointed out what their position was. He pointed out that they were permanent officers, that they were employed for a specific purpose during the session, and that outside the session they were perfectly free to do what they pleased. Surely it is not possible that, with a high authority such as the present Prime Minister laying down that rule, you are going to condemn men because they took the leader of the Liberal party at his word, as one of these translators said in his defence: I had the opinion of the hon. leader of the Liberal party that I was perfectly free to do what I pleased outside the session. I was, therefore, fighting on velvet, because if the Conservative party remained in power, I was not likely to be disturbed, and if the hon. member for Quebec East came into power, I had his word, the charter of my liberty, because he is a gentleman whose character before the whole Dominion is unblemished. Is the hon. gentleman going to cast that high character, the white flower of a blameless political life, into the gutter, in order to gratify the wolfish instincts of a few hon. gentlemen behind him? Let me call the attention of the House to what the hon. First Minister said. Speaking on the subject, on 10th April, 1888, he said:

> In fact, the complaint which was made against them is not in reference to their services as officers of the House, but the charge is that they went out of their proper sphere of action and grossly insulted some members of this House. The charge was brought forward by my hon. friend the Secretary of State in a letter dated the 22nd of May, 1887. In that letter, after naming the officers, he said: "These officials acted with indescribable violence in the last election campaign; both on the hustings and in the press, they wrote and spoke things regarding me so offensive and calumnious that these gentlemen I could neither speak to them nor salute them in the House, and I say sincerely their presence in the precincts of the House is for me a nuisance, to which, it appears to me, no one has a right to subject a member of Parliament.

That was the kind of language used by a kind-hearted man, then the hon. Secretary of State, one of the Ministers of the Crown. He said he had been so insulted that he could not bear to meet these gentlemen. But what was the language used by the leader of this Government:

> Now, I must say at once that it seems somewhat singular, and it is, I think, improper that officers of this House should be allowed to engage actively in politics. I have no hesitation at all in making that statement, but if those gentlemen declare that they took an active part in the political campaign, they also declare that in doing so they had the sanction of this House.

That is the very thing that Mr. Vanasse, who did not plead guilty, says he had.

> They state that the House had appointed the translators of the debates—I am not speaking of the other officers of the House, but of the translators only—with the understanding that

they should be allowed to take part, not only in political campaigns, but in active politics in all circumstances. This matter came up incidentally in 1884. At that time it was stated, without contradiction from any quarter, that the translators of the debates were permitted to be engaged in active journalism and therefore to be engaged in politics.

Without going further, how can this House, and how, above all, can the majority in this House, led by the speaker of those eloquent and true words, condemn those gentlemen? Above all, how can they condemn Bouchard? Bouchard—what is his offence? His evidence was that he went to a political meeting, not to take part, but as an elector. But when the meeting was nearly over and some were going out, a number of persons came up to him and urged him to go up on the platform and say a few words. He said a few words, speaking in French. No report is given us in French of what he said. No French paper published an account of that speech, but we have some account of it in the "Citizen." And when I wanted to have the reporter of the "Citizen" brought in order that I might ask him whether he knew French and was therefore in a position to report what Bouchard said, I was not listened to. Here is the report in the "Citizen" of June 12th, 1896, of that speech made in French. This account of the speech covers only a few lines. And Bouchard is to be hanged on the evidence of that contracted report, although when the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government, was leading the Opposition and some persons have asked him with regard to reports of his speeches that were not verbatim, sometimes in regard to reports of his speeches sent by telegram and very brief, I have heard him scout the idea that he should be held responsible for a single syllable, and very properly. But supposing this report of the "Citizen" was accurate, here is all it says:

Mr. Joseph Bouchard followed in French. He contrasted the policy expounded by Laurier in 1893 on the school question, when he pledged himself to even the Orange lodges, and to proceed to Manitoba to defend the rights of his countrymen before Greenway, and that followed by the same leader in 1896.

Now this is in the oblique case, this is in the historical tense. No man under heaven will be bound, no man under heaven will bind another by a report of that sort:

Mr. Bouchard supported his able argument by an array of quotations and figures which convinced his hearers and drew forth unstinted applause. The talented speaker next touched upon the fiscal policy as affecting the workingmen, demonstrating by incontrovertible evidence that protection was the best safeguard that the toiler could wish, and resumed his chair amidst applause.—Quoted in the "Citizen" of June 12th, 1896.

Why, Sir, supposing that this report is correct, is there anything in that report of his speech to justify this House in saying that this gentleman shall cease to be a permanent officer translating our debates, when we have the dictum given in his place in Parliament of the gentleman who is now at the head of this great country that outside of session these gentlemen were free to act how they pleased? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) in the same speech went on to say:

On that occasion the hon. gentleman, member for North Norfolk, who was a member of the Debates Committee, spoke.

Now, I appeal to the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk. We differ on a great many things; we do not see eye to eye; but I know he is at bottom a man of benevolent nature:

I must say that the matter came up on the question of increasing the salaries of translators, and the hon. member for Norfolk stated that he was opposed to an increase of salaries because the translators were actively engaged as newspaper correspondents.

Now, that is the statement of the hon. gentleman who now leads the House, a recitation of the fact giving it the form of an argument. He said:

I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not.

This refers to a very important circumstance relating to reporting in this House and the translation of the debates. After "Hansard" had been on the way for some time, the gentlemen engaged on "Hansard" felt, and very properly felt, that for the arduous toil and for the nervous strain they were exposed to, the salary they were then receiving was inadequate, and what was agreed to be done was this, the hon. member for North Norfolk endorsing it—to increase the salary of the reporters and bind them to give their whole time, or at least to be at the call of the Government, when Parliament was not in session as well as during the session, but leaving the translators with their former allowance of $1,000, which is a small wage for a long session, but leaving them free outside of the time they are employed by Parliament to do as they please. Well, now, Sir, further on the same speech the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government said:

It seems to me, under such circumstances, to be beyond doubt that those dismissed officers were led to believe, and had every reason to believe, that they could do on the Liberal side of politics what other translators could do on the Conservative side, and certainly if you are to apply an equal rule you must say that Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier were no more guilty of trespassing against the privileges than were the three translators on the other side of politics who had been retained.

And he (Mr. Laurier) goes on further to say:

The hon. members must remember that the translators of the debates for three or four

months of the year do nothing else but translate the debates of the House.

This was to excuse the violent language. He even found excuse for that. Turning aside from the case of Bouchard and speaking of the strong language used by McLeod in the correspondence signed "Liane," when I bring before the attention of the leader of the House what the nature of this correspondence is, he will agree with the view I take. What is it, Sir, but a piece of rhetoric? There is nothing imputed, nothing inherently vicious imputed to any of the politicians he dealt with. Talk about what is said concerning hon. gentlemen, why one hon. gentleman was called a blockhead. If I were to take to heart everything that is said against me by these gentlemen who use the winged words that control us all and that are really more powerful than anything we can do ourselves, I should have been dead long ago:

> They become saturated with abusive language, and to expect that they would act differently was to suppose they were different flesh and blood from ourselves. I will say this to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially to the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who seemed to have been rather thin-skinned on the question.
>
> That if they find fault with the translators who engage in politics, for having been guilty of abusive language, I call upon the man without offence to throw the first stone, and I do not expect it will come from the other side, at all events, and perhaps not from this side.

Further on, he says:

> I think that position would have been a sound one, and a warning would have been given to those officers which would have amply met the justice of the case.

That was an alternative that he suggested in dealing with them. Still further on, in reply to an interruption of Mr. Desjardins, who then used to sit in this House, he says:

> The official reporters stand in a completely different position from the official translators, because the reporters have been made permanent officers of the House, and they cannot engage in any other work; their services are at the disposal of the Government after the session, and their appointment expressly says so; but the translators are appointed to translate the debates and nothing else, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, who is Chairman of the Debates Committee, that it was always understood that during a part of the session they could engage in any work they chose to engage in.

That is to say, that, if they translated their work properly and impartially, this House had nothing whatever to do with any other work. The only question they have to ask is, Have they translated their portion of the debates honestly and impartially? Therefore, there is no parallel, the hon. gentleman says, between the two classes of officials. So that, although those gentlemen—now I petition the attention of the leader of the Government to this argument—although these accused translators have done nothing that, if they were officers employed and paid during the whole year round, would, according to the generous dicta that he himself laid down, justify their decapitation, much stronger is the rule he laid down, when you are dealing with men who, as he says, are only employed for a short time of the year, and even during that time it is well understood, as he emphatically points out, that they could give their time to other matters. Well, this subject came up again, as I find on page 747 of the "Hansard," 11th April. And again the then leader of the Opposition spoke on it, and I will say this now about the remarks of the leader of the Opposition at that time. The position taken by the hon. gentleman was the position, at core, that any legal mind would take; but, running through his speech on each occasion, there is a generous element, there is a touch of feeling, there is a touch of sympathy, there is a generous disregard of mere technicalities, and a desire that, in the case of men who are earning their daily wage in the way these poor men are, if there was a doubt, they should get the benefit of it; that, if generosity was to play a part, it should lean towards them, and that the Government of that day, and the friends of the Government of to-day, if they are to lean in the least, should, according to the sentiment, to the temper, to the feeling shown in the hon. gentleman's speech—if there was to be any leaning from the cold pathway of justice, it should be, not to enraged politicians, who are here successful, and now, with M.P. after their names, are flushed with victory and full of self-importance, but to the poor translators on whose necks these gentlemen would fain let fall the axe. Now, as I say, on 7th April, the hon. leader of the Opposition spoke as follows:—

> I have just one word to say in answer to the right hon. gentleman. If the same measure of justice is to be applied to all the offenders who have equally offended in this matter, the resolution of my hon. friend does not go far enough, and should include all those who being actually officers of the House, are not only during the elections, but are day after day, writing letters and writing correspondence to their papers upbraiding members of this House. The practice should not be tolerated at all. I have said in my opening remarks, and I repeat it here, that it should not be tolerated that an officer of the House should engage in active politics. I think the principle is a wrong one. I agree with my hon. friend from Oxford, I agree with everybody who has spoken on this side, that if my hon. friend the Secretary of State wants to pose in a magnanimous position, it does not lie in him to dismiss men because they offended him. But let him say, We have been violating the rule, let us make a new rule, let us forget the past, and then we will think it magnanimous.

That is a noble appeal, and I am only sorry, for myself, that the then Secretary of State did not listen to it. Well, I think

I may lay down this proposition, that, if a man out of power, in whose hands there is no sceptre, and on whose brow there is no crown, lays down a rule of magnanimity, when he is crowned and when the sceptre is in his hand, I think he is bound ten-fold by the words, the eloquent words, and the appeal that he made. I am very glad to notice that the hon. leader of the House said "Hear, hear" to the words I quoted.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very sorry these good words were not accepted in 1888.

Mr. DAVIN. But no new rule was laid down.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, quite a different rule laid down there.

Mr. DAVIN. I think my hon. friend is mistaken there.

Notwithstanding what my hon. friend may say, I cannot believe he is actuated unconsciously, perhaps, since he protests with anything but resentment. If he were not actuated by resentment, he would say: I will make it a rule that these men will not in future trespass against the privileges of this House; but the result will now remain, with the connivance of the hon. gentleman who leads this House, that three men will be selected because they have not offended against the majority, and those who offended against the minority will be paid and protected by a majority of this House.

No new rule was laid down, but I say to him, in his own language: Now, lay down a new rule. I will welcome it myself. Let him make a new rule, and let him pursue the magnanimous path that he pointed out to the then Secretary of State. Well, this matter came up again in 1894, and, of course, this shows, as I ventured with great respect to point out to my hon. friend a few moments ago, that he was mistaken in supposing that a new rule was laid down at that time, because, on 3rd July, 1894, the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin) complained of this same Bouchard, I think. The hon. leader of the Opposition at that time—and mind this is nearly a whole septennary of years after he had made this magnanimous appeal to the magnanimity, to the deaf magnanimity, I am sorry to say, of the then Secretary of State; nearly seven years had rolled away, and it is palpable that no rule had been made at the time, for this is what the hon. gentleman says, generously again coming forward against one of his own followers at the time, again standing on the side of justice, to defend a helpless translator of the debates. He said:

This is a new departure from the rules which were well understood when the French translators were appointed. Some years ago, in 1882 or 1883, when the late Minister of the Interior—the late Hon. Thomas White—was Chairman of the Committee, a report was adopted by this House, and at that time it was understood that the shorthand writers should receive $2,000 a year, and that their services might be taken advantage of by the Government at any time during the recess, and the translators were to receive $1,000, and were to be free to take up any occupation they liked during the recess. * * After the session they are free to go into journalism or anything else they like. * * The rule has always been that during the session they are to devote their whole time to the work for which they are paid by this House; outside the session they can do what they please.

Suppose they edited a newspaper. Why, there is no part of this country where you could run a purely independent paper. Take Montreal or Toronto, the two big cities—the genius of the greatest journalists that ever wrote, and the wealth of a Rothschild, would not enable you to run a purely independent paper in those great centres. In those little places where those gentlemen were editing papers, it is absurd to suppose you could have a clientèle sufficient to support an independent newspaper. In Canada you must write on one side or the other, either Liberal or Conservative. Here is what in the course of the same debate, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said—as will be found at page 5227 of the Debates:

The rule has always been that during the session they are to devote their whole time to the work for which they are paid by this House; outside of the session they can do what they please.

I say, with that statement before us, it is not possible, in my opinion, without self-stultification, that the Government, at the head of which stands the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), could accept or endorse the report presented by my hon. friend the Chairman of the Debates Committee. Let me say of all these gentlemen that from the point of view of justice, they were prima facie in the same position as Lasalle,—I say that prima facie they were all guiltless. Take the case of Lasalle. There was a modern inquisition on a small scale held in regard to Lasalle, but zealously conducted as it was, it failed in its object, so much so that one of the most authoritative members of the committee on the other side of the House, the hon. member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver) moved as an amendment to a motion of mine, that the name of Lasalle be omitted. I want to call the attention of the House to what, on the face of these documents, occurred:

Mr. Davin moved in amendment, That the said motion be not ordered to be reported to the House, but that it be printed, and another meeting called to consider the same. And a debate arising thereupon; and the question on the amendment being proposed; Mr. Scriver moved, in amendment to the said proposed amendment, That the report be amended by striking out therefrom the name of Lucien Lasalle, and all that relates to him, appearing in the said report.

And the question being put on the amendment, the committee divided, and the names being called for, they were taken down as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Bergeron, Craig, Davin, Earle, LaRivière, Scriver and Taylor (7).

Nays: Messrs. Beausoleil, Charlton, Ellis, Haley, Monet, Richardson and Somerville (7).

Mr. Monet, the prosecutor, voted for his own prosecuting motion. So the votes were equal. What occurred then? The Chairman of the committee, who moves this motion to-day and asks this House to endorse this report, gave his casting vote,—how? Giving these translators the benefit of the doubt, as Lasalle had been given—whose name afterwards in sheer shame the committee had to omit and exclude.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. The casting vote was given against those men by the Chairman of the committee. The record continues:

And the question being put on the amendment, the committee divided as follows:—

Yeas: Messrs. Bergeron, Craig, Davin, Earle, LaRiviere and Taylor (6).

Nays: Messrs. Beausoleil, Charlton, Ellis, Haley, Monet, Richardson, Scriver and Somerville (8).

Again Mr. Monet voted. Under these circumstances, Sir, I lay down this proposition again, that prima facie every one of those translators was guiltless. What had to be done? They were brought there, and stating it mildly, they were put on the rack. They were cross-examined. Mr. Lasalle was asked this and that, and after inquiry he had to be let go. Mr. Bouchard came, and he was asked about the report of a meeting. He acknowledged to have been at the meeting and explained how he happened to be there, and he told what took place, as published in the Ottawa "Citizen," and that was the only charge against Bouchard. Some hon. members on the other side of the House and some hon. members on this side who had taken an interest in the accusations would have been willing to adopt a report if it were limited to dismissing two of these men, Vanasse and McLeod, Bouchard being allowed to go free. I felt, as did my hon. friend the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and other hon. gentlemen, that there was no case established against Lasalle or Vanasse, and that we would not be justified, even for the sake of saving Bouchard, in deserting them, and therefore we determined to let Bouchard take his chance with the other two rather than be guilty of the injustice of abandoning those two men. Although I had no conversation with Bouchard, I venture to say that he would have preferred such a course rather than the abandonment of his two confreres. In regard to McLeod, what took place? He was brought before the committee and was asked whether he wrote a letter to the "Le Trifluvien" over the nom de plume of "E. Liane." He said he did. Passages from that letter are extracted, no doubt the worst passages, passages in which rhetorical phraseology is used, as we find used by my colleague on the press. We all have a tendency, especially when writing on politics, to resort at times to the large language of the earlier gods, and those gentlemen, no doubt, fell back on those broad utterances that used to vibrate through the atmosphere when earth was young. And what does it amount to? Here is the parliamentary letter set forth at page 12 of this report, and here is the head and front of the offending of McLeod:

To this, what has Mr. Laurier answered? My God! what a pity to see a man well gifted, a leader of a party supposed to be deeply impressed with the feeling of his responsibility and even making a show of it, a compatriot in a word, trying to endanger, in one hour, six years struggle and of unspeakable sacrifices, to strive miserably in some evident contradictions, to defy the religious authority which has been of all times, for our French Canadians, the supreme bulwark of the nationality, to kill himself and his party for twenty years to come!

Why, Sir, what he accuses the hon. leader of the House in these words, is that for which his (Mr. Laurier's) followers in the west wished us to throw up our hats and handkerchiefs about and sing paean. He was represented in the west as like Ajax, defying the lightning and throwing down his gage of battle to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. This writer goes on:

He found the means of committing in a one hour speech enough of cowardice, of treachery, of infamy, to deserve on the part of Dalton McCarthy, the man from whose shoulders has fallen the mantle of George Brown, the man that the withheld angers of ours are pursuing since years; the man who, since years, wages against us a war of privateer which has kept him a place apart in the maledictions with which we overwhelm the inveterate and irreconcilable enemy of our language, of our institutions, of our laws, and, above all, of our religious convictions; to deserve, I say, on the part of Dalton McCarthy, this word, at the same time, cruel and vindictive: "He has not only robbed me of my motion, he has taken away from me the title of champion of Protestants." And the word is true. What a moral ruin is the leader of the Liberal party in this country, who calls himself French and Catholic? Then what is left standing in him; what is left of his national and religious convictions? What has he done with the national feelings of honour, of patriotic pride, of the ideas of duty and of responsibility which they tried to inculcate on him in one of those humble houses, the character of which he is ready to lay bare, out of complaisance for English surroundings?

This is very strong, but, Sir, we have it on the authority of the leader of the Government himself, that even during the session these gentlemen may engage in other occupations. Who could know—and on this point I appeal to the magnanimity of the leader of the House—who could know that Mr. McLeod was the writer of these articles if he himself had not opened his mouth, which it was not necessary for him to do. You have a man writing for a Conservative journal, and what does he do? Why, he does the same thing as the leader of one party does when he speaks of the leader

of another party: he paints in colours of eclipse and ruin the policy of the opposite party. Could any language be more violent than that which the leader of the Government has applied to the policy adopted, and still adopted by gentlemen on this side of the House? To quote his own language, the leader of the Government, in 1888, appealed to Mr. Chapleau and said: "You are accustomed in this House to use violent and vigorous language; these gentlemen are translating your words, and are you going to condemn them for doing the same thing?" There is no attempt to conceal that McLeod wrote both those letters, but I do say that these three or four extracts in the report are extracts from a series of letters eloquent, striking, and, on the whole, moderate. Everybody knows, and no one better than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), who is a lawyer, that you may take extracts from the writings of any one, and by selecting a passage here and a passage there, you wrongfully may make the writer out to be an atheist, or a scoundrel, or a repudiator of the most cherished convictions of the people of the country where he lived. I, therefore, say there is nothing that would justify interfering with Mr. McLeod, who it turns out is one of the most capable translators we have.

Now, Sir, about Vanasse. The charge against Vanasse is that he admitted that he took part in politics. As I remember it, Mr. Vanasse admitted nothing of the kind. Mr. Vanasse came before the committee and he told us what I have read out to this House: that he had in his mind the position that he held, as described by the leader of the Opposition at that time, now the Prime Minister of Canada, and he felt perfectly free to take the course he did. He submitted this document to the committee, which I am bound to place before this House in order that they shall have before them the case of Vanasse:

Official Debates Office,
September 10th, 1896.

To the Chairman and Members of the Debates Committee, House of Commons.

Dear Sirs,—If the committee will kindly allow me, I wish to add a few remarks to the verbal explanations I have already given to your committee at its last meeting, as regards my conduct in the late Dominion election.

1. During that contest I have taken part in no political meeting outside the county of Richelieu, where I live, although strongly urged to do so.

2. I have not written a single line in any newspaper for several years past.

3. As I stated to your committee last week, I took the course I did in June last because I thought my right to do so had been clearly acknowledged in the House of Commons, as shown by the following quotations from speeches delivered by several members. In 1884, Mr. Charlton, then a member of your committee, made this statement:—"I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not."

In April, 1888, the Hon. Laurier spoke as follows:—

It may probably be said that there is no fault found with their taking part in politics if they chose to do so, but they must use polite language. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the House of Commons which gave the translators permission to engage in politics, but the House could scarcely be expected to hope that they never would be guilty of using abusive language. Hon. members must remember that the translators of the debates, for three or four months of the year, do nothing else but translate the debates of the House; they become saturated with abusive language, and to expect that they would act differently was to suppose they were different flesh and blood from curselves.

* * * * * * * * *

The translators are appointed to translate the debates and nothing else, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, who is Chairman of the Debates Committee, that it was always understood that during a part of the session they could engage in any other work they chose to engage in.

Mr. Mills (Bothwell) is also quoted by Vanasse in this apology which he makes, and Mr. Mills used the following language:—

Mr. Mills (Bothwell) used the following language:—

* * * So far as those translators are concerned, it was said at the time of their appointment that the House gave employment to them but for a very small portion of the year, and that their salaries were less than the ordinary reporters upon the Official Debates, and that they were to be at liberty to engage in ordinary avocations whenever they were not employed here. It was well known at the time they were appointed that some of them were on the political press of one side and some on the political press on the other side, and it was expressely stated by the committee at whose instance they were appointed that they were not to be interfered with in their political freedom or independence.

Well, Sir, that learned voice is silent in this House. We no longer have that hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills of Bothwell) to give us learned lubrications upon constitutional questions, but happily we have his words and his authority recorded here to-day. We have that authority as high almost as the authority of the hon. gentleman who leads the House, and the dictum of Mr. Mills is that we have no right whatever to interfere with the political freedom and independence of these gentlemen. This is what Mr. Vanasse himself said:

In conclusion, I beg to submit to your committee that the above quotations show clearly that the translators of the debates are not to be considered as members of the civil service; that their right to engage in any pursuit they choose between the sessions, when not employed in translating the debates, has been repeatedly acknowledged in the House of Commons; and that in taking a certain part in the late election I was violating no rule to which I might be subjected. But should your committee declare that in the future we are not to interfere in any way in politics, I am quite willing to abide by that decision, doing my work faithfully as I have done for the past thirteen years.

Is not that the very position taken by the hon. leader of the Government himself? Is not that the position taken by him, not once or twice, but three times? Under these circumstances, surely that humble man, Mr. Vanasse will not appeal to the hon. leader of the Government or to this House in vain. Sir, we have come to a time when we ought to lay down rules that shall be strictly enforced, and about which there shall be no doubt—rules in regard to such questions as this to which public officers shall be amenable. In this connection, I would call the attention of the hon. leader of the Government to an article in the "Evening Journal" of Ottawa, which has been for some time, I believe, giving him an independent support; and if I were in his position there is no support in this country which I would prefer to that, because it is a generous and effective support. That paper has had several articles urging the Liberal party to rise to the standard of its best minds. I remember a few weeks ago an eloquent article in that paper, putting the matter in this way. Suppose there are a number of men in the Liberal ranks throughout the country who are clamouring for places, and who say, "We have been working for eighteen years, and we want to get these positions." The "Journal" asks, are these the kind of men the Liberal party has come into power to serve—men who turn away from the rough-and-tumble field of active life to cowardly bury their independence and their possibilities in the grave of a civil service position? Are these the men for whom the Liberal party and the Government of the Liberal party should thus early degrade its scutcheon, and soil its banner? Here is what the writer in the "Evening Journal" said only two days ago:

HON. MR. BLAIR'S IDEA.

The "Journal" yesterday received the following letter, with a note from the author saying that he had written it before the "Journal's" article of Monday appeared, but that perhaps no harm would be done by still publishing it. The 'Journal" is sure that no harm can be done by hammering at the subject until there ceases to be danger that Mr. Blair's idea will spread much, and we publish with pleasure the letter, which is written by a man of Liberal leanings whose name would carry much weight if it were known.

I believe that the gentleman who edits the "Journal" is the same gentleman who edited it a year or so ago; and if so, I have the honour of knowing him personally, and whatever he would give his word for, I would take; and I have as little doubt that this letter was written by a Liberal whose name would give additional weight to what he said, as I have of the authority of holy writ. Here is the letter:

As one who viewed with no little sympathy the advent to power of the present Liberal Government, I write to express the strong feelings of disapproval and apprehension with which I regard the recent declaration of the Minister of Railways as to the method he proposes to adopt in dealing with cases of alleged political activity in the Conservative interest on the part of employees of the Government railways. I venture to say that if Hon. Mr. Blair acts in any systematic manner on the principles he enunciated he will do his party more harm than he will ever have it in his power to undo. Is it to witness such an exhibition of tyranny and small-mindedness as this that the country has waited so long? Are these the Liberal principles that are going to lift Canada to a higher political plane? Mr. Laurier had better see to it and that quickly, or he will find that the popular sympathies that carried him into power were not given in expectation that such would be the principles of his Government, and that they are not to be retained by such means.

Surely Mr. Blair might have sufficient magnanimity to recognize that many of the poor labourers to whom he referred—it is particularly this class of employees towards whom he proposes to exercise the most summary severity—so far as they took any part in politics beyond simply voting, did so more or less under compulsion, real or imaginary, and through dread of losing their humble positions.

And the letter of "Liberalis" goes on to try to raise the thoughts of the leaders of the Liberal party and the standard of the Liberal party up to the height of the best minds of that party, which is the standard of the best minds of both parties, and therefore the standard of the best mind and the best conscience in the whole Dominion of Canada. This is the way the writer concludes his article:

It is to be hoped that the writer of the above represents the sentiments of a great number of moderate Liberals. It is to be hoped that moderate men of all parties are anxious now to put this country upon a higher political plane than hitherto. There is an opportunity to do so that may not occur again in a lifetime. A party so long in power that few of its opponents have had a chance to make mistakes has been put out of power, and these opponents with their blank record have been put in power with a strong majority, unhampered by bad records or political sins, with a clean sheet on which to write history. What shall be inscribed on that white page? Cabinet management of the caucus order for the sake of party and political office? For the sake of salaries and contracts? For the sake of personal self-seeking and vanity? Or government for the best good of this country of ours, for the good of its future, for the encouragement of public and private honesty, magnanimity and high principle? Look to it that your country shall receive better from your party rather than worse, you among the Liberals who believe that the same honour and heart and self-respect should characterize the conduct of men entrusted by their fellow citizens with public administration as should characterize the gentleman and the honest man in private life.

One sentence could be added to that. Are they going to commence their history by giving effect and endorsement to the vengeful feelings of a few supporters, who, because they think they had some reason to be aggrieved, or merely because they find men occupying certain positions which they

want for others, trump up charges against them ? We had before us one man who said he was expecting a situation, and I suppose there are three persons waiting to take the places of these men the moment they are decapitated, if it should be so.

An hon. MEMBER. Twenty.

Mr. DAVIN. I am told there are twenty. Well, they are like the young birds that I used to disturb in their nests when a boy, and saw a number of red mouths wide open which evinced the avidity of hunger. Against Bouchard there is no case whatever ; and so far as he is concerned I say that this report cannot be accepted without creating a scandal. In regard to Vanasse, what did he say ? I had a charter, the words of the leader of the Government, whom I believe to be a man of honour. Will the hon. gentleman put him in the position of being able in a few days from now to take up the report of "Hansard" and say : Here are your words ; I relied on them ; I believed you to be a man of honour ; I believe those words were the ægis that would protect me against all the malice of petty politicians ; but since you, too, have adopted the narrow rule which you stigmatized properly in 1888 and 1894. I find that I relied on you in vain. I do not know the hon. gentleman except through sitting with him here during the past ten years, and no one could do that without conceiving the highest opinion of him, and therefore I appeal to him with confidence. With regard to Mr. McLeod, I make this appeal. The only charge against him is one in which the hon. member for Richelieu and the leader of the House are concerned. There is no charge that Mr. McLeod said anything personal against any member of this House except my hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau). What he said, I think, was that the hon. gentleman was a blockhead or something to that effect. Why, what signifies that ? Nobody believes that the hon. gentleman is a blockhead. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is one of the most brilliant supporters of the leader of the Government, and when you call a man like the hon. member for Richelieu a blockhead, you only provide a foil by which the public can the better see his brilliancy set off. It is an advantage to a man of ability to be thus stigmatized, because it gives a dark background on which his shining qualities can be emphasized more thoroughly. I grant that in those letters signed "E. Liane," Mr. McLeod used strong language in regard to the leader of the Government, but I have read through the letters in French, from which these extracts are made, and I do not find in them one expression that can be described as a personal aspersion on the hon. gentleman. Nobody knows better than the hon. gentleman himself, who is an accomplished critic, that it would be the grossest literary injustice, the grossest moral wrong, when this man's bread and butter is dependent on it, to judge him by the rhetorical expressions he used when writing a letter to a little paltry paper down in Three Rivers. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman how unjust it would be for him to say : Because you gave utterance to some strong opinions about me, as a public man, I am going, now that I am in power, to send you to the rightabout. That would be unlike the hon. gentleman and I cannot believe that he will stoop to it. Although he appealed in vain to Mr. Chapleau, I do not believe that my appeal to him will be in vain. Mr. Chapleau is a friend of mine. I place him high as a statesman, as a leader of men, and as a man. He is one of the most delightful companions, and one of the tenderest hearted men. But the leader of the House has an opportunity to place himself higher in tenderness of heart and chivalric feeling. I believe that the appeal which he made in language whose eloquence I wish I could emulate, and made in vain, to Mr. Chapleau, I shall not make to him in vain.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like, as a young member of the committee, to say a few words on the subject, and must apologize if I venture to speak so early in the debate. I feel impelled to do so, however, as I shall be obliged shortly to leave the Chamber, and do not wish to lose the opportunity of expressing my views on this question, in which, as a member of the committee, I took some part. It seems to me that this is not a subject for such mock heroics and farcical imitations of Demosthenes and other ancient orators to which we have been treated this afternoon by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to be indulged in. For my part, I promise you, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks will be brief, and, I hope, to the point. The hon. gentleman to whom we have just listened, and who has taken up such a vast amount of time during this session, waxed very eloquent upon this, as he does upon most other subjects. No doubt he feels that this session is the last opportunity he will have to address Parliament, and is in consequence most anxious to make the best of his opportunities. I was greatly surprised indeed to find the hon. gentleman referring, in the terms he did, to the conduct of the Chairman of the Debates Committee in giving a casting vote on motions brought before that Committee. I am sure that the hon. member for West Assiniboia ought to have the very highest opinion of casting votes, for were it not for the casting vote of the returning officer, the hon. gentleman would not be sitting in this House at present, and I may say that this House will not feel under any deep obligations to that returning officer for having given his casting vote in the way he did, because we must admit that a great deal of the time of this House has been wasted by the long speeches of the hon. gentleman. Let me

refer very briefly to the cases under consideration. I have followed them very closely, I have read the evidence very carefully, and, as I have said, I do not think that these cases call for any mock heroics. They are just cases where any men of ordinary common sense could see the facts for themselves and come to an intelligent judgment. Let me, at the outset, read a brief extract from Todd, which will enable the House to see upon what lines the civil service shall be conducted. He said:

> Doubtless, active interference in politics on the part of a non-political office-holder would be a case of misconduct sufficient to justify his dismissal. It is a well understood rule of constitutional government that all such functionaries should abstain from taking an active part in political contests, and observe a strict neutrality therein.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does that refer to members of the civil service?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It refers to permanent officers.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Of the Government?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Officers of the permanent civil service, I presume. I do not see that we should draw any fine distinctions in this matter. These translators are officers of this House and are civil servants, receiving their salary from this Parliament. According to Todd, they should observe strict neutrality. On that basis, let us judge the conduct of these men. Mr. Vanasse came before the committee and frankly admitted that he had appeared on a public platform and made speeches and used strong language. He made no bones about the matter, and it was only after the committee had adjourned on that day and had met about a week later, that he came before it and presented the views embodied in the letter whch the hon. member for Assiniboia read to this House. So that it was not spontaneous on his part. He brought up these excuses a week later. No doubt he had been prompted to do so by some one friendly to him. Now, Vanasse used offensive language and took an active part in the political contest. Surely it is not necessary to appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House to concur in the report with regard to Mr. Vanasse. I do not now recollect exactly what language he did use, but my recollection of it is that it was very strong. He was clearly an active and offensive partisan. I do not apprehend that the word "offensive" in this sense has the meaning sometimes attributed to it. There are the words "offensive" and "defensive." In interpreting the term for application in such cases as these under discussion I take it that "offensive" means the antithesis of "defensive."

Mr. DAVIN. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sure the hon. gentleman will allow me. He is stating what took place, and has spoken of words brought before us as having been used by Mr. Vanasse. My recollection is that it was stated that he took part in public meetings, but we did not get his words.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. He spoke of the leader of the House as a renegade.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My recollection is, and I am glad that the Chairman of the Committee bears me out, that Mr. Vanasse used the words "traitor" and "renegade," as applied to the leader of this House. Surely, Mr. Speaker, these are offensive words. I come now to the case of McLeod. I have no doubt that he is an efficient translator. That is a subject with which the committee, in this inquiry, had nothing whatever to do. The committee were there to pass upon the evidence which was submitted to them. McLeod was accused of having written a series of letters to the press. Mark you, these letters were writen during the last session of Parliament. Some excuse might be offered, though I am not prepared to say I would agree with it, if he had undertaken to do this work during the recess. But these letters were written by Mr. McLeod during the last session of Parliament, while he would be presumed to be attending to his duties as translator of the debates. In these letters he referred to one hon. member of this House as a young blockhead, and used very offensive language toward the hon. leader of this House. He admitted the charge quite frankly, when the question was put to him, and the House will surely agree that, in writing this series of letters, at least in writing them during the session of Parliament, he was guilty of conduct which the House could not afford to overlook. Then, as to the case of Bouchard, I frankly confess that I felt deep regret in being obliged to concur in the report upon his case, because it was represented to me that he was a needy man. But I saw before me a duty. For I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is a duty the committee owed to this House and to the country to see to it that no active partisan should occupy the position of translator of the debates, on the principle that no members of the civil service should be allowed to participate in active politics. It is because I felt it to be my duty to concur in that report, that I did so concur in it. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) dwelt with great pathos upon this case; in fact, I looked around, during his remarks, to see if any hon. members were using their handkerchiefs. But Mr. Bouchard himself came before the committee and freely admitted that he attended three political meetings during the last contest, and at one of these political meetings he took the platform and made a speech of considerable length, a speech which the "Daily Citizen," of this city, lauded very highly. Now, the reports

of that speech, as contained in the "Citizen," but which Bouchard said was exaggerated, stated that he strongly supported the late Government, which was the then existing Government, and endorsed its policy on the school question and its trade policy. Now, Bouchard himself said that his speech was brief and that he made that speech just as the meeting was about to close. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that that speech was made, not at the close of the meeting, because I saw by a report in one of the papers, that a Mr. Baskerville spoke after Mr. Bouchard had concluded his speech. However, we will not split hairs upon that point. If Mr. Bouchard went upon a public platform and participated in the public discussions during an election, I contend that he was guilty of active and offensive partisanship in the late contest, the word "offensive" having the meaning I attributed to it a few moments ago. Therefore, it seems to me clear that these three gentlemen, applying the rule laid down by the members of the Government since this session opened, were clearly guilty of taking part in politics; and, however harsh it may appear, and however much hon. members may regret to concur in that report, it seems to me quite clear that these gentlemen should be dismissed. Now, in connection with the dismissal of civil servants for active and offensive partisanship, it seems to me that there are two points that hon. members should keep steadily in view. One point is with regard to the civil service itself. Is it most desirable, in the interests of the service, that its members should cease to take part in political affairs? I think the time has come, and it has come none too soon, when this Parliament should declare, and it should be clearly understood throughout the country, that no civil servant, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, should participate in active politics. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to bring up the experience in Ontario, as has been done in the past; but I would remind hon. gentlemen that two blacks do not make one white. If a wrong is done in Ontario, that is no reason why a wrong should be done by this Parliament. I remember that in Manitoba there were cases in which the accusation was made that civil servants participated in politics; and I, as the editor of a paper there, took occasion to denounce the practice. I think that practice should be denounced. I think that, in the interests of the civil servants themselves, they should be debarred from interfering in active politics. We have heard hon. gentlemen speaking here, seeking to draw fine lines as to whether civil servants should vote, or how far they should go in participating in politics. But it seems to me there is very little difficulty in drawing a line beyond which they should not go. I think the members of the civil service should have a vote and that they should be entitled to hold their own opinions and express them inoffensively and in private. But there is a vast difference between active electioneering and a private expression of opinion. We do not seek to deprive the civil servant of his vote, but we do seek, in his own interest and in the country's interest, to deprive him of the liberty of taking an active part on the hustings and in any public way in political contests. These are my views upon the question, and I would urge upon hon. members the most careful consideration of this report, in order that they may vote intelligently. The members of the committee did not, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia alleged, display any "wolf-like passion." I attended the meetings of the committee day after day, and I saw no manifestations of "wolf-like passion." In fact, I saw very considerable and very deep regret expressed upon many faces there that it should be found necessary to present such a report. The idea was not one of revenge; the idea was that, as a committee, we should do our duty to this House and to this country. And, in doing our duty, Mr. Speaker, we found it necessary and desirable to recommend that these gentlemen be dismissed.

Mr. CRAIG. I would not take any part in this debate were it not that I am a member of the Debates Committee, and being familiar with the evidence, I wish to place my views of the situation before the House. I shall endeavour to approach this subject in an impartial spirit. I do not think this is a party question at all. There are party questions, I do not consider this is one, and I shall not approach it with any party spirit at all. I trust that members on both sides of the House will endeavour to look at this, leaving party out of the question. We are to consider the case of three men who have risked their situations, and we are to pronounce on their case to-day. I wish to show that there are mitigating circumstances in the case of these men, and I have no doubt that what I shall say will have the consideration of all the members of this House. I agree with the hon. member who last spoke in assuming that every member will give this matter careful consideration, that we shall not come to this matter with our minds made up. We might do that on some questions, but on this question I hold that we should not do so. We should come here to-day to discuss this question with an open mind, ready to form our conclusion on the evidence placed before us. I suppose it is natural that we might look at the matter from different points of view. I have no fault to find with the action of the committee in this matter, so far as concerns the proceedings which took place at the meetings I attended. I believe that all intended to do what they thought right, and I have no doubt they wish to do that to-day. Now, I want to say that I consider there is a difference between the conduct of some of these men. I hold that Mr.

Bouchard stands in an entirely different position from Vanasse and McLeod. In my mind there is no doubt that the language used in the letter of McLeod and the language used in the address of Vanasse, may be called offensive. I am sure that if it was used against me, I would feel that it was offensive—that is, politically. I do not know that in most of the language used there is anything personally offensive, although I could not justify for one moment the expression used by Mr. McLeod with reference to the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) where he called him a young blockhead. I think that is getting down rather low in political discussion, and I have no doubt the member for Richelieu looked upon that as very offensive indeed, and I think I would be disposed to do so myself. So I am not defending McLeod and Vanasse from the charge of having used offensive language in their letters and speeches. I say further that if these men are to be treated as members of the civil service, then I have no doubt they will come under the conditions laid down by the Premier within the last few days, and no doubt they will have to go if we class them as civil servants. But I hold they are not civil servants, and I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact. They did make the excuse that they thought they were acting strictly within their rights, because they took what had been said in previous years by the present Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, and by other members on that side of the House.. Well, whether they were justified in doing that, I am not going to say, but there is no doubt they did justify themselves by referring to the language used by the Premier, and by other members of the Opposition, and by another member of the Government, as I shall show in a moment. Now, I do not intend to speak more than a few minutes, but this is so important a question that I shall have to trouble the House with reading again part of what has already been read by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who preceded me. I am going to read from a speech made on April 10th, 1888, found in "Hansard," page 713, a speech made by the then leader of the Opposition and the present Prime Minister. Speaking about the dismissal of Mr. Tremblay, he said:

> Now, I must say at once that it seems somewhat singular, and it is, I think, improper, that officers of this House should be allowed to engage actively in politics. I have no hesitation at all in making that statement, but if these gentlemen declare that they took an active part in the political campaign, they also declare that in doing so, they had the sanction of this House.

Now, that is just the case of the gentlemen about whom I am speaking. Vanasse and McLeod admitted that they took an active part in the political campaign, but they say that in doing so they had the sanction of this House—just exactly the plea that was used by the gentlemen who were under discussion at that time:

> They state that the House had appointed the translators of the debates—I am not yet speaking of the other officers of the House, but of the translators only—with the understanding that they should be allowed to take part not only in political campaigns, but in active politics in all circumstances. This matter came up incidentally in 1884. At that time it was stated, without contradiction from any quarter, that the translators of the debates were permitted to be engaged in active journalism, and therefore to engage in politics. On that occasion the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was a member of the Debates Committee, spoke. I must say that the matter came up upon the question of increasing the salaries of the translators, and the hon. member for North Norfolk stated that he was opposed to an increase of salaries because the translators were actively engaged as newspaper correspondents. He said:
>
> I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translaters' situations or not.

The leader of the Opposition at that time goes on to say:

> So it was openly stated on the floor of the House, in 1884, that the translators of the debates, while being officers of this House, were at the same time actively engaged in political work, and writing for the newspapers with which they were connected.

And so arguing in the same direction that these men had been permitted by the House to take part in politics, that the statement had been made that they were permitted to do so without contradiction from any member of the House. I have another quotation to read. The hon. the Prime Minister, at that time leader of the Opposition, discussing the same matter, goes on to say that the practice allowing officials to engage in politics, should not be allowed. He says:

> The practice should not be tolerated at all. I have said in my opening remarks, and I repeat it here, that it should not be tolerated that an officer of this House should engage in active politcis. I think the principle is a wrong one. I agree with my friend from Oxford. I agree with everybody who has spoken on this side that if my friend the Secretary of State wants to pose in a magnanimous position, it does not lie in him to dismiss men because they offended him, but let him say——

And this is an argument I intend to use to the Prime Minister to-day, an argument used by himself at that time. In speaking of the Secretary of State at that time, the Prime Minister said:

> ——let him say, We have been violating the rule, let us make a new rule, and let us forget the past, and then we will think it magnanimous. Notwithstanding what my friend may say, I cannot believe he is actuated, unconsciously perhaps, since he protests, with anything but resentment. If he were not actuated by resentment he would say: I will make it a rule that those men will not in future trespass against the privileges of this House.

So that the Prime Minister, who was at that time leading the Opposition, said: Let us make a new rule, we wish to have that rule, let us lay down a rule now for the future, but don't let us judge these men by the past—and I use the same argument to him to-day. I think it is a good argument to apply to the present case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why did you not accept it then?

Mr. CRAIG. Well, I was not here, or I might. With regard to the contention that if these men were civil servants, they would properly come under the condemnation of the House, I say that if such was the position I would not object to their dismissal. But I hold that they are not civil servants. On April 11th, 1888, I find the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) said:

> However that may be, my own impression about the position of the civil servant is this: I do not approve of a civil servant taking an active part in politics. I do not approve of the language used in this particular case, such language as I see in the records in the Votes and Proceedings—I do not think any reasonable person will approve of that course, but I hold that there is a great difference to be drawn between the case of a civil servant whose whole time is given to the Government and that of a person employed temporarily who receives only a partial remuneration, not sufficient to enable him to live except by making exertions outside. When owing to the limited employment obtained here, a person is compelled to seek employment elsewhere, you thereby relegate him to the full status of an ordinary citizen, untrammelled by his temporary or partial employment in this House.

No language could be plainer than that, and I commend it to the careful consideration of the Prime Minister. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) was right in laying down that rule, and stating that the translators are not properly civil servants. No doubt, whether they acted rightly or wrongly, those men had a perfect right to take it for granted, from the language used by the then leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, and from the language used by the present Postmaster General, then a leading member of the Opposition, that this position was taken by the Opposition as a whole, and if it was the position taken by them then, I hold it is the position they should take to-day. If they wish to class these translators with civil servants, if they wish to affirm that they should not take part in politics, let them say so, and I shall have no fault to find. If they transgressed, they would then know the consequences: but I hold that these men have a right to offer as an excuse the excuse they have offered, namely, that they thought they had a perfect right to act as they did. Mr. McLeod acted as correspondent of a newspaper. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated that the salaries of the translators were not increased because they were correspondents, and in that way earned an additional amount during the session. Mr. McLeod said he understood he had a perfect right to do so. But Mr. Vanasse did what he did after the session was over, when, according to the language used in this House regarding the translators, he had a perfect right to so act and no one could find fault. The translators frankly admitted that they did what they were charged with doing, but declared they had a perfect right to do so in view of the statements made in this House without contradiction. So far, with respect to the cases of McLeod and Vanasse. But I hold that the Bouchard case is quite different. Bouchard did not use offensive language. It has been laid down that a civil servant using offensive language should be dismissed. It cannot be shown that any offensive language was used by Bouchard. If hon. members will look at the report in the "Citizen" of the meeting referred to, which report he says is exaggerated, they will fail to find any offensive remarks; and as no charge for using offensive language can be sustained against Bouchard, he must be acquitted. What did he do? He admits having attended three political meetings, which he says he attended as an elector. Then he admits speaking at one meeting, but he says he had no intention when he went there of speaking or taking any active part in it, but towards the close some of his friends induced him to sit on the platform, and before he was aware of it the chairman called on him to make a few remarks, which he did. He admits frankly having done so; but he said nothing offensive and did not take an active part in politics, and did nothing else but attend the meetings, and went to one meeting without the slightest intention of making a speech, but was dragged into offering a few remarks. His case stands entirely apart from the cases of Vanasse and McLeod. I therefore move the following amendment:

> That the report be amended by adding the words: "with the exception of the part relating to Joseph Bouchard."

I do not intend to offer any further remarks in support of the amendment. I think I have said quite sufficient to show that this case is entirely different from the other cases. The other men admitted they had used language which perhaps was offensive, but of which the House could judge. I hold, however, they are justified in the excuse they offer by the speech delivered by the Prime Minister. But I hold that Bouchard's case is entirely different. He used no offensive language, he took no active part in politics, he only attended three political meetings as an elector, speaking for a few minutes at one meeting, which he had no intention of doing when he went there; and I hold, under these circumstances, that whatever conclusion we may ar-

rive at with respect to Vanasse and McLeod, the House should accept the amendment and allow Bouchard to continue in his position. I appeal in this case for generous treatment to be extended to these men. I do not think we should judge them too harshly if they have transgressed, and I ask the Prime Minister that the fullest weight be given to the excuse made. They thought they were right in doing what they did.

The PRIME MINISTER. How is that ?

Mr. CRAIG. They thought so from the remarks made in this House, which were allowed to pass without contradiction.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the motion I made at that time was defeated ?

Mr. CRAIG. I hold that that fact does not change the opinion of the hon. gentleman.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does it change the opinion of the other side ?

Mr. CRAIG. I think we may say this, that if the hon. gentleman held those views at that time, he holds them to-day. The views held by the hon. gentleman in office now and those he held in opposition cannot change on this important question. Certainly the Conservatives rejected the motion, and I think they made a mistake in doing so. But because the Conservatives objected to the motion of the then leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, I do not think that fact should change his views to-day, and in my opinion it does not.

The PRIME MINISTER. But it changes the views of the other side. These men had no right to interfere in politics in 1887 ; hon. gentlemen opposite think they had a right to interfere recently.

Mr. CRAIG. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Conservatives in 1887 were in favour of punishing men for interfering in politics ; now they do not wish men to be punished for interfering in politics. They have changed their ground entirely.

Mr. CRAIG. I wish to reply to that argument for a few moments. It is an argument which should never be used by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is what is called the "tu quoque" argument—you did so and so, and we are going to do so and so. I hold that is no justifiable argument. Certainly it is an argument, but it is a poor one for hon. gentlemen opposite to use—I think you should have done so and so, but as you did not do so, I will not do what I thought was right at that time ; I thought it right at that time that the men should not be punished, but a new rule should be laid down, although those men thought they had a perfect right to do what they did. They thought they had a perfect right to take part in politics because of what had been said on the floor of this House. Then the hon. gentleman said : Let us not dismiss them, but if you do not wish them to take part in politics, lay down that rule for them. Well, I hold that the same thing applies to-day. Is it the fault of Vanasse and McLeod that the rule was not laid down then ?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The rule was laid down by the declaration of the House.

Mr. CRAIG. I hold that there was no rule laid down. In fact a distinctly opposite rule was laid down by the present leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier), and he asked that the rule should be laid down but it was not. If the House wishes to lay down a new rule let them do so now, but do not let us judge of the past actions of men by a new rule which is to be inaugurated for the first time now. It is a most unfortunate thing that the Liberal party, coming into power with great professions—and they have a perfect right to make professions if they intend to carry them out—it is an unfortunate thing that when they come into power with great professions of what they intend to do, and that when they do something wrong and we charge them with it, their answer is : Well, you did the same thing. I say that this is no argument at all, and I hold that the Liberal party will make a great mistake if they adopt this report, and dismiss these men. I just wish to say one word before I close, and I would not say it at all were it not for the remarks of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). He said, that we talk about Ontario, and he told us that two blacks do not make a white. That is perfectly true, but my answer is : that the principle of the Liberal party as laid down is that civil servants shall not take part in politics, but nobody would ever recognize that as a Liberal party principle judging by the conduct of the Liberals in Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong this debate. I have said all that I can say, and the matter is before the House. I ask particularly that the case of Bouchard shall be considered entirely different from the others. I have no doubt, that hon. gentlemen who consider the matter without reference to party, will agree that his case does stand entirely distinct. I shall now conclude, and I venture to believe, that all I have said on the matter can be fully substantiated by the records of the House.

Mr. CASEY. It appears from the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) that the Opposition have abandoned the case of two of the translators.

Mr. CRAIG. I made no motion.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. gentleman has allowed his amendment to drop. The hon.

member (Mr. Craig) has entered into the whole subject of dismissals and he has reiterated, in a manner that I am astonished to hear from a gentleman of his experience, that, if the rule had been made at the time when the Tremblays and Poirier were dismissed, that translators should not interfere in politics; then it would be quite fair now to turn out these men for interfering in politics. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) must remember, for the fact has been called to his attention by the Chairman of the committee (Mr. Choquette), that such a rule was laid down at that time, laid down in opposition to urgency from our side of the House, and that these men whom it is now sought to dismiss took the places of men who were turned out of office simply because they did interfere in politics. Therefore, Messrs. Vanasse, McLeod and Bouchard knew perfectly well that they took office as translators subject to the condition that they should not interfere in politics. They cannot grumble, and no man in the House can complain, if the rule under which they took office is applied to themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had better ask the question when I have finished.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not ask it if my hon. friend dissents.

Mr. CASEY. I do not wish to break the line of my argument. These translators not only took office under that well understood rule, but they took the places of those who had been dismissed for interfering in politics. Surely neither they nor their friends can complain of the rule being applied to them. Let me remind the House that these gentlemen are not civil servants in the ordinary sense of the word, ; they are not men responsible directly to the Government, nor to the head of a department, nor even to Mr. Speaker. The rule was established by this House that these men were responsible to the Debates Committee and to this House. These men are the servants of the whole House. It is especially incumbent upon men who are the servants of the House not to be guilty of any interference in politics; I will not merely say offensive interference, but of such active partisanship as would make their impartiality as translators doubtful. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a great deal of the point that the chief translator was not called upon to prove that there had been any partiality in the translation done by these men. Well, that might be impossible to prove. Nobody is going to read over the whole of the matter which they have translated and compare it with the original, in order to establish that. But can any one believe that men who were so bitter in their political feelings as these men have shown themselves to be, are to be trusted as the impartial translators of what passes in this House. I, for one, as a member of this House cannot.

Again, two of these men, McLeod and Vanasse, are proven on their own admission to be guilty of using offensive language against the leader of one side of the House. They are perhaps to be pitied for the fact that they have been led into this error by the leader of the party to which they belong. I understand that one of them used the term, that the present Premier of Canada was "a traitor to his race and religion." In a moral sense perhaps we can hardly blame the man for using that phrase, for he got it from a speech delivered in this House by the leader of the Opposition who was then the leader of this House for the Government. The present leader of the Opposition told our Premier that he was "a traitor to his race and religion," and this poor party heeler, who was drummed out—in virtue of the salary he received, not from the Government, or from a party, but as a servant of this House—this poor party heeler who was drummed out to serve during this campaign echoed like a parrot the words of his leader. That leader insulted the present leader of the Government of Canada. He not only insulted him and the party which he leads, but he insulted the race and religion of the hon. gentleman, and the race and religion resented the insult, and it is from that race and from that religion more particularly that the reply has come. It is a case of like master like man. The master was abusive on the floor of this House and the man was abusive outside the House. He who was abusive in the House has fallen in consequence of the abuse; the master has gone and let the man who made himself the servant of that master go with him. Any hon. gentleman who respects this House, or his own position as a member of it, cannot do otherwise than vote for the dismissal of one of our servants who has been guilty of such conduct. As to Bouchard who has been guilty merely of active partisanship, and who has not been charged with being offensive, the precedent is fully established by what has been already done in this House.

The line taken at that time, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and all the old members will recollect, was this, that the Liberals who were dismissed from the translating staff, had only done what the Conservatives on the staff had done, but in the opposite direction. The Conservatives on the staff had been encouraged to work for the Conservative party, and had done so without blame; but, when the Liberals on the staff had used the same liberty as the Conservatives, they had been dismissed, and dismissed with contumely. It was our contention then, not that these gentlemen should be allowed to engage in politics, but that the two parties on the staff were not treated with fairness—that the Conser-

vatives were allowed to meddle in politics, while the Liberals were dismissed for meddling.

Mr. DAVIN. Not by the committee, but by the House.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Assiniboia, this afternoon, read that very point from the speech of the present leader of the Government. Now, Sir, on the ground of the dignity of this House, on the ground of the necessity of having impartial men to translate our debates for transmission to other parts of the country, on the ground of the precedent set by hon. gentlemen opposite, I have no hesitation in saying that the self-respecting members of this House must vote for carrying out the principle in this case. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and the gander must submit to it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I do not feel, Sir, that I can endorse some of the remarks fallen from the hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the official report of the debates now under discussion in this House. I venture to say that if the officials in the service of this House, or belonging to the civil service are going to be treated at the hands of this House or of the committees of the House in the way in which they are now being treated, the civil service, I say, will be degraded into a school of hypocrisy. The officials of this House and the civil service employees are threatened with being made a target for persecution, whenever a new party comes into power. When the Conservative party were in power, in 1888, we heard the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) and his friends emphatically protesting against what they called actual persecution, in the case of some translators of the Debates. As the hon. gentlemen know, three translators of the Debates were dismissed in 1888. I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, the translators who were turned out, were not accorded as fair a treatment as should have been meted out to them at our hands. I believe that the precedent then set up by the House should not be adhered to in this case. I hold, on the contrary, that it is high time that those dismissals should be put a stop to, as every change of government would be likely to bring about the recurrence of such reprisals and would result in making slaves of the officials of this House, and causing the civil service, as I said a little while ago, to be degraded into a school of hypocrisy. Whenever the officials of this House think it fit to write their minds about the political men of the day and the course pursued by them, should the House prove unduly severe, they will not be at a loss, while remaining anonymous, how to give utterance to their opinions in even stronger terms than those for which the translators are upbraided for indulging in. Now, the translators under trial, are charged with having taken an active part in politics during the late contest and with having contributed to the press offensive articles against the hon. gentlemen opposite, and therefore it is urged that they should be dismissed. Such is the charge brought against them. But, Sir, who are the men that are going to take the places of those translators, the moment they are decapitated, if it should so happen? Are not the Government prepared to fill the vacancies to be created by appointing to the staff their own supporters who have taken an active part in the late contest? The Government, through their majority in the Debates Committee, are going to appoint to the translators' staff, in the place of the actual translators, men who have taken a prominent part in the late electoral contest, in the interest of the party now in power, men, I say, who have interfered in politics with perhaps more vigour, and made themselves more offensive than those it is now sought to dismiss did. But, I ask, Sir, what will happen during the next electoral contest? My hon. friend the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) and his friends are not sure in what way the people are going to declare their verdict. Now, those translators or other Government officials, whose active services the hon. gentlemen opposite may perhaps appeal to during the next electoral contest, those employees, I say, urged by their political leaders to act up to their convictions and to give utterance to their views in public are very likely to tread in the footsteps of the translators who are now under trial before this House. They may, no doubt, take part in the political campaign, wearing the mask of hypocrisy, and may, perhaps, under the cover of a nom de plume contribute to the press slanderous articles, or, at any rate, as strong editorials as those which the translators are now charged with having contributed to the press. With the precedent which it is now sought to establish in this case, the result will be that the party, now in Opposition will resent the action taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite and that, yielding to the pressure of public opinion, as expressed through the House, they may be constrained to do by the employees who are going to take the places of those now threatened with decapitation, as the hon. gentlemen are now doing by the latter. And then, no doubt, the hon. leader of the House (Mr. Laurier) veering again, will wax eloquent, as he did in 1888, while arraigning the arbitrary action of the Cabinet that is to be, and crying mercy for his friends who will have to stand trial upon charges like those now laid against the translators.

The FIRST MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). (Translation.) We have no friends among the translators.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) You have no friends now, but you will have some by

that time who will have taken an active part in the electoral contest, and done their utmost to maintain my hon. friend in the position he now occupies. Now, it is in the interest of the translating staff of the Debates, and of his own supporters who may be appointed to that staff, that I do now urge the First Minister to deal fairly by the officials who are now members of that staff. I venture to say, Sir, that some hon. gentlemen opposite have taken too active a part and displayed too much animus against the present translators. The hon. gentlemen who have charged those translators with having used offensive language in discussing political issues, with reference to the hon. leader of this House and some of his friends ; the hon. gentlemen, I say, who have taken that action are undoubtedly the very men who have used, with regard to the leader of the Opposition in this House and the supporters of the Conservative party, far more abusive and offensive language than that which the translators now threatened with dismissal have ever indulged in. I may say that during the late contest, I heard the hon. gentlemen opposite use such abusive language. Now, I ask, wherefore do the hon. gentlemen who made use of such violent and abusive language against us, on this side of the House, so loudly clamour for the beheading of officials of this House who are not permanent, but are employed only during the session ? No doubt, the hon. gentlemen are afraid of having too vivid a light cast upon their political course. I fail to see that these hon. gentlemen who now persecute the translators of the Debates, evince anything like liberality or largeness of mind in their conduct. I see nothing but arbitrary in the course now pursued by the hon. gentlemen. The French translators of the Debates, should no more than the rest of the Government officers, be degraded into mere slaves. I fail to see how the dignity of this House will be added to, in allowing its officials to be thus degraded in the eyes of the people. I believe that our officials should be given free scope and full freedom, provided they do the work they are paid for by the House. I hold that, during recess, they should be perfectly free to do what they please, and to engage actively in politics, if they so chose to do, provided that the language they use be devoid of any violence or abuse, such as some hon. gentlemen have resorted to, when speaking of their opponents. Judging from the report now before this House, I hold that many hon. gentlemen, on both sides of this House, have used in reference to their opponents much more violent and offensive language than that which these translators are charged with having indulged in.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the case of these translators, it seems to me, is somewhat different from that of the permanent civil service official who oversteps the fence-line of discretion, and goes upon the political platform and talks for his party. Civil servants who are in the permanent service, are, I understand, prohibited from doing any outside work. Now, are these men, who are only sessional employees, although at liberty to follow their personal professions during the recess, under the same restrictions as the permanent staff ? I do not think they are, inasmuch as they may follow their legitimate professions during the recess ; but, as they receive a goodly, yes, a substantial part of their income from the country, I think they should have better sense than to go upon the political platform and shake their tongues, and, forsooth, play the part of Sir Oracle, and cut and slash at political leaders whose policy does not agree with their own. The question, it seems to me, resolves itself into a conflict between two principles. The majority of the committee, by dismissing these translators, would indirectly assert the principle that to the victors belong the spoils. The minority of the committee, by retaining them, would assert the no less evil principle that the servant of the whole country has a right to be the soldier of one party. There are men in office in the country, such as issuers of marriage licenses and postmasters, who receive a ten-dollar bill from the Dominion every year as salary, who are entitled to the fullest rights of citizenship. But these translators do not belong to any such class. Their work is hard, and they do it well ; and the thousand dollars they receive per session is certainly a substantial addition to their income, any how, it goes a long way to keep them from that avidity of hunger which my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke of about half an hour ago. Any assertion of the principle that a man in receipt of substantial public pay, has a right to be an active politician, is simply another way of saying that a party has a right to billet its warriors on the country. I think the House should condemn the principle invoked to justify the retention of these men ; it should also condemn the principle invoked to justify their dismissal ; and it should adopt the new and better principle that would keep all civil servants out of active politics. Some talk of the freedom of citizens in this country. Why, Mr. Speaker, there are many citizens in this country who would be only too glad to exchange their freedom for the salaries which these translators get. Some gentlemen talk as if the freedom of the subject were endangered. There could be no greater mistake. There is lots of freedom outside of the civil service. There is always a good crop of freedom in this country ; but, as my hon. friends on the Liberal side of the House can testify, from their correspondence, there is sometimes a short crop of salaries. I find myself at war with both sides on this important question. An appeal on behalf of these translators to the justice of Parlia-

ment might be disallowed. I hope that an appeal on their behalf to the mercy of Parliament will not be disallowed. These men have been brought face to face with their own wrong-doing. They have been in a sort of lingering pickle for over a month, and, in addition, they have been stewed in the stock-pot of the committee. They are only bits of moistened clay like ourselves, Mr. Speaker, and surely it is better to forgive than to have revenge. We have listened this afternoon to the arguments on both sides in connection with this report; and, as we are the jurors in the case, I think that, as jurors, we should unite upon the Hibernian verdict of "Not guilty; but don't do it again."

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

After Recess.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, I was about to express my surprise that the hon. gentlemen who are responsible for bringing this question before Parliament did not rise in their places to support the charges which they thought fit to make in the Debates Committee against the French translators of the debates, whose dismissal is asked for by the report of that committee now submitted for our consideration. In looking over the report of the committee, I find a letter written by the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) which reads as follows:—

House of Commons, 28th Aug., 1896.

To the Committee of the "Debates."

I beg to make the following statement:—

That I have been informed on reliable authority:—

Jean Baptiste Vanasse, Peter McLeod and Lucien Lasalle, three translators of the "Debates" of the House of Commons of Canada, have taken a prominent part in organizing political strife since 1891, when in office.

An opportunity to prove the statement is humbly requested.

D. MONET.

I also find another document, which, translated, reads as follows:—

House of Commons,
Ottawa, 27th Aug., 1896.

P. A. Choquette, Esq., M.P.,
Chairman Debates Committee.

My dear colleague,—

I desire to direct your attention to the active part taken in the last general election by Mr. J. B. Vanasse, of Sorel, a member of the staff of translators of the "Debates." His interference in politics has been so public and notorious that he could not disprove the charge. You may, by way of convincing yourself as to the correctness of the statement I make, refer to the newspaper "Le Sorelois," containing his speeches, denouncing the Hon. Mr. Laurier and your humble servant as traitors to their faith and their nationality. I also inclose you an affidavit substantiating said charge, which being true, I cannot see why Mr. Vanasse should not receive the same treatment as was meted out to Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay, who were dismissed for having meddled in politics. Mr. Vanasse certainly deserves it for many more reasons than one, and his dismissal will satisfy the people of the district of Richelieu.

Yours truly,
A. A. BRUNEAU.

At a subsequent meeting of the committee another charge was put on record:

House of Commons,
Ottawa, 2nd Sept., 1896.

To the Committee of the Debates.

I beg to make the following statement:—

That I am informed on reliable authority that Joseph Bouchard, one of the translators of the "Debates" of the House of Commons of Canada, has taken a prominent part in organizing political strife and making stump speeches during the last contest in 1896 in the Dominion, when in office since 1891.

An opportunity to prove the statement is humbly requested.

D. MONET, M.P.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these two gentlemen, who have seats in this House, thought fit to bring charges against officials of this House and pressed them before the Debates Committee. One of these hon. gentlemen is a member of that committee, and acted the part of accuser and of judge at the same time, voting in one of two instances on questions that were raised in connection with the case. Yet now, when the House is seized of this matter, neither of those two gentlemen has dared to come forward and express his opinion. This is a personal matter with them that should never have been brought to our consideration. Here is the member sitting for the county of Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) formulating a complaint against another gentleman who resides and has a vote in that county, who has the right to exercise his franchise, who voted at the election, who thought fit to express publicly his opinions on the topics of the day, and who was perfectly right in so doing, because, at the time, he was not acting as an official of the House, that is to say, he was not on duty. As has been ably explained by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), these official translators are not members of the civil service. They do not, in the proper sense, come under the laws which govern the civil service, and my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is altogether astray when he seeks to apply what Todd says with regard to the civil service in these cases. It has been not only asserted but proven that when these officials were appointed, the understanding was that their services would be required only during sessions, and that during recess they were at perfect liberty to do as they pleased and what they pleased. So much

was that the case that, on a former occasion, when officials occupying a very similar position, in fact the very same position, were dismissed—not by the House, not by the Debates Committee, but by a gentleman who, Mr. Speaker, sat in the very Chair you occupy to-day—their dismissal was condemned by my hon. friends from the opposite side of the House, because then, it appears, these gentlemen held that opinion simply because the victims happened to be their political friends. To-day, because the three victims whose heads we are called upon to cut off happen to belong to the other creed in politics, they stultify themselves and take back all the good they said on a former occasion in order to achieve the end which has been contemplated by the two members who are more directly interested in this case. I would not like to be charged with taking up too much time of the House by reading, perhaps repeating, some of the quotations that have been made from debates that have taken place on former occasions under similar circumstances. At the same time, I hope I may be allowed to refer to the opinion expressed by Mr. David Mills. Speaking on the occasion of the dismissal of Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay, he said :

So far as these translators are concerned, it was said at the time of their appointment that the House gave employment to them but for a very small portion of the year, and that their salaries were less than the ordinary reporters upon the Official Debates, and that they were to be at liberty to engage in ordinary avocations when they were not employed here. It was well known at the time they were appointed that some of them were on the political press on one side and some of them on the political press on the other side, and it was expressly stated by the committee at whose instance they were appointed that they were not to be interfered with in their political freedom and independence.

This is the opinion expressed at that time when the very question that we are discussing to-day was raised in this House, and the hon. gentleman on the other side who then sat in this House and supported that opinion and condemned the dismissal of the three gentlemen who were turned out for having interfered in politics, or, perhaps I might better say, for having used language that was found to be objectionable by some hon. gentlemen then sitting in this House. To-day, because the position is reversed, because those who are offended are sitting on that side of the House and those who have offended belong to the same political creed as we on this side of the House, hon. gentlemen opposite now state that these men have acted wrongly and that their heads must be cut off. Well, I say again, if they persist in that position, they will simply stultify themselves and they will have to take back what they have said on former occasions. I am more surprised at the attitude of the hon. leader of this House (Mr. Laurier) than at that of any other hon. member. The leadership of a party must certainly add some obligations to the one who occupies such a high position and he should be above all suspicion —he who has command not only of the House but of the whole country. Now, as has been already mentioned in this House, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) referring to the dismissal of Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay, said :

It may probably be said that there is no fault found with their taking part in politics if they chose to do so, but they must use polite language. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the House of Commons which gave the translators permission to engage in politics, but the House could scarcely be expected to hope that they would never be guilty of abusive language. Hon. members must remember that the translators of the debates for three or four months of the year do nothing else but translate the debates of the House ; they become saturated with abusive language, and to expect that they would act differently was to suppose they were different flesh and blood from ourselves.

This was the opinion expressed by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. And he adds :

The translators were appointed to translate the debates and nothing else, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, who is Chairman of the Debates Committee, that it was always understood that during a part of the session they could engage in any other work they chose to engage in.

That is to say, not only did the hon. gentleman admit that the translators of the debates were not bound to devote all their time to the work that was entrusted to them, but during their leisure, even while the session was in progress they had a perfect right to do work outside for other concerns. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman said this afternoon in a short passage of words with my hon. friend here (Mr. Davin) that this position had been reversed, that is to say that this question had been settled and that a majority of this House had decided that the translators were no more at liberty to act as they had been allowed to do before. But, Sir, I find that in July, 1894, the hon. gentleman was still of the same opinion as in 1888. In 1894 a charge was brought against one of the translators whose head we are asked to cut off to-day, that he had interfered in politics by writing political articles in one of the newspapers. In defence of the position of that gentleman, the hon. leader of the House, who at that time was the head of the Opposition in this House, said :

Some years ago, in 1882 or 1883, when the late Minister of the Interior—the late Hon. Thomas White—was chairman of the committee, a report was adopted by this House, and at that time it was understood that the shorthand writers should receive $2,000 a year and that their services might be taken advantage of at any time during recess, and the translators were to receive $1,000 a year and were to be free to take up any occupation they liked during the recess. After session they were to be free to go into journalism or anything else they liked.

The rule has always been that during sessions they are to devote their whole time to the work for which they are paid by this House. Outside of the session they can do what they please.

So that even the leader of the Government never understood that what took place in 1888 would be the rule, and that thereafter no member of that staff would be allowed to devote any time to politics, or would be allowed to take part in the political considerations of the country. Now, what has been the position upon this question of the committee of this House appointed to supervise the printing of the debates? Those translators of the debates, I maintain, are not under the jurisdiction of the Government, they are officials of this House, and, therefore, they are not supposed to be put in office, and are not put in office, on account of their political views or antecedents. As a proof of this, I may mention that, during the time I had the honour of being a member of the Debates Committee, I well remember that, whenever a vacancy occurred, the political views or the political creed of a candidate for that position were never taken into consideration. I may say that though, during the last Parliament, a majority of the committee was composed of members belonging to the Conservative side, appointments have been made of gentlemen belonging to the Liberal side in politics, as against applicants well qualified belonging to the Conservative side, because there were reasons for such appointments. I may mention one instance. A gentleman by the name of Richardson, a Roman Catholic and a Conservative, died while he was a member of the reporting staff. Having the honour of being the chairman of the committee at that time, I spoke to some friends, and a gentleman by the name of Campbell was recommended to me, not on account of his political creed, but on account of his ability, on account of the good services that he could render to the staff by joining the body of good men we already had there. This gentleman had been for a long time a reporter on the "Globe," and admitted that he was a Liberal in politics. On the other hand, a gentleman on the reporting staff of the "Empire," also well qualified, but who was not, perhaps, as well known to the committee as Mr. Campbell, made an application, and he was strongly recommended by every member of the Government of the day. But this Mr. Campbell had already temporarily filled the position after the death of Mr. Richardson, and he had a claim to the position, and we did not wish to do an injustice to him by preferring a political friend, and so we decided to keep Mr. Campbell, though he was a Liberal, opposed to us in politics. But we kept him in office because he was a first-class officer, and we knew very well that he would discharge his duty impartially and faithfully, as he has since done. Well, when we are charged with making political capital with this question, I think the charge does not become those hon. gentlemen who have never sat on that committee, and who are not aware of what has taken place in that committee in the past. I must admit with regret that we have never seen such disgraceful proceedings in that committee as we have had since the opening of this session.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must know that he is out of order in referring to what took place in committee, beyond what is shown in the report now before the House.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I only expressed regret. Well, after several meetings such as I have described, we came to the conclusion that we must deal with the subject in the fairest way possible. On the 17th September, when the committee met at ten o'clock in the morning, after the minutes of the former meeting had been read, and the order of the day had been called, I made the following proposition:—

That after hearing the charges and the evidence in the cases of Messrs. Vanasse, McLeod, Lasalle and Bouchard, this committee is of the opinion that no charge or complaint having been made against any of the above named officials in regard to the proper and impartial discharge of their duties, as official translators of the debates, during the session, and that the charges brought against them being purely of a political character, and not of such a nature as would justify the interference of this committee, acting impartially, be it resolved that the order be discharged and the business of the committee be proceeded with.

Well, Sir, on that occasion I thought I was justified in making such a motion, because the question was a political question, and one that never should have been brought up before a committee of this House, because, in the work of that committee and in the discharge of our duties as members of that committee, we should never be actuated by political feelings, we should deal with matters coming before us in an impartial and liberal manner, and it was with that object that I made the motion I have just read. But, Sir, the accusers were persistent, and nothing less than the heads of those very men we are now asked to discharge from the service of this House, would satisfy them. Why, Sir, while we were dealing with that case, we were canvassed by a lot of men seeking the positions of those very men we were asked to discharge, and we were called upon to support this or that candidate in the face of these poor men, whose cases have not yet been tried. More than that, Sir, I saw on one occasion a document containing charges against one of those who were accused, and behind that document was the application of the very party who wanted to get his place. When one sees things of that sort, under such circumstances, I think, we are justified in asking this House not to be in too great a hurry to ruin fathers of families who have

held these positions for years, who have discharged their duties so far as the work is concerned to the satisfaction of the House and the public at large, men who never for a moment thought that while they were allowed to go and vote at elections they were not allowed to express freely their opinions on the political topics of the day. Why allow these men to give their votes as citizens if you want to deprive them of the right to speak their minds as to the way they intend to vote or have voted. I am not in favour of suppressing the vote of the civil servants, because this is a free country, and whether a man belongs to the civil service or works for a manufacturer or a farmer, or is employed in the public service he has the same right as any other citizen of the country to express his political opinions. I am more sorry for this occurrence because this matter is brought up by members who are personally interested in the matter, and have probably friends to put in the very places of those men whom we are called upon to dismiss to-day.

Mr. SCRIVER. How do you know that ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. You are not one, I am glad to say.

Mr. SCRIVER. I ask the hon. gentleman how he knows that.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am not allowed to state what transpired in the committee.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman will excuse me, but I think he is not warranted by anything said in the committee in making the assertion he has made with respect to personal interest.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Are you referring to what took place in the committee ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is about time we had good order, and in order to have good order we will vote against the dismissal of those men we are called upon to discharge to-day.

Mr. BRITTON. I think there ought to be a rule laid down, after so much discussion as we have had in this House on this matter and very similar matters during the last few days they have been under consideration. I supposed there had been a rule almost agreed upon, if not quite agreed upon, between the members on the Government side of the House and hon. gentlemen opposite. I thought it was quite well understood, at all events by the majority on the other side, that if a person who held an office in the civil service or in the employ of the Government took an active and offensive part in election matters, he should be asked to resign his situation or he should be dismised. I am quite aware that in the discussion of the matter the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) did not go so far in that direction as the leader of the Opposition, but he went, as it seems to me, quite far enough to warrant the course that is proposed to be taken by the members of the committee in their report on this matter. If that is so, then the passing of the report, at all events so far as two of the persons charged is concerned, would only be the logical and natural conclusion and simply following the rule agreed upon by the parties. I confess that there is to my mind a considerable distinction between the cases of the three persons. I think on the evidence before me, and which I have read this afternoon, that the case of Bouchard is very much less aggravated than the cases of the other two individuals, and I will go so far as to say this, that if I had been on the committee and dealing with this matter, I would have given Bouchard the benefit of the doubt and have not executed the penalty sought to be enforced against him. But while it is one thing to deal with the matter as a member of the committee, it is quite a different matter to deal with the report presented by the committee for our consideration. This is a judicial deliverance on the part of this committee. They have given a much more full consideration to all matters that came before them than any one can possibly do by looking at the evidence and dealing with the matter here, and while I would have been willing to give the benefit of the doubt to Bouchard, so far as I am advised at present and I am able to form an opinion from the record of the committee, yet a different rule should be observed in dealing with the matter in this House. As this is a judicial report carefully prepared by the committee and presented to the House, we should hesitate before we go against the report ; so while Bouchard might have been entitled to the benefit of the doubt there, he is hardly authorized to receive that benefit here, and it can hardly be expected that we will deal differently with his case when it is embodied in the report from the way we will deal with the cases of the other two translators. I cannot see the difference sought to be drawn between these translators and employees of the House and members of the civil service. Technically there may be a difference, really these is no difference. The former are in the employ of the Government just as much as are regular civil servants, and, therefore, they should be subject to precisely the same rule. Surely it is not a matter of very great importance if they regard their situation as in any degree permanent and kept on year after year that they should have some time between sessions when they had not any work to do. If we were to draw a comparison we might find that to be the case with judicial officers. County court judges, who are entirely apart from politics, have not their time fully occupied, and the Government allow them when they are not occupied in trying cases or attending court, to take arbitrations and do work for their own benefit, which is entirely

different from the judicial work, yet they are judged to be in the employ of the Government all the time, and it would be unseemly in them to take part in political matters. What is true in their case is only true in a lesser degree in the case of these gentlemen who have for several years past been receiving the money of all classes and political creeds in the country. So that the distinction sought to be drawn between them and civil service employees proper is imaginary—there is no distinction that really can be made to apply to one and not to the other. I do not desire to go over the printed evidence and comment upon it, for it has been reviewed by some hon. gentlemen who have preceded me ; but I rose more particularly to call attention to one point which is made apparent in the printed copy before me. Light is shed on the way certain matters are managed by this little piece of evidence which comes accidentally before the House. We have complained and have desired some rule laid down in regard to Government employees. We on this side of the House have complained that whenever there was an election the Conservative party has always had, first, their committees ready ; second, they have had their committee rooms lighted and heated for them ; they have had their men ready at a moment's warning, at the bugle call, to take part in the election. The custom-houses post offices, inland revenue offices, offices of weights and measures and steamboat inspection have been committee rooms heated and warmed, and these officials were the men ready to go into the field and oppose the Liberal party. I find that one of these letters signed by one of the translators who were acquitted in this matter, is dated from the "Conservative Association, Montreal, Post Office, first story, Room No. 1." That is proof conclusive, if proof were needed, that the statements which we have made from this side of the House, that the public buildings, the post offices, &c., throughout the country were used for the Conservative Association headquarters, and as a rallying ground for Dominion officials to send out such political literature as I find here, and which I dare say every one has read. It only requires to be read in order to show the unfair advantage which the signers of that letter asked persons to take in promoting Conservative work throughout the country. Knowing what the Liberal party have had to contend with from first to last, the wonder is that we are on this side of the House to-night, instead of on the other. We have had difficulties to contend with beyond all reason in our election campaigns. I would ask my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in the light of what he knows in reference to what has been done by officials from time to time, if he does not think it right to take back the expression he used in reference to the Liberals, when he said they were sitting around with a wolf-like hunger upon them, ready for the offices that might become vacant by the dismissal of persons guilty of offences of this kind.

Mr. DAVIN. That was only a metaphor, and if the hon. gentleman feels greatly aggrieved, I will abolish the metaphor.

Mr. BRITTON. The difficulty about my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is that he is all metaphor. I sympathize as strongly as any gentleman on the opposite side can with these gentlemen in the position in which they find themselves. My desire would be to continue them there as bread-winners for their families, but surely a principle is involved, and if we are to have a rule laid down that officials shall not use their undue influence against the political party in opposition, then there can be no better time than the present to lay down the rule. But, Sir, we ought to see that justice is now done no matter who happens to be hurt.

Mr. BERGERON. Although I am a member of the Debates Committee, I would not have taken part in this discussion were it not for a remark made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). That hon. gentleman said, that Mr. Vanasse had been appointed to replace one of the translators who had been dismissed in 1888. It would be an injustice to Mr. Vanasse if that statement were not corrected. As a matter of fact it is not so. Mr. Vanasse was appointed when the "Hansard" translators were first named, in the same way as Mr. Beaulieu and Mr. Lasalle. This is a matter which looks to be of small importance, but as this case goes before the country as being a little piece of political vengeance it is just as well that it should be set right. I am afraid that we have occupied too much of the time of Parliament by this discussion. The people of the country think that we have more important business to transact than to occupy our time in trying to knock the heads off three poor translators. This is nothing else but a piece of political patronage. A great deal of allusion has been made to those who were dismissed in 1888, at the instance of my old friend Sir Adolphe Chapleau. I remember that the Premier said at that time that these men should not be dismissed, and I entirely agreed with him then. I was tempted to vote against the motion of the then Secretary of State, Sir Adolphe Chapleau, but anybody knowing the relations which existed between that hon. gentleman and myself, will understand very well that I yielded to his request, and the result was that I did not vote at all. I feel the same objections to-day to vote for this report of the Debates Committee. These men being paid only $1,000 a year were under the impression that they could mix in politics and do something else for a living outside of the session. They believed that being voters they could speak on the platform and write in the newspapers. They might have used strong language it is true,

but that is only a question of degree. We all know very well that if they were told to-day that they should not write any more political articles, or speak any more on political platforms, they would avoid doing so in the future. And after all, Sir, if these men are dismissed by whom are they to be replaced ? They are to be replaced by political partisans and friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. They will be replaced by men who must have been mixed up in politics before, either in the press or on the platform. Every member who has had experience in this House knows that it is a very difficult thing to secure good translators, because it is one thing to be a translator and another thing to be a good translator. To be good translators they must be men who have been employed in journalism, and men of good education. Consequently on their very profession they have been politicians more or less on one side of politics or the other. If we dismiss these men for political reasons and appoint in their places political friends of gentlemen opposite, we will be exposing ourselves to a repetition of what has taken place, and we will expose these gentlemen to the fate of those whom it is sought to dismiss now. We know very well that the half of the gentlemen who are writing on "Hansard" are political friends of gentlemen opposite, but there was never a question of that when they were appointed, because we were looking for the men who could do their work best. There were also some translators appointed who were Liberals, but nobody said anything about it, and had it not been for the unfortunate occurrence of 1888 they would be in their positions still. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) expressed himsel as feeling lenient towards Mr. Bouchard. It is true that Mr. Bouchard did not take any part further than to speak at one meeting. He was a voter, he did not use any strong language, but simply said in public what any elector has a right to say in conversation. If we give these gentlemen the right to vote, we must necessarily give them the right to express their opinions. This is after all purely and simply a question of political patronage, and it will go to the country that the House of Commons assembled to pass important laws and discharge important business for the country has spent a whole afternoon trying to dismiss three employees so as to replace them by the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, one word just to set my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) right about a matter which, if not answered, might give hon. gentlemen a false idea of the real facts in regard to that office in the post office at Montreal. The Minister of Public Works was here a moment ago, and he might prove what I am saying. There is an office in Montreal for the Government. The Ottawa Ministers, when they went to Montreal formerly, had no place where they could receive their friends or the public, except at hotels. It was considered better to have a room in one of the public buildings, and a room was obtained in the post office. As has been said in another place, the Conservative Association was disbanded after the election of 1891. There was no more organization, unfortunately for the party, of which we had proof in the election of 1896. Therefore, there was no longer a president or a secretary of the Conservative Association. If Mr. Lasalle signed that letter as secretary, he did so, not at the instigation of the party, but at the instigation of the late Minister of Public Works, who, knowing that Mr. Lasalle had formerly been secretary of the association and had acted with the president in connection with the revision of the lists, asked him to act as secretary. As a matter of fact, there was no Conservative Association, and there was no room in the post office of Montreal for that purpose ; but there was a private office attached to the office of the Ministers, and it was there that the gentleman who called himself secretary, worked with Mr. Benoit for a few days—and he was there only a few days, for the two gentlemen quarrelled and separated. Now, there are not many of the gentlemen on the other side of the House who made the accusations against these men, to stand up in the House and make their accusations good. My hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Monet) has not one word to say in justification of his demand for the dismissal of these men.

Now, when I heard my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Robertson) this afternoon, I felt that he was expressing the sentiments of the great mass of the people outside who are not biassed by political feeling. The position he took was that we should not dismiss these men, but, at the same time, we should not sanction their going on the platform to speak or their writing in the press on political questions. Taking that as the idea that ought to prevail, I beg leave to move, in amendment to the motion made by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette)

That all the words after "That" in the main motion be struck out, and the following inserted instead thereof : "In the opinion of this House, the translators of the Debates of the House of Commons be notified that in the future they will not be allowed to speak on political platforms or write political articles.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on the Debates, which we have now before us, is the application of the rule which was adopted by this House in 1888. The motion of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has no application whatever, because the very rule which he wants the House to adopt, was adopted in 1888.

Mr. BERGERON. Not with the assent of my hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER. Against my protest, my loud protest. I fought, and fought in vain, against the action of the committee and the action of the House at that time. I fought, and fought in vain, to have the three translators who were then dismissed, retained in the service. The majority of that House would not have that. The majority of that House proclaimed the principle that the translators of the debates, like all civil servants, should not interfere in politics, and that, if they did, they would incur the penalty that is visited on every civil servant who interferes in politics. I fought against that principle, and the argument I urged then I would be prepared to repeat now, if the question had not been placed in the position in which it now is by the action of the House at that time. I thought then that sessional clerks should not be placed on the same footing as the civil service generally, and the reason I gave was that, as these men were not required by their office to give the whole of their time to the service of the country, but were only required to give their time during the session, they should be allowed outside of the session to follow any avocation they saw fit, journalism or anything else. Moreover, there was another reason at that time why this argument should be maintained. It was well understood, when the service of the debates was organized in 1883, at the instance of the late Mr. Thomas White, that both the translators and the reporters would be allowed a great deal of liberty outside of the session. So far as the reporters were concerned, it was understood that they should be allowed to take part in journalism, if they saw fit; and the rule was acted upon—and my hon. friend from Beauharnois has recalled it—that on the staff of the translators the two parties should be represented. But my hon. friend knows that this rule was violated in 1888.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not do it.

The PRIME MINISTER. No one at the present time did it. It was very well to apply the rule when friends of ours were the offenders, but now, when other people are the offenders, our hon. friends opposite say: "Oh, be generous and magnanimous; do not apply to our friends the same rule that we applied to your friends." In the name of reason or justice, what have they to complain of, if we apply to their friends the same rule that they applied to our friends? Injustice always recoils upon the perpetrators, and the majority abused their power in 1888, when they dismissed Mr. Poirier and the two Tremblays; they applied the rule which to-day they object to. We are simply doing by them what they did by us, and who will say that there is injustice in that? In 1888 the case was much stronger than it is at the present time, because then it was understood that the translators would be allowed to go into journalism, and, if so, they were to be allowed all the privileges which the pursuit of that profession involved—the privilege to speak or write their minds as they saw fit. One Mr. Tremblay wrote in the press; the other wrote a pamphlet; Mr. Poirier spoke on the platform. For these things they were dismissed. I argued that they were not in the same position as regular civil servants, but that after the session they should be allowed the privilege of engaging in other avocations. My appeals to the House were in vain. There and then, by a large majority, the House proclaimed the principle that the translators of the debates should be treated as civil servants, and should not be allowed to take part in politics. Not only was the rule affirmed but it was applied immediately, and three translators, for no other crime but that which is here reported against these gentlemen, were dismissed. Again, I repeat, if the rule was adopted at that time, what are we going to do at present? What can we do but apply the rule then laid down by the House. Of the three translators who came before the committee, two said they relied on the statements made by myself and some other members of the Opposition to the effect that they should be given the privilege of engaging in journalism. True it is that I gave this opinion on the floor of the House, but hon. gentlemen know very well that the House adopted the contrary opinion. It adopted the opinion that these translators should act as civil servants, that is to say, that they should not engage in politics. There is more than that. When the three translators were dismissed in 1888 for having taken part in politics, these gentlemen, who were put in their shoes, knew that if they were appointed on the staff of translators, it was because their predecessors had violated a law which the House declared it would not allow to be violated. Therefore, they had all the less reason to interfere in politics, for they knew what they were doing. Therefore, if they were to rely on any authority for doing what they did, it was not upon the authority of myself and friends, whose opinions were refused by the House, but they should have considered themselves bound to act by the rule of the majority. Here we are coming into office at present, and we find the rule established that these translators have violated. We find that they have violated the very rule upon which they came into the service. Again, I ask, where is the injustice done to them when they are treated exactly as the previous translators, whose places they filled, were? If another rule is to be established, I am quite willing to accept it, but only after the present rule is applied.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a matter of revenge.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is a matter of justice. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) appealed to my generous

heart, as he was pleased to call it, to my magnanimity, as he was pleased to call it. I want to be as generous as any man. I do not like this motion, I would prefer not to vote for it, but since there is a law in the matter, I do not want to have that law applied to my friends and not to my opponents. If it be applied at all, let it be applied all round. But let there be equal justice and equal rights to all. When we are in Opposition, let us be treated as hon. gentlemen wanted to be treated themselves. They find this rule galling, no doubt. I found it very galling at that time, and I had more reason to find it galling then, because the rule was adopted in violation of an undertaking by the House. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said a moment ago that when the office was reorganized in 1883, it was understood that the two political parties were to be represented on that staff. That rule was applied in 1883, and three Conservatives and three Liberals were appointed. The three Liberals appointed were Messrs. Ernest and Rémi Tremblay and Mr. Eudore Poirier. When they were dismissed, were they replaced by Liberals ? No, they were replaced by three of the strongest political partisans of the Government. In a double manner, the party which was then in a minority was unjust to the minority. They have chosen their own bed, they have made their own laws, and they cannot say that we are committing any injustice when we apply to them the very same law and rule which they themselves thought fit to establish.

Amendment (Mr. Bergeron) negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the main motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you put that motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word in justification of my vote. I have not taken any part in the discussion on the merits of the case, nor did I intend to, but I cannot find it is in heart to vote for the deposition of Mr. Bouchard, who is one of the three translators reported by the committee for dismissal. I do not think that Mr. Bouchard, considering the circumstances of his engagement, his political employment, and its being a well understood fact that he and the others had a perfect right to earn the rest of their living outside of the sessions of Parliament as they pleased, should be dismissed. He did nothing that was discourteous, nothing that was violent or offensive, there is not the first syllable of any allegation of that kind made or proved, and I certainly think it is an outrage to dismiss him, under these circumstances. With reference to the others, I have simply to say that I will vote against the whole report. I had rather they had used less strong language, but, at the same time, the circumstances of their employment are entirely exceptional, and I take that ground.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The only explanation I can give of the speech which the hon. gentleman has delivered is that he was not in his place a few moments ago, when the facts were stated by the leader of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I am going by the report and the evidence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman may mislead himself, but he will perhaps permit me to say shortly what the facts of the case mainly are. If it were a matter coming for the first time before the House, there would be a good deal in what the hon. gentleman has said. But, in 1883, when the late Mr. White became chairman of the committee, it was understood by both sides that these gentlemen who were appointed should have the privilege of using their spare time during recess in journalism and other pursuits, which necessarily involved their taking part in politics. At that time three Conservatives and three Liberals were appointed. But in 1888, the House adopted the rule, after thorough discussion, that these gentlemen should not be allowed to take any part in politics at all ; and acting upon that rule, which was affirmed by a large majority of the House, in spite of a strong protest from the leader of the House, who then led the Opposition, the House determined——

Mr. FOSTER. What rule does the hon. gentleman mean ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That these officials could not take part in politics.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a rule of the House ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not only was the rule established, but it was acted upon ; and the only three Liberal translators on the staff were then and there dismissed and their places filled by strong Conservatives. Well, Sir, under these circumstances, the rule having been established and established in the most effective way, by a vote of the House and the dismissal of the old officers, the new men came into office with the thorough understanding of the rule which the House had established. They have chosen—they had a perfect right to do so—deliberately to break that rule, and I do not think that they have any right to come into this House and ask us to repeal the rule then so clearly laid down.

Mr. FOSTER. What crime has Bouchard been guilty of ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same crime as Ernest Tremblay.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken on this motion.

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking to the main motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken on the main motion.

Mr. BERGERON. I spoke on the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member moved the amendment.

Mr. BERGERON. That has been negatived. We are now on the main motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has spoken on the main motion.

Report concurred in.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Georgian Bay Ship Canal and Power Aqueduct Company.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.

GRAIN STANDARD BOARD.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that through the courtesy of the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) I have received a list of the grain standard board. But I find that there is not one name on it of either Liberal or Conservative from West Assiniboia, and I would appeal, therefore, to put on the name of one from Western Assiniboia. I will take the opportunity of submitting one or two names. I do not care whether he appoints a Liberal or a Conservative. But I think that there ought to be a name from West Assiniboia on this list.

APPOINTMENT TO THE BENCH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to take up the attention of the House for a few moments to call the attention of the First Minister to some remarks which have appeared in the newspapers on a matter which I think seriously affects British Columbia. I refer to the rumours that have been going the rounds of the press to the effect that it was the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. Joseph Martin to the Supreme Court in British Columbia. Now, Sir, this matter has been discussed in another place and discussed very ably and fully; but I think it is my duty to bring the matter before this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only ask a question at this stage.

Mr. PRIOR. I will await another opportunity.

SUPPLY—APPOINTMENT TO THE BENCH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

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

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I think this is a matter of the greatest moment to British Columbia; and I must say that I could not believe that there was any truth in these rumours, I could not believe it possible that the Government would administer such a deliberate snub to the bar of British Columbia on their first taking office. But it is evident that the majority of the lawyers in British Columbia believe it, or that there must be something in this rumour, for I have received to-day a copy of a resolution that was passed by the Bar Association of Victoria on the 10th instant, which I will read to the House:

> Whereas, it has been rumoured that there is a possibility that the vacant office of the Puisné Judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia may be filled by the appointment of a barrister not a member of the Bar of British Columbia, contrary to the practice which has prevailed with respect to such appointment for a period of over twenty years. Be it therefore resolved by the Bar Association of the city of Victoria that any departure from the said practice would be detrimental to the best interests of the public, as well as of the profession in British Columbia. Be it further resolved, that in the opinion of the association this province should be regarded as within the benefit of the provisions of section 97 of the British North America Act, taken together with section 10 of the Terms of Union with respect to such appointments. And be it further resolved, that this association do respectfully protest against the appointment of any person not now a member of the Bar of British Columbia in active practice to be a judge of the said court. And be it further resolved, that it is necessary to the due and effective administration of justice in this province that the said vacancy be filled with as little delay as possible.

I am crediby informed that the bar associations of other towns in British Columbia have passed similar resolutions and forwarded them to the Government through other channels. I suppose the members of the Government do not know much about British Columbia. I am aware that the hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier) visited that province some time ago in company with other gentlemen who have seats in this House, but who, I am sorry to say, are not members of the Government, though when in British Columbia, they expected to be. I believe that very few, if any of the other members of the Government have been in that province, and therefore it is, perhaps, excusable for them not to take much in-

terest in an appointment of this kind. But if they will allow me to tell them, I would like to say that there are plenty of good lawyers, plenty of men who would be ornaments to the bench in British Columbia, without importing one from another province. There are gentlemen of both parties in British Columbia, men of good legal attainments, men who have had large experience in the courts, and whose character or integrity is beyond the suspicion of reproach. I therefore think that the hon. the First Minister might look to some of those gentlemen, be it on his side of politics or on my side of politics, instead of trying to foist a gentleman like Mr. Martin on the bench in British Columbia. Some of us know that gentleman, we have sat in the House with him for years past, and we know that he is a most rabid partisan, we know he is a man given to the most violent language, politically, and I do not think that any of the members from British Columbia could give their consent, if it was asked, to see him elevated to a position on the Supreme Court bench. Now, I would like to say that I myself, with other members from British Columbia, have in the past recommended the appointment of Mr. D. M. Eberts, who is at the present time Attorney General of British Columbia. He is a gentleman who is most popular with all classes, he is a good lawyer; I am no lawyer myself, but I am informed he is, by other lawyers. He holds the position of Attorney General, and I may say, he is a man who has never taken any active part in Dominion politics. I do not remember ever having seen him on a platform, or heard him say one word in favour of one party or the other. I can say that his name was received with great pleasure by the late Government, and that they did everything they possibly could to have him appointed before they went out of office; and I would ask the present Government, if they can see their way to carry out the recommendations that were then made and have Mr. Eberts appointed to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court bench in British Columbia. It is time that appointment should be made. It is now eight months since Sir Henry Crease received the honour of knighthood, and was superannuated, and therefore left the bench. During the whole of that time the post has remained vacant, and it is very hard on the present judges of British Columbia that this vacancy should continue. They are a hard worked lot of men. The country is a large one, and some of them have to travel enormous distances to perform their duties; and where there are only a small number of them, I think it is four now, one vacancy makes a great deal of difference. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the present judges on the bench have given the very greatest satisfaction to all classes and to all shades of politics. Three of them, I believe, are old politicians, three of them, in fact, were Premiers of the province of British Columbia; and I am glad to say that since they were raised to the bench, they have kept entirely free from politics of all kinds and descriptions. There are no men to be found in the whole Dominion of Canada who stand higher in the esteem of the people amongst whom they work than the judges who sit on the Supreme Court bench in British Columbia. I may also say that one reason why Mr. Martin should not be sent there—and I trust there is no truth in the rumour,—is that when Sir John Thompson was Premier, he held that although it is not specially stipulated in the terms of union,—on that point I am open to correction—that the Supreme Court judges should be appointed from the bar of that province, still in the terms of union, sections 97 and 98, it is stipulated that in the other provinces they shall be taken from the bar; and Sir John Thompson always believed that that spirit should obtain when any appointments were made in British Columbia, and I think there is no hon. gentleman on the floor of this House but must admit that it is only fair to the lawyers of that province. I will say in conclusion that I hope I have not taken up the time of the House with a matter that hon. gentlemen think worthless of their attention. I sincerely trust that the First Minister and his Government will make the appointment very shortly, and that they will make inquiries and find out if there is not some gentlemen, even on their own side of politics—I certainly would like to see one of my own side appointed, but that is almost too much to expect—but at any rate, I hope they will find some gentleman who is a member of the Bar Association of British Columbia, and appoint him forthwith to the Supreme Court vacancy that is now open. There are other members in this House representing British Columbia, and I would like to hear their opinion as to whether they do not think that it is fair and just to the lawyers of British Columbia, that that seat should be filled from amongst them.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court of British Columbia at a very early day. The case is indeed more pressing than I supposed. After having heard the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), it becomes still more the pressing duty of the Government than I had supposed, to see that this vacancy is filled up very shortly. My hon. friend has just informed us that the present vacancy on the bench has existed for the last eight months. This Government has been in office only six weeks, and if the vacancy has run so long, it is not the fault of this Government, but the fault of the late Administration of which my hon. friend was a member. Therefore since the vacancy has been existing for eight months, there is evidently a still more press-

ing reason that it should be filled at an early day, and that this Government should not to be so negligent in its duties as the late Government was in that respect. With regard to the appointment of a titular to the office, I am sure my hon. friend is too old a politician now, and has had too much to do with the press, to believe all that he sees in the newspapers. If members of the House generally were to take notice of all that appears in the newspapers, their lives would hardly be worth living. For my part, though I read the newspapers pretty regularly, when a thing is affirmed in the newspapers I am disposed to believe that the reverse is true.

Mr. FOSTER. How long since ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, since I have been reading the Conservative papers. With regard to one of the names that has been suggested as a likely occupant of the bench, Mr. Martin, I am surprised to hear my hon. friend speak as he did of Mr. Martin a moment ago. Last evening we had the pleasure of hearing the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) speak of Mr. Martin, and certainly from the character which was given him by the member from Winnipeg, nothing is too good for Mr. Martin. He is fitted, not only to be a judge of the Supreme Court, but of any other court, or a member of the Government, or anything else. So I have to refer my hon. friend from Victoria to his colleague from Winnipeg to settle with him as to whether Mr. Martin is qualified.

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

(In the Committee.)

Department of Indian Affairs, including $300 each to James Kearns and W. Peart, messengers, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act $50,192 50

Mr. FOSTER. What Minister is to be interrogated in regard to this vote ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) will supply all the information needed.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) to explain the change made in the vote for civil government under the head of Indian Affairs. I find that in the Estimates, as brought down by myself, there were four chief clerks, including the solicitor, and eight first-class clerks. In the present Estimates one of the chief clerks seems to have been dropped and an addition made to the first-class clerks. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain what has caused this change.

Mr. DOBELL. I am told that there is really no change in the department except the death of one of the clerks. There is a decrease of one clerk, and the statutory increase of $50 per year for 23 clerks, showing a net decrease of $302.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman must be mistaken. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Estimates submitted, he will find a Deputy Minister, chief clerk and solicitor. In the old Estimates there was a deputy and two chief clerks. One chief clerk appears to have been dropped.

Mr. DOBELL. That was a proposed promotion, which has not been carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. The promotion of a first-class clerk ?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman the name of the officer ?

Mr. DOBELL. William McGirr.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it is proposed not to promote him. He is a very capable officer, however. There was a question asked the other day, to which I was promised an answer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question had reference to one of the clerks employed, as to whether he had reached the maximum in his class. I ascertained he was at the maximum of his class.

Salaries of immigration agents and employees in Canada $21,150

Mr. FOSTER. Do the Government propose to follow out the same plan of immigration agents in Canada as has in the past been carried out, and for which this estimate was prepared ?

Mr. DOBELL. There is no change contemplated for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose not. As there is no Minister, there is no one to contemplate any change.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a good reason.

Salaries of immigration agents and employees in Great Britain and Ireland... $9,285

Mr. FOSTER. What agents are now employed in Ireland ?

Mr. DOBELL. There is a vacancy in Ireland.

Mr. FOSTER. At what place ?

Mr. DOBELL. At Dublin.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed by the hon. gentleman, or does he know it will be proposed by the person who is to fill the vacant portfolio, to have that office continued in Dublin ?

Mr. DOBELL. That is a question we will have to settle in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not know whether the vacancy is to be continued.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The vacancy may be filled.

Immigration expenses $84,915

Mr. FOSTER. We should have some explanation about this. For several years past there has been a more or less vigorous criticism of the methods employed by the late Government, and a great deal has been said by hon. gentlemen now in power, when in Opposition, in reference to useless expenditure on immigration. The method of this expenditure has differed in different years. A quite vigorous policy was carried on by the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) in the western and north-western states of the Union, running down as far as Nebraska and the central part of Illinois, taking in the whole range of states between that and the northern border, and going west to Washington Territory. A great many valuable immigrants were brought to Canada from that section; men who in part were Canadians and in part were American farmers, who had all of them done pioneer work, and who, I believe, have made a valuable class of settlers. A large number of these have settled in the Edmonton district, one of the best immigration districts in the North-west. I would like to have my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) state if the Government has at all considered this matter, and whether they propose to carry on operations of that kind. Then again, with reference to the old country. I have seen some rumours in the newspapers that a change is to take place in the headship of the Paris Bureau, and that a more vigorous immigration policy is to be conducted on the continent of Europe, particularly with reference to France and Belgium. I would be very glad to have any information which my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) can give with reference to these matters.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The question to which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has just alluded is one which cannot fail to engage the attention of the Government, because there is no question more important to us. I cannot say that the Government has given more serious attention to this matter than to anything else, because in the short period we have been in office, our time has been necessarily taken up with many onerous duties. The question is one which my colleagues and myself have had a pretty clear opinion upon. Though I must say that I am not altogether an admirer of the immigration policy of our predecessors, yet I altogether approve and commend the system which has been—I will not say inaugurated—but attempted to be inaugurated by them, with a view of securing immigrants from the western states. For my part, I am strongly of opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of all those who know something of our western country, that a double event is likely to occur in the near future in connection with the western states and the Canadian North-west. It seems to me pretty evident from the short acquaintance which I have had with that country—and I do not claim my views to be peculiar to myself—it seems to me to be tolerably evident that a large emigration must overflow from the American side to the Canadian North-west. The fertile belt of the American territory is pretty well exhausted, and in order to accommodate more immigrants they must go into a system of vastly expensive irrigation. Before that system can be in operation, it seems to me simply a law of nature that the overflow of population must come to Canadian territory, where the land is ready for settlement; the very best land that it is possible to have, and superior probably to anything that is to be found or that ever was found on the American side. Already this overflow is taking place, not to a very large extent up to the present time, but still enough is manifest to show that there is a steady current coming over from the American to the Canadian side. I believe we will have the support of both sides of the House if we continue the efforts which have been commenced in that line, and which ought to be directed towards having active immigration agents in order to divert the overflow of the American surplus population into our own territory.

What I may call a phenomenon is also, I believe, probably about to take place. I would not wonder, for my part—and perhaps the leader of the Opposition will agree with me in this—that likely, at no distant date the American people may be found to be vast consumers of the surplus wheat products of the North-west Territories. The Americans are, I believe, about exhausting their wheat fields, and the American population which comes over from the American side to the Canadian side will, at no distant date, find a market for their wheat production in the United States. Be this as it may, it is a consideration not for the immediate future. But what is of the immediate future is that we should have the surplus of that valuable immigration which has commenced to cross the border and settle in our country. The Edmonton district and the Red Deer Valley have received already a pretty considerable American population.

Now, with regard to the efforts of the Government to obtain immigration from Belgium and from France. I cannot say that this feature of our policy has received the same consideration, and for my part I have never had—although something is to be done in that respect—I have never had a very great confidence that we could ever have many immigrants from France. The French people do not emigrate, but remain at home. If it were possible to have from France an immigration, not from towns and cities, but from the rural portions of the

country, we would certainly have a most valuable class of settlers. I think, however, that a good deal more is to be had from the British Isles themselves. The Government received some time ago a report from Sir Donald Smith in that respect, and if gentlemen opposite think it advantageous, the report might be laid on the Table of the House. It tells us that probably, in the near future, we may look forward to some increase of immigration from the British Isles to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has not replied to my suggestion as to the rumour that a little gentle pressure was said to be in process of being placed on Mr. Fabre to induce him to emigrate from Paris to this country. I should hope it was not true.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not heard of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before this vote for immigration passes, I wish to say a few words with reference to it. I would urge upon the Government, in connection with their immigration policy, the desirability of encouraging Icelandic immigrants to settle in our western country. I may say, for the information of hon. gentlemen, that the Icelandic immigrants who have been brought there in large numbers have proved themselves to be one of the best elements in our population. They have a faculty of assimilating with the people: they intermarry with the residents of the country, and when they are only a very short time there they become as good Canadians almost as any class of people we have. They adapt themselves to the conditions of the country. They adopt our school system and our other institutions, and as I say become amongst our most valuable settlers. The other day I received a letter from one of the most influential Icelanders in the west. I have no objection to mention his name, Mr. Christopherson: He has done very valuable service to Canada in inducing large numbers of his fellow-countrymen to immigrate here, and he suggests that the times are now so hard in Iceland, that it would be a most opportune time to induce large numbers of his countrymen to settle in Manitoba. While I think that something, and something very considerable, should be done along this line, still I believe with the hon. the Premier, that the true solution of the settlement of the Canadian North-west lies in receiving the overflow population from the Republic to the south. As one who has lived in the North-west for a considerable number of years, I can say that the natural conditions offered to settlers there, are second to none in any part of the world. I believe that Manitoba and the Territories possess the most fertile soil of any country in the world, and I am thoroughly convinced that if we can render the conditions over which this Parliament has control such as will enable the settlers to purchase their necessary commodities cheaply, we shall go a long way to encourage immigration into that country. I recognize that there will be political differences with regard to the tariff, but I am strongly convinced that the best immigration policy that can be adopted, for Manitoba and the North-west particularly, is to lower the duties on the necessaries of life to a minimum, and also to lower, in fact, to wipe out entirely, the duties on agricultural implements. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not agree with me in that regard; but while there may be a difference of opinion on the question of having a tariff, in the eastern provinces there certainly can be no difference of opinion with regard to removing the duties from agricultural implements and farmers' necessaries in the North-west, and it is my sincere hope that when the Government propose their tariff changes at the next session, these duties will be removed. Before taking my seat, I would like to ask if an amount is to be provided out of this vote for the Western Immigration Association in Winnipeg, an organization which came into existence about a year and a half ago, and to which, if my memory serves me correctly, the late Premier, during a recent visit to the North-west, promised some public aid—I understand, if they would do their duty politically.

Mr. DOBELL. I may say, in answer to my hon. friend, that there is provision made in the Estimates, in case we think it desirable, to make a grant to this society.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this society the result of the convention that was held there?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The leader of the Opposition might tell my hon friend what the society is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I may say that there was a convention held in Winnipeg last fall under the auspices of this society. It is a society of considerable influence; among its members being a great many influential people of the country, and it is possible that it might do some good in the way of furthering immigration into the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite sure the Government cannot turn their attention to a more important question than this question of immigration. There is no doubt that it is the great want of the country. We have a boundless territory, we have inexhaustible resources, we have a fertile soil, we have an admirable climate, we have everything to tempt people to settle in the country, and all that the country requires to give it a great and rapid advance is our being able to induce people to come into the country; and I was very glad to hear the hon. First Minister evince an appreciation of this work and state the determination of the Government to do everything that is possible to promote it. I quite agree with that hon. gentleman that a num-

ber of circumstances are now indicating a more favourable prospect and opportunity for Canada than it has had in the past. The very facts to which he has adverted,—the decrease of the wheat-growing lands in the western states, the great competitor we have had, and the greater advantages that Canada now presents for agriculture—must at no distant day tell very strongly in our favour. There is no doubt that the time is not very remote when the enormous population of the United States will tax all the producing power of that country for its supply of food, and will thus give a much greater advantage to the agricultural products of Canada, which has in the past had such very severe competition from the United States. The commissions of agriculturists that have been sent from various states of the union into the North-west of Canada, and have examined the great agricultural resources of that country, have placed on record, on their return to the United States, the declaration that there was no country in the world which presented as great agricultural attractions as Manitoba and the North-west of Canada. Another fact in connection with this matter is that a very large number of Canadians years ago went into the western states, into Dakota and Minnesota; and we have the advantage of bringing to the country persons who are not only the best qualified from experience for prairie farming, but who in a great many instances are Canadians who are glad to take the opportunity of returning to their country. The importance of doing everything that is possible in that direction cannot be overrated. Reference has been made to the Icelandic immigration. I can only say that I believe Iceland presents a most admirable field for development. The Icelanders, being accustomed to a cold climate, and being thus prepared to meet the winter of Manitoba and the North-west, and showing a readiness to avail themselves of the fishing opportunities in connection with the great lakes, have proved to be most suitable settlers for that country. One of the most intelligent Icelanders whom I have met, a gentleman who has had a great deal to do with promoting that immigration, told me that the whole population of Iceland would be only too glad, if they were able to realize the value of their property and holdings in Iceland, to follow the 10,000 of their countrymen who have settled in the North-west of Canada, and have found the change eminently advantageous. At this moment the opportunities for developing that country are exceptionally good. Last year we had a very large crop of a very admirable character. One of the things that has given, and will give when properly known, an enormous advantage to Canada, and promote the immigration of agriculturists to Manitoba and the North-west, is the well-known fact that the further north wheat is grown where it will ripen, the better it is. I had an opportunity of witnessing the triumph of Manitoba wheat in the great agricultural exhibition that was held at Islington, in London, a few years ago, and in which the gold medal was given to the Manitoba exhibit. The five judges, none of them Canadian, agreed in reporting that a sample of wheat from the North-west, which was too late to enter the competition, was better than that of Manitoba, to which the gold medal had been awarded in a competition open to the whole world. It was not only shown that the wheat grown in that country was superior to anything that can be produced in the United Kingdom, but that can be produced in any other country. Under these circumstances, especially considering the very low price to which wheat has fallen, it is of very great advantage to have the best article produced, so that it can command a higher price than that of any other country. The red Fife wheat of Manitoba and the North-west commands a higher price at the great wheat mart in Chicago than any other wheat except that grown immediately alongside the Canadian boundary, because it is required for the purpose of mixing with other grain and giving lasting qualities to the flour. Under these circumstances, I am sure there is no subject to which the Government can turn their attention with greater advantage as regards its progress and prosperity, than this of immigration. I quite agree in what the hon. First Minister has said with regard to immigration from France. I do not think that is very likely to result in any very great development, because the population of France does not increase. It is absolutely stationary, but there is no doubt that immigrants from rural portions of France would be well adapted to succeed in Manitoba and the North-west, if they could be induced to go there. There is a good prospect in Belgium, which is an exceedingly overcrowded country, and also in Norway and Sweden, whose people are well adapted, by the character of their climate, for settlement in Canada, and the direct communication that has now been established between France and Belgium and this country will, no doubt, facilitate a larger amount of immigration from these countries. I only wish again to express my gratification at the determination evinced by the Government to do everything possible to promote that which I regard as one of the first and most important means of the rapid development of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope the hon. First Minister will ponder what my hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has suggested. That hon. gentleman very properly suggested that Icelandic immigration would be an advantage to Manitoba, and, for that matter, to the North-west Territories. In that connection, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that our German immigrants from all parts of Germany and from Southern Russia have proved most successful settlers. We have in Assiniboia

several colonies of these settlers, successful, thrifty, careful and prosperous. They, in fact, will solve problems that hardly any other immigrants will solve, owing to their wonderful carefulness and thrift and strong sense of the value of money. What I would specially impress on the hon. First Minister is what my hon. friend from Lisgar has advocated, namely, to throw off the duty on implements and on everything the agriculturists buy, and that I have continually been urging in this House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You have not voted that way.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. I would be very sorry to put the House to the trouble, but the only way one can prove a negative in regard to a statement like that is by the exhaustive process. And, if any hon. gentleman dares to persist in the statement, I will come here and, on the motion to go into Supply, bring up every motion, and every speech, and every vote of mine in this House for the last ten years.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, it is not true, it is not true; we take it all back.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, I will never hear that again. No doubt, my hon. friend made that statement in good faith, but he is thus echoing a mere newspaper joke; he does not pretend to have gone over my votes, and he stated to me himself in his own office, when I returned from this House, his appreciation of the way I had fought for the North-west in this House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That must have been a joke.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it was on the eve of the election of 1891, and the hon. gentleman explained to me that my career in the House would secure me an overwhelming majority, which it did.

An hon. MEMBER. A majority of one.

Mr. DAVIN. No; I had, in 1891, a majority of 327, and as to the majority of one, we have heard that joke before, and we have heard it applied to the colleague of my hon. friend from Lisgar, the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Macdonnell), who has a majority of one. This joke about majorities, as marking the efficiency of a member of Parliament, shows the grossest possible ignorance of parliamentary representation. The idea, evidently, in the minds of some hon. gentlemen is that the efficiency of the representative in Parliament is in exact ratio to the size of his majority. If that were so, in what a poor condition, considered in his representative capacity, would my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) be at present. My hon. friend boasts of his big majority, but his predecessor had a majority nearly three times as large, certainly twice as large, and it would be absurd to say that Mr. Davis, who is no longer a member of this House, was a double-barrelled representative, as compared with the present representative of Alberta. Go to the history of England, go to such men as Lord Palmerston and Sir Robert Peel, and what do we find? We find that such men, the most representative men that England ever produced, choosing some little pocket borough, with about 120 electors, to send them to Parliament. The fact is that remarks of that kind are rooted in—well, I was going to use language that my hon. friend might consider a little too strong—but they are certainly not rooted in parliamentary knowledge or parliamentary decorum. I have pressed upon the House and upon the hon. gentleman who now leads the House, the importance, in the interests of the North-west, of admitting free, if possible, or as low as possible, everything the farmer uses.

Mr. McGREGOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad to hear that cheer. And I have a motion on the paper to that effect, and, if I could have got one of the independent members of the House to second that motion, I would have moved it before now.

Mr. LAURIER. Why not find a seconder on your own side?

Mr. DAVIN. That would not have the same significance, and besides some of my political friends do not agree with the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. That is perfectly true and perfectly frank on my part. But let me say here, Sir, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has in his Ministry gentlemen who contended that we should have coal oil free. I have at the present time letters from the North-west Territories from influential men there, urging me to press this upon the Government. And, mind, these letters are from supporters of the leader of the Government. Take, for instance, the case of the Medicine Hat "Times." That paper is edited by a Reformer, and several of those who own it, are Reformers—it is owned by a kind of commission. That paper has an article in regard to a motion or speech of mine, I have forgotten which, in which it urges me to press upon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) to let coal oil in free. There would be no disturbance and, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has pointed out the abolition of this duty would be a powerful means of securing immigration. My hon. friend from Lisgar expresses the hope that next session implements will be admitted free. But, if implements are to be admitted free, I have heard no explanation, and no explanation can be given, and human reason is incapable of finding an excuse, why they should not be let in free this session. Reverting to the question of the duty on coal oil—suppose that duty is to

be greatly reduced. I remember that when the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) sat here beneath me, and we were pressing certain matters upon the House, the hon. gentleman would call out that coal oil was one of the necessaries of life. There, Sir, the hon. leader of the Government has the opinion of his Postmaster General that coal oil is one of the necessaries of life ; let him admit it free. The hon. member for Lisgar tells him that it would be a powerful means of bringing in immigration to let agricultural implements in free. Very well, then let them in free. An irregular committee, not at all official, therefore there is no impropriety in my referring to it, was formed of gentlemen who are members of this House to make a report that should be submitted to our agriculture committee and that has been published in the papers. That report is signed by gentlemen not one of whom belongs to the Conservative party. They are all Reformers or independents. One of them is the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and another the Patron candidate in this House, while another is my friend and colleague from Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), the last named being in fact chairman of the committee. And what do they also recommend as well calculated to promote immigration to the North-west ? They want the hon. gentleman to have a policy of extended creamery support such as I have, again and again, advocated in this House and in regard to which I advocated action this session ; they want also to have the duties lowered or taken off all those things that a farmer consumes ; they want to have their freight rates dealt with just as we have urged sometimes also, and they also want a large and grand system of cold storage that, by and by, will be brought before this House. All these things, I grant cannot be done this session. But there are some things that, even at this late period of the session the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) could do, especially as we have the recommendation of the names of the hon. member for North Simcoe, the hon. member for East Assiniboia and the Patron candidate in this House, all of whom support by their votes the leader of this House. They say, with the view to having this done this session they took the somewhat irregular course they did. And one of the things they recommend is what my hon. friend from Lisgar has very properly and very effectively advocated, namely, to admit free into the North-west Territories whatever the farmer buys. So that I would urge on my hon. friend, although late in the session, to give weight to the views expressed by this irregular committee. And I am glad to find that these views are being taken up. I do not care who takes them up ; I do not care from which side the propositions I approve come, they will have my support. But sometimes at a previous period it seemed to me that when I was advocating these things I was pouring water upon sand, but it appears now that it was out of a golden pitcher. Now, having the support of hon. gentlemen, and as that support is not confined to one or two, and as the same thing is urged from this side also, I trust he will let coal oil in free and do it this session, and that he will let implements in free and do it this session.

Mr. FRASER. I think it is unfair to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that there should be remarks about his inconsistency. We have an example to-night in this speech of his, which is so perfectly consistent with his vote of last night.

Mr. DAVIN. You could not have followed my speech of last night.

Mr. FRASER. I care not for the speech ; I look at the vote. I know you cannot decide what the hon. gentleman's speech has been by his vote, nor can you decide what his vote will be by his speech, except upon the principle that they are invariably at variance. But how he can rise, after the vote he gave last night and ask for legislation he speaks of in the abolition of the duty on agricultural implements and coal oil passes my comprehension. How can he pretend to consistency ? The truth is a man cannot be a protectionist and a free trader at the same time, and when the hon. gentleman attempts to make one kind of speech for his constituents and then give the other kind of vote in this House, what can be the result except the exhibition we have to-night ? One would almost be led to suppose that there must be a protest against him and he fears that the election will be voided, because his was an ad hoc argument so far as the North-west is concerned. He is a good enough logician to understand that it is a good thing for the North-west and a good thing for Canada that these changes should be made in the tariff. But if this is done, what becomes of the fiscal system he has always supported, the system of protection ?

Now, the question of immigration to the North-west, and not only to the North-west, but to all the provinces is the most important that can engage the attention of this House. There is no other matter that both parties ought to be agreed upon more than on this, and I am sure that the facts of the case prove that the immigration policy of the late Government was one of the most doleful failures that ever were known in any country. I agree with the hon. gentleman in his description of the class of people that ought to come into this country. But the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has made that country what it is. They started in by giving to speculative companies immense tracts of land. They gave men to understand that if they went up there they could have large areas of land, and make fortunes, and return

again. They forget that the principle underlying emigration ought to be that men should go to a country as their home, there to take up a piece of land, to engage in its culture, and by the accretions of year by year, do what is done in the older provinces adding to their wealth by littles, and thus make a stable population. The effect was the very opposite. I am only speaking for myself, but we must retrace all our steps in this matter, and free every acre of land in the North-west, and give it to the people. For myself I am ready, as a member of this House, although the constituency from which I come is not as much interested in the matter as are others, to vote that it shall be ascertained upon equitable terms what amount of cash all these companies have really put into the lands they own in the North-west, and that this country shall pay it.

Mr. DAVIN. What companies ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). All the companies, colonization companies, every company that got land up there.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman name a colonization company that has land in the North-west ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I mean the whole country.

Mr. DAVIN. Name a single colonization company that has land in either place.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there is no company in Manitoba or the North-west that has any land there now ?

Mr. DAVIN. I mean to say that you cannot name one.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). And that proves his case, because he may know the names and I may not.

Mr. DAVIN. It proves you are talking about something of which you do not know anything.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That may be, but the hon. gentleman has sense enough not to say that there are no such companies. I made the statement that there are companies there who hold land, the Canada and North-west Land Company.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that a colonization company ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The boldness of the hon. gentleman is the natural outgrowth of the vagaries in which he indulged a little while ago. Although I may not be able when asked to give the names of the companies, that proves nothing. If I had a short time to look up the names, I could find them. But I say it was wrong in principle to bind up the land, and I stated that as a member of the House I was ready to vote to every company, railway company or otherwise, that had any land in the North-west so bound up, the actual money they put into it in order that it might be made free to the people. What else can we do that will make that country great and prosperous except to free the land and open it to settlers ? I would even go further as the best relief, and would assist immigration to that country. I would assist it, not by the miserable methods of the past, but I would even give immigrants supplies for a year or two, and they could pay it back. Aye, more, I would invite Canadians that are now in the United States to come back, and I would give them land up there to settle on, and would see to it, as I think this House ought to see to it, that in place of the land being put in large quantities into the hands of a certain number of men, we should put it into the hands of individual proprietors, individual farmers, as the only mode by which you can bring up that country and make it great. We have been moving in the opposite direction, but I am glad that we have now a tribute to the policy of this side of the House, from the hon. gentleman himself. He says that he agrees with the hon. member who has just spoken that the only way to make that country prosperous is to take the duties off these articles. That is nothing new to this side of the House. We have always maintained it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you carry it out ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). We will carry it out, there is no question about it. But does the hon. gentleman who put the question think it is a good thing ? Does he agree with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that that would help the settlers in the North-west ? If so, he is bound as a true Canadian to help the land out there. The fact that we may not be able to do all that some may want, on account of the burdens that are laid upon us, is no reason why we should not go in that direction. I believe that the policy of any government in this country for the next ten, fifteen or twenty years, ought to be largely in the line of getting people into this country. Fancy this mighty Dominion with only one acre out of every hundred occupied ! We have been all the time thinking about other things, and neglecting the great truth that if we have men at work upon the land, we are laying the foundations of wealth and greatness. I should be ready to vote any reasonable sum to be wisely applied in bringing people into Canada ; and I rejoice to know the semi-conversion of my hon. friend to the good Liberal doctrine that a reduction in the tariff will help the settlement of that country. I hope that ere long the light may shine more fully upon his mind, and that he will be more fully alive to this question. That great country from which the hon. member comes, Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia, are the hope of this Dominion, and if they fail,

Canada fails. I have no hesitation, after having seen that country, in coming to this conclusion. The efforts of this Government should be directed to see that any one who has any idea of leaving Canada, should go up to the North-west as the best place in which to settle; and that all nations—and here I must of course, in deference to the better judgment of others, make an exception—but that all those who are willing to labour, should be invited to come to this country. One of the ways to attract them is to reduce the tariff. Let us make this country a cheap country to live in, so that any farmer who goes to the North-west shall find there a country in which the conditions of life are much better than to the south of us. Men will always go where they can do best. There may be a whim of going where they have friends, but it may be said that wherever men know that their condition is going to be best, they are going to that place. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his partial conversion, and hope that he will go in the same direction until he and I work together to free that great land as much as possible of the burdens that are now upon it. But let me suggest to him that when a vote comes on such as that of last night, with a possibility of such a discussion as this, he should consider which side he is going to take, so as not to take both sides.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has given a speech that would be very proper in a debating society. The falacy which runs through the first part of the speech, so far as it refers to my opinions, is the assumption that it is a Liberal policy to let agricultural implements in free.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I beg your pardon, I spoke for myself.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman spoke for himself. He talks of my conversion to Liberal views, and it was a mere idea that floated vaguely through his brain. Now, I do not care on what principle any government thinks it is acting, if it gives us implements free, I shall welcome it. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how a Minister preparing a tariff on the principle of a tariff for revenue only could make exceptions such as I want made. But I hold that a protectionist could make those exceptions, for this reason, that he looks at the tariff partly with the view of raising a revenue, but partly also with a view to developing the industries of the country, and, if you convince him that the farmers of the country, or of any section, who are the primal manufacturers, will be benefited, by any exceptional course—and let it be remembered that the proposal made in regard to creameries seems now about to be adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, all of which proposals are exceptions to the general order of things—a protectionist could consistently make the exceptions, but, if a Minister sits down to frame a tariff for revenue only, I do not see how the exceptions can be made that I want carried out. If the Finance Minister makes them, and I do not care whether they are inconsistent or not, I shall welcome the deed. I should like to inquire where my supposed inconsistency arose. Reference was made to my vote last night. What did the resolution moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) ask that was inconsistent in holding the principles of protection or even the principles of a revenue tariff? I do not see how the economic theories necessarily should affect our views in regard to the main provisions of the motion moved by my hon. friend. The gist of that motion was, that, if you are going to make a change in the tariff, and suppose you are going to adopt a revenue tariff four or five months hence, the Government should state the principles on which they would proceed and that they were going to prepare a revenue tariff; if, on the other hand, they resolve to adhere to the present tariff in principle, and make such modifications, they should say so. That was practically the motion submitted by the hon. member for York, and I am in the sense of the House, when I say that a more audacious proposition could not be laid down than that voting for that proposition was inconsistent with the views I take on this subject. I differ, I know well I have always differed, with hon. members of the party with which I act, in respect to my views of what protection should be.

The PRIME MINISTER. Scientific protection.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I believe in scientific protection. For instance, when Sir Leonard Tilley first brought down his Budget, I at once wrote a letter to the "Mail," pointing out that, in my opinion—and I hold the view still—the only way, and the proper way, to protect iron is by a bonus. I differed from the whole of the party. If I had to protect raw material like iron, I would protect it by a bonus, and I would do so because, while it is of the utmost importance to develop the iron industry of the country, at the same time it is equally important that an article which constitutes the raw material of hundreds of industries and manufactures should come in free. That is a view I stated as far back as 1879. The hon. gentleman who accuses me of inconsistency, speaks as if it was a new idea to pick up the odd sections once more and appropriate them by the Dominion, in fact buying them back again. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to look at the paper I was editing in 1885, before I had the honour of a seat in this House, when I propounded that as a policy in an article written at that time. Afterwards, a paper called the "Call" took it up, and subsequently some hon. members came to think there was something in it. At the present time you could not get either party to take it up, but within a few years

it will be taken up and then, as always occurs in these cases, it will be considered a statesmanlike policy.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman who says "Louder," will tell me where he is, I will pitch my voice in his direction. I am glad he is very anxious to catch all the words of wisdom I am endeavouring to utter on his behoof. I ventured to interrupt the hon. gentleman, because he assumed a tone of great authority and talked of the colonization companies and all the land they own in the North-west. Colonization Company is a technical term that applies to a large number of companies which came into existence fourteen or fifteen years ago. The hon. gentleman spoke of those companies having a large quantity of land, but, with the exception of a few, all of those companies have disappeared, and most of the land has gone back into the possession of the Government. I may tell a story here that is historical and sheds some light on the perspicacity and foresight of the illustrious leader of the Conservative party, Sir John Macdonald. When the Bill for the formation of colonization companies was before this House, I happened to have the honour of a conversation with Sir John. I said: "Is not this a serious policy, a grave thing to bring all these companies into existence? Look at the quantity of land that would be locked up." He said: "Have you read the agreement they make with the Government?" I said: "I have looked into it." He said: "Read it again. It is impossible that those gentlemen could make a cent under that agreement. They wish to get land under those conditions. We will give it to them, and they will act as immigration agents; but, in the end, all the land will revert to the Government." Most of it has so reverted. So much for the knowledge on this subject which the hon. gentleman who spoke in the ex-cathedra manner possessed. I do not think he is fully aware of all that has been done in the past in respect to immigration. He spoke of the way he would assist immigrants. The assisting of immigration in the way he seems to indicate—he did not go into details—is a very difficult matter, especially to give immigrants direct assistance. We have had several schemes in the past in regard to that matter, and one after another has been abandoned. The best assistance we can give immigration is to spend what money we can in supplementing the extraordinary capacities of nature in the North-west, in order to make that country an inviting country for immigrants from every part of the world. It is a country of boundless resources, of boundless fertility, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has said; but there are peculiarities in it as there have been in other new countries. And I have no doubt that by the expenditure of money in different parts of those territories, not merely can they be made more attractive to immigrants than they are at the present time, but land, which at the present time is comparatively low in value, can be increased by square and cube multiplications and brought to the utmost limit of fertility and attractiveness, compared with which its advantages in these respects at present are small. I have been waiting for the Minister of the Interior to enter the Cabinet, so that the House might learn what he would propose to do. If the hon. gentleman who takes temporary charge of that department, were Minister, I have no doubt he would be equal to all the needs of the department. I know well from experience that no locum tenens, no temporary Minister can inaugurate any policy. I should like to have had assurances from the Government, that this very year they will take steps in the direction of irrigation, such as during several sessions past I have advocated in this House. If you go west in the Territories, one system of irrigation could be used with ten-fold returns for the money that you spend. The plains between Moose Jaw and Regina are the most fruitful that the eye of man ever rested upon, and the grasses are as rich as the eye of man has seen.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Oh, we are sick and tired of that kind of talk.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is not a North-west man.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No, I am not.

Mr. DAVIN. I know he is not. If the hon. gentleman will withdraw to the rookery to which he belongs I shall be very glad.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You are talking all the time.

Mr. DAVIN. I say, Sir, that there we have the richest possible soil, and yet up to the present time we have not solved the question of finding water. I say that it is the bounden duty of the Department of the Interior to take the money that is due to the North-west Territories by right, if the grant were based on the same calculation as money is given to Manitoba; it is its duty to spend that money on works and improvements in the North-west Territories, which will make the lands there still more productive to the immigrants. Now, Mr. Chairman, I revert to the proposal of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and I hope that even this session—I do not care whether it is on Liberal ground or protective ground they do it—the Government will carry out the policy of the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) when he was in opposition, and let coal oil and farm implements into the North-west Territories free of duty. I assure the Premier, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has assured him, that if that is done it

will contribute to the effectiveness of any immigration scheme he may propose.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I owe the House an apology for having spoken, because I started the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) afresh. All I have to say is, that I was correct in my statement that the land is owned at present to a certain extent by these colonization companies. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is not aware, that while the colonization companes have closed the contracts with the Government, yet they took up large areas of land for the essential part of the settlement and now hold it.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman then does not know very much about the North-west.

Mr. DAVIN. One after another disappeared.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). One after another did not disappear, except on the terms of getting large slices of land.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If the hon. gentleman stakes his reputation to that as a member from the North-west I will produce the agreements from the department.

Mr. DAVIN. You can produce an insignificant fraction.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Indeed. I said that they took large areas of land before they gave up, so that it is not as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) said, that the wise statesman, his leader, made companies leave the country.

Mr. DAVIN. He said the land would revert to the Government.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). And therefore the companies must leave the country, because they would have no existence, except as land companies.

Mr. DAVIN. What he meant was that these colonization companies would not succeed.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Then, if they were foredoomed to failure it did not show much statesmanship to give them an existence.

Mr. DAVIN. They did act as an immigration agency.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman was wrong and I was correct in what I stated.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If the hon. gentleman likes he can go to the department and learn about it.

Mr. DAVIN. I know exactly what has happened and I understand all that.

Mr. BRITTON. It was part of the policy of the late Government to send a person from Canada to the two Dakotas and other western states, to induce some persons who had failed there on account of blizzards and one thing and another, to settle in Manitoba. Amongst those agents they had a Captain Holmes employed. I would like to know if Captain Holmes is still in the employ of the Dominion Government, and if so, on what terms ? I find that in the year ending 30th June, 1895, he was paid I think $2,200. I want to say here, that that gentleman had altogether too much versatility of talent, and was a person of too great ubiquity to be employed in the service. He was often found in Ontario doing other work for the late Government than persuading the discontented settlers from the Dakotas to come to Manitoba. It is a matter of importance to hon. gentlemen to know whether he is still in the employ of the Dominion Government.

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Holmes is no longer in the employ of the Government.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say something, Sir, on this question of immigration. It is a matter which interests the whole House, but which probably interests members from Manitoba and the North-west more especially than it does other hon. gentlemen. It is perhaps on the principle that those who know the least are best qualified to speak on certain subjects, that most of the talk in regard to this question to-night has been done by others than members who are particularly interested in it. I shall venture to occupy the time of the House for a few minutes. As to the statement made by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Davin) in regard to colonization companies, I think he said there was only one of these companies whose land has not reverted to the Crown.

Mr. DAVIN. Only one or two.

Mr. OLIVER. How many then ?

Mr. DAVIN. A mere fraction of the colonization companies that were brought into existence.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. gentleman said one. Would he mind mentioning what one that is ?

Mr. DAVIN. I can mention it if the hon. gentleman likes. It was the Yorkton Company.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I can mention another one.

Mr. DAVIN. I dare say you can.

Mr. OLIVER. And I could mention still another one, and a number more could be mentioned also. However, that is not the

point just now. I want to draw attention to the condition of affairs resulting from these grants, and to state just exactly how they have affected immigration. One grant was made to the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company, of four townships which were situated exactly in the heart of the settlement that already existed in that country. The town of Edmonton is 20 miles distant from Fort Saskatchewan. The country was more or less settled in the neighbourhood of these towns. Those four townships were immediately between these towns, and each of the four townships was already partially settled. But upon the colonization company taking possession of their lands, notice was issued to the settlers upon those lands that they would have to vacate. That was the first act of that colonization company; and there is a gentleman employed in the offices in these buildings who was connected with that transaction and was present at the time. The duty devolved upon me on that occasion to do what little I could to protect the settlers from this alleged colonization company which, so far from bringing in settlers, in fact ordered those settlers off the land which they had themselves improved. This is one sample of the policy for which the hon. gentleman gave so much credit to the gentleman who led this Government for so many years. This colonization company retained possession of that land for a number of years. They never made the first attempt to put any settlers upon it, and when, as time rolled on, they did not wish to complete their agreement with the Government and make their final payments on the land, so far from that land reverting back to the Crown and becoming available for homestead settlement, the Government made an arrangement with them whereby they were allowd to purchase absolutely and outright as much of that land as the money they had already paid on it and the money they had already expended on improvements on their own behalf, would pay for at the rate of one dollar per acre; while the ordinary homesteader who has not completed his homestead duties is driven off the land if you like, or is deprived of it without compensation, and I will not say but justly so. But the case is very different in dealing with this speculative company, which was not a colonization company at all. The very money which they had laid out to break the land and build and erect buildings for themselves was credited to them in payment for the land at one dollar per acre, when the selling price of the same land at the same time to any body else was two dollars per acre, if not three dollars. That company dissolved as a company; but the men who composed it at that time still hold that land in the heart of the settlement. They hold it at a price which has prevented settlement from that day to this; and there is every evidence that they will continue to hold it, because just as the value of the land rises their prices rise; so that up to date they have practically sold none of it, although it has been saleable at a fair rate. As soon as its value rose to five dollars an acre, they raised their price to six dollars; and to-day that land remains unsettled in one of the most thickly settled districts in Manitoba or the North-west Territories. That is a sample of the immigration policy of the late Government. What was done at Edmonton was done at Red Deer, 100 miles south of Edmonton, by the Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Company, so-called. That company is holding land there to-day, being the absolute owners of it, and thereby preventing settlement upon it, and it is considered by the settlers of that locality to be one of the greatest obstacles to settlement in the district. The gentlemen who have spoken here on the subject of immigration lay rather more stress on the tariff side of it than is absolutely necessary. That is one side of the question, and it is a very important factor in the case, but it is not everything. I am not able to describe to this House in the words in which it should be described, the policy that has been pursued during the past sixteen years by the late Government in regard to the settlement of that country. It is not in one or two or three particulars, but it is in all particulars. The very first proposition which closes from settlement 20 out of the 36 sections in every township of the Territories, leaving only 16 sections available for homestead settlers, is enough for a beginner. You can easily see what a valuable proposition that is to secure settlement. It may be said that this is done to provide land grants for railroads. We will admit that it is, if you grant the land to the railroad when the railroad has earned it; but in every part of those North-west Territories where there is no railroad, and where there is no prospect of there being a railroad, that land is still reserved from settlement to encourage railroads, and to encourage the settlement of the country if you please. You encourage the settlement of the country by keeping more than half of it closed from settlement. That is another feature of the policy pursued by the late Government. Now, it is not only the statutes in regard to the administration of the lands of the Territories that has been objectionable, but the administration itself. I say that Administration—and I can give particulars to the House if the House requires them—has been distinctly against the settler on every pretext. In every case in which a question arose between the settler and any other interest, the decision was against the settler. I can prove that the law has been twisted and defied in order to strike the settlers; and it is the law, and the administration of the law more than the law itself, that has made a change in the representation of those Territories from four Conservatives to practically four Liberals. The House may account for that change in any way it pleases; but I say that it is the administra-

tion of the affairs of the North-west in regard to the settlers that has to a great extent brought about the change. Besides the administration of the lands, there is the matter of railroad rates. I say—and I think all the members representing both Manitoba and the Territories will agree with me—that the question of railroad rates is the great question in that country. It is the question that has militated most strongly against its settlement; and any proposition to deal with the country which does not include a proposition to deal with the question of railroad rates is not going to be thoroughly effective. I am not going to deal with figures to-night, because there is not time, but they are available in the records of this House, and should have been printed a year ago. I hope they will be printed before another year, so that everybody may see them for himself. The evidence was put in and it cost the country plenty to get it, and then it was practically suppressed after it was obtained.

There is one condition required in all countries which depend upon railway communication for their trade and commerce, and that is competitive rates. That is the condition of England, and in eastern Canada and in every other civilized country, except the North-west Territories, and the reason why there is no competition there is because it was the settled policy of the late Administration not to allow it. The policy of that Administration was to prevent and not to assist railway competition in the North-west. They accomplished their purpose effectually, and the result is what has been stated. If there is a reason for an acrimonious discussion in this House with regard to immigration, that reason is the policy of railway monopoly in the Territories which has been followed by the late Government. We must have railway competition or we cannot have prosperity, especially in that country, above all other parts of the Dominion, where the railroad haul is so great and where railway freights eat up a greater proportion of the value of farm products than do the railways in any other part of the country. I do not wish to go any further with that side of the question at present, but I am prepared to bring the proofs of the facts I have stated before the House if necessary.

I would ask what proportion of the grant of last year was expended in England, in the United States and in Canada, and on what service?

Mr. DOBELL. I should think about $30,000 in Great Britain and $30,000 in the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. On what services was that amount expended in Great Britain?

Mr. DOBELL. On agents' travelling expenses, delivering lectures, and paying bonuses to the agents of steamship companies. Every steamship agent gets so much per immigrant brought out by his company.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask this House have the results of our immigration agencies in the old country justified that expenditure? Whatever the theory may be, the result has not justified one dollar of it. In my judgment, the system pursued is such that it could not, by any possibility, produce good results. When you simply send agents to the shipping ports of England to secure passengers for a certain line of steamships and pay those agents at so much per head, the only result you obtain is that you help people to come from England to the States through Canada. That is why our immigration returns are not borne out by the results in our population, because what are entered in the returns as immigrants to Canada are really passengers through Canada to the United States, whose expenses are partly paid by the Canadian taxpayer. Such a system is a disgrace. It is simply another means of bonussing the corporation who run the steamships, and is not entitled to be considered as part of an immigration policy. I would ask the hon. gentleman on what services the money spent in the United States was expended?

Mr. DOBELL. Payments of agents entirely.

Mr. OLIVER. No assisted passages?

Mr. DOBELL. No.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall not discuss that matter. Very likely it is a proper policy to have agents in the United States, and while there might be some little difference of opinion as to the policy, I shall not say that it was not a proper policy, and that it has not given certain results. One of the results is that we have got in a good many people who are not very well fixed to stay in after they get here, and as a consequence a good many of them are going out again. However, I do not propose to discuss that feature of the case very much. The point I want to make is this. People who come from the United States to the North-west get a rate of one cent a mile from any part of the United States to any part of Canada. I was under the impression that rate was controlled by the Government and was due partly to Government assistance, but I find I am mistaken, and it is therefore a matter with which the Government have nothing to do. But there is a very strong feeling in the North-west that there is something unfortunate and undesirable in a condition of affairs that assists a man to come from any part of the United States at a cent per mile for transport while the better man from the eastern provinces of Canada, has to pay a rate of three, four or five cents, with the same proportion of difference in the transport of his effects. It is

known that people in the eastern provinces of Canada who wish to go to the North-west, have taken passage to points in the United States, and then have secured the cent-a-mile rate to the North-west. Now, that is a very peculiar condition of affairs. If the Government is not responsible for it, we should not hold them responsible; but we think the condition is so peculiar as to call for attention on the part of the Government, in order to remove the discrimination that seems to exist in favour of outsiders against our own people. It has been stated in this House, and it cannot be denied, that there is from year to year an overflow of population from the eastern provinces of Canada. That overflow may be due to one cause, or it may be due to another. I will not argue now what the cause is: I do not know that it is worth while in this connection to argue that out. But the fact is that that overflow of population is by all odds the most desirable immigration that can possibly go to the North-west: these are the people who will do more good to themselves in the North-west than any others, who will do more good to the North-west than any others, and who will do more good to the Dominion by settling in the North-west than any others. That we have this condition of affairs existing, we know, and we know that it has existed for thirty years or more. And, unfortunately, there seems a probability of its continuing to exist. But, if we consider it desirable to settle the North-west, we should consider the desirability of settling it with the overflow of our own people. It is to this feature of the policy of the late Government that I desire to call attention. It is now many years ago that I read in the report of the Department of the Interior the statement that it was not the policy of the Government to encourage the removal of people from one province of the Dominion to another, or from one part of the Dominion to another. I say that as long as the Government of the country sees fit to ignore the loss of population which the country suffers from year to year on one hand, and the desirability of using that population in settling our own country, and the possibility of directing it to our own country on the other hand, we cannot expect success in the settlement of our own country. If we want people there, our own people are the best that we can have; and it is surely better for us, if they are going to leave us, that they should be producers in our own country and assist in enlarging the market of our merchants and manufacturers in the eastern provinces and assist as taxpayers in bearing the burdens of the whole Dominion, than that they should cross the line into the United States, which the greater portion of them do, I fear, where they cease to have any part in bearing the burdens of the Dominion or enlarging the markets for the eastern part of the Dominion. This, I think, was probably the worst feature of the immigration policy of the late Government; and that is a point I would like to press upon the new Government, not merely as a matter simply of immigration, but as a matter of what you might call, I suppose, high politics. That western part of the country is capable of supporting a very much greater population than the eastern part is. It is practically divided from this eastern country by a tract which is not capable of settlement; cut off as it were; it is in another country. Unless that country is settled up by our own people, people who are of the same kin as you, who have the same social ideas, the same political institutions, the same political aspirations—unless that country is settled up by such people, at least in sufficient numbers to control it, then, Mr. Chairman, you cannot control it, and it will not remain always a part of this Dominion. This is a state of things I would like the new Government to take into consideration. It is a matter of the utmost necessity for the binding together and building up of this Dominion that there should be a strong settlement from the eastern provinces of Canada in the North-west, because that is the only guarantee that we have that it shall remain part of Canada, the only means of cementing the eastern and western parts of Canada together. Now, I know how strongly this idea has been resented in these eastern provinces. I know how it has been said that the North-west is ruining the country, not only by reason of the expenditure it causes, but by reason of its being a competitor with the eastern producer. I say you can put this consideration to one side and look at the greater consideration; if you want the help of that country, you have to put in a nucleus of your own people. So far as the competition is concerned, you have the competition of the Western States. It is the competition of those states that has worked whatever injury that has been worked in the matter of your production. It is the fact of our people having gone to the Western States that has caused the loss that has occurred. Therefore, you cannot lose in the matter of competition by sending your people to the North-west, and, on the other hand, you are bound to gain, because every settler who goes to the North-west, by reason of the wider opportunities afforded him there, becomes necessarily of more value to this Dominion than if he had remained in the east. It is a well-known fact that a given number of producers in Manitoba produce a greater amount of wealth if not for themselves for the Dominion than an equal number of producers in any other part of the country. So, I say, the removal of a farmer from Ontario to Manitoba is not a loss to the Dominion on that account; and, when you consider that, if he did not remove from Ontario to Manitoba, he would remove from Ontario to the United States, I ask you to consider the amount of gain as compared with that case. This is the side of the immigration question

I wished to put before the House to-night, and I took this opportunity to do it. I hope hon. members will give this matter the fullest consideration, aside from party politics. I am prepared to argue out the partisan questions that arise as such; but this is not a party, it is a national, question.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I do not wish to detain the House long, but I wish to point out one or two matters in connection with British Columbia which I think should be brought to the attention of the Government, as to the Government's policy in regard to what is known as the railway belt in British Columbia. Although that railway belt has been in the hands of the Dominion for some years, there are large portions, which could be settled by very desirable settlers, but that the land has not been surveyed, as it ought to have been. The settlers going in there are placed at a great disadvantage. They are in this position—they have to go on the land without being able to find out what section they are on, and they do not know, when they start in to improve the land by putting up a house, and so on, but that, when the survey line is run, it will divide one portion of their location from another, and they thus will be obliged to choose between their house and their cultivated land. This has militated against the settlement of the valleys in British Columbia, and it is a very important matter in that country that we should get the valleys settled up and brought into cultivation, so that they may supply the mining camps that are being opened up every day.

I want to impress on the Government the necessity of their examining into the question of the lands through that railway belt at the present time. Another thing that is keeping that country back is the question of town sites in the settled lands that were held in that railway belt. There was a dispute between the provincial government and the Dominion Government that does not even yet seem to be satisfactorily settled, and the people who want to obtain land are not able to do so at present. Now, the policy that will best suit that country and bring immigration into it, will be a policy for the development of the country. The tariff policy does not affect largely the settlers at the present time. We have first to get the settlers in there, and in order to do that we must have a proper survey of the country so that they can take up land. Then when we have opened up the country by means of railways and made it possible for the settlers in the valleys to get their produce to the mines, we shall have no difficulty in getting people to go into that country. At present it is difficult for the settlers to get their produce into the mines and sell it at a reasonable price. I was very much surprised the last time I went down to the Kootenay country to find a large number of farmers going in there from Edmonton and that part of the North-west, and the reason was that they found they could not send their produce into Kootenay at reasonable rates, and consequently they had given up their farms in the Edmonton district and were going down into the mining country. Now, that class of people do not make good miners, but they understand all about farming, and if we can bring these people into communication with the mines so that they can sell their produce, we shall have no difficulty in developing that country.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House long this evening, because there is no hon. member present who wishes more earnestly than I do that this session should come to a close. But some remarks were made by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) which I do not think ought to be allowed to go without, I won't say contradiction, but without reply or explanation. In the first place, I note that he complained very much that certain sections in each township were reserved from settlement. Now, being a western man like himself, I can only say that if, in the judgment of this House, it is possible to throw the whole of the land in the west open for free settlement by homestead entry, no one would be better pleased than myself, and I believe with him, that that would aid in settling that western country, and aid in its development. But unfortunately we have to consider the interests, not only of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but also those of the older provinces of Canada; and the representatives in this House coming from the older provinces, outnumbering considerably those who represent the prairie section, will, I am afraid, hardly consent to give the whole of the land of the west to the settlers who go in there, and to supply the means which will be required to build railways through that country from the public treasury of Canada. My hon. friend must know, from having lived so long in the west, that it is useless to expect settlers to go into any part of the country which is unprovided with railway communication with the markets of the world, unless they have some reasonable expectation that these railway facilities will be provided in the near future. So far as I have been able to see during the three years I have had the honour of sitting in this House, there is no chance of persuading the representatives from the older provinces to grant subsidies to these railways sufficient to secure their construction, unless those subsidies are also supplemented by grants of land to aid in the construction of those railways, and to a certain extent to secure European or other capital with which to build them. As to the advisability of having all the western lands open, I most heartily agree with him, but I differ with him in the practicability of the scheme which he suggests.

The hon. gentleman went on to say that the administration of the land department

in the west was what caused the change in the representation which has undoubtedly taken place in the Territories in the last election, as compared with that which held in 1891.

Mr. OLIVER. I said it was one of the causes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I thought you said the main cause.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I will let it go that way. I think the question of railway monopoly in my constituency, at any rate, was the main cause.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). There is no doubt that as amended, my hon. friend's statement is not so far from the mark. There is no question that in Alberta when I went up there to work against my hon. friend—but very unsuccessfully I am sorry to say, though personally I am glad to see him in the House—that was one of the causes which was urged very strongly in favour of his candidature. But my hon. friend knows possibly better than I do, that the principal cause of his success in Alberta was the division in the Conservative party. He knows perfectly well what took place there in connection with the Conservative candidate. He knows that the division which existed in the convention that nominated a candidate, and the manner in which the convention was called, had more than anything else to do with my hon. friend's success—more than anything else except, possibly, the one point, the main point, on which he won his election, and that was the Manitoba school question. He knows that his stand on that question secured him the vote of hundreds of men who in the past had always voted Conservative, and who, when that question is once removed, whether it is removed by the genius of my hon. friend the leader of the Government, or by the natural course of events, will again fall back into the Conservative ranks.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman what particular class of people changed their political views on the Manitoba school question ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I am not in a position to state what particular class, but I do not hesitate to say that a large class of men who had always voted Conservative in the past, voted for him on this occasion. I mean members of what is known as the P. P. A., and some gentlemen who were strong members of the Orange body, and who, being carried away for the time being by their strong Protestant feelings, and by the belief which they held, unwarrantably, I think, that there was danger of the Church of Rome gaining undue power through the course of the Conservative Government when the last election took place, changed their views, and for their first time, cast their ballots for a Reform candidate.

The PRIME MINISTER. And will return a Conservative Government as soon as that question is settled.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not only indebted to the Orange order for a very good support, I must admit, although the chief did not happen to vote for me, but I also got a majority in the two French and one Scotch Catholic district.

Mr. MACDOANLD (Winnipeg). I have no doubt, in fact I know, that what the hon. gentleman says is perfectly true. In the French Catholic districts they voted for him as a supporter of the hon. leader of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. Everybody was apparently displeased, the P.P.A., Orangemen and others.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I am afraid the result shows that everybody was not displeased with the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend's remark was too true. Let us look at other constituencies in the west. In so far as Western Assiniboia was concerned, the representative of that constituency in this House had to face a combination against him such as I believe no man who occupies a seat here had before him when called upon to meet the electors. He was opposed by a Patron candidate, who had support of the Reform party ; he had the opposition of a large majoirty, or at all events, of a very great portion of the Orange body, because in this House my hon. friend voted for the Remedial Bill, and he had the opposition of the French Catholics, who supported my hon. friend the leader of the Government because he was of their race and of their creed, and I say it is not unnatural they did so. I am not finding fault with them, but I am simply giving it as an explanation. As regard Eastern Assiniboia, my hon. friend knows the trouble that arose there, the split in the party. Going to Saskatchewan, where the leader of the Government was a successful candidate, by a majority of 41, if I am not mistaken, the Conservatives had two candidates in the field, supporting the same party, but divided on the question of remedial legislation. The hon. gentleman knows that although the leader of the Government was elected by a majority of 41, an unsuccessful Conservative candidate polled over 200 votes, I think over 250 votes. So I think the reason of the success of the Reform party in the Northwest Territories is not far to seek, and we have not to look at the land laws or their administration for the reason.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the reason there were two candidates ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). One was in favour of remedial legislation and the other was not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). And opposed to the Government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Opposed to the Government on that measure, but in full sympathy with them on the trade policy and on every other point except remedial legislation, but unalterably opposed to them on that particular subject. The next point my hon. friend took up was the question of freight rates, and he stated that so long as the present rates existed the North-west would either never fill up or would fill up very slowly. There is no question that the high rates of freight which prevail act as a deterrent to settlers going into the country. But we have to face this fact, that Winnipeg, which lies on the extreme eastern border of the prairie section of country and is the limit, lies between fourteen hundred and fifteen hundred miles from the seaboard. If you include the distance between Winnipeg and the Mountains you have to add from 900 to one thousand miles more, and if you go away up to Edmonton, where my hon. friend from Alberta lives, you have to add three hundred or four hundred miles additional. Now, we have to recognize this fact, that neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor any other railway which now goes or hereafter may go into that country will be conducted on philanthropic principles; they will all be carried on as business enterprises; and the first thing the management of the road has to consider is to get such returns from working the road as will pay interest on its bonds, and then, if possible, leave some dividend to shareholders. I care not what the road is or how many roads you get into the country, they will all be governed by the same principle. In my opinion the only way to reduce freight rates is to construct a line of road to Hudson's Bay. Thereby you can get a short line to the sea. That affords a much shorter route for our agricultural products and cattle—ours is an agricultural country, and there is nothing but agricultural produce to export—and it would prove a much less costly route to the sea on account of the shorter distance. I am sorry to say that up to the present time the projected line of road to Hudson's Bay has received no support from the other side of the House. I hope that now my hon. friend is in power and has to consider the interests of the country as a whole and not merely to find flaws and faults in the policy of the Government, a new era will dawn, and we will find him in the near future an able and energetic supporter of an outlet by means of Hudson's Bay. Until we get that road built, I fear there is no chance of securing any material reduction in freight rates, and my hon. friend is right in saying that the high freight rates tell against immigration to the western country.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has stated that no railway there would carry on its business on philanthropic principles, that the charges had to be heavy because the trade is not heavy and the distance long. If two roads were constructed, would the trade be heavier, the distance shorter, and the companies getting more returns?

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). If two roads started from the same point and ran to the same point, there would be no reduction in freight rates. We would simply see what we saw when the Northern Pacific was brought into Winnipeg by the province, when they handed over to the company the line built to the boundary. The new company entered into an arrangement with the railway already there, and the result was the adoption of a uniform rate of freight to any given point. History would simply repeat itself if another line were constructed under those conditions.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am asking for information.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). But a very different state of things would arise if the Government would give support to a railway to Hudson's Bay, which would have a shorter line, and consequently, even though it charged the same rate per mile, would be able to carry the farm produce of the country at a much lower price.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand the explanation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Then there was another point my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) alluded to, and I was rather glad to hear him mention, because it is the first time since the beginning of the session that I have seen the hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) who in this House represents the shadow of a shade of a Minister of the Interior which we have at the present time, take any real or lively interest in any matter concerning his Department of the Interior, and that was when he referred to the amounts paid to the steamship companies for bringing immigrants to this country. Then for one short moment my hon. friend did evince an interest in this question, and he explained very clearly why the steamship companies should get their bread money. I do not doubt, from the experience which the hon. gentleman from Quebec West has in steamship matters, that he fully appreciates the fact that it is to the advantage of the steamship companies as well as to the advantage of the country, that this money should be paid. I was quite glad to hear him explain to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who seemed to be labouring under some misapprehension, the position of affairs in regard to assisted passages.

Now, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has referred to the question of American settlers. I am glad to say that we have settlers from the other side coming

into this country, and I was glad to hear him state that when they do come they form a very valuable class of the community. He stated, however, that many of them, when they came in, went out again. All I can say is, that in the great majority of cases they have gone to the Edmonton district, which he represents, a district which I believe to be one of the best and most fruitful in the west, but which labours under the one disadvantage of being far removed from a market. In all other respects that district possesses every attribute which a settler could desire. I was, however, sorry to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) say, from his local knowledge I take it, that there was something in that country which drove settlers out. I am willing to believe that on this point his tongue carried him a little away, and that he did not mean exactly what he said.

Mr. OLIVER. If I said so I certainly did not mean it, and I beg the hon. gentleman to allow me to retract any such statement if I made it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I am quite well aware that no man in this House would stand up more for his part of the country than would my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and I expect in all matters of immigration, where political feeling does not come in, that he and I will be found working heart and hand for the same cause and with the same object in view. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) then went on to speak of the overflow from Ontario, and he found fault with the late Government or some member of the late Government, for having stated at some time and in some place, I know not where, that he did not desire to disturb the population of Canada by transferring it from one of the older provinces to the newer sections of the country. So far as that goes I heartily agree with the position taken by the late Government. I believe that when men are doing well in the older sections of the country, the best thing they can do is to stay where they are. I believe that no Government would be doing any service to Canada if it endeavoured to unsettle men's minds and to induce them to emigrate from Ontario, or Quebec or the Maritime Provinces, to one of the new provinces of confederation. The hon. gentleman went on to state that this policy of the late Government was the cause of a certain portion of our population flowing into the United States of America. My belief is that this is not the cause why a certain portion of the young men of our country who, having found that they cannot get farms at prices which they could pay in the section of the country where they lived and followed Horace Greely's advice to go west, and have chosen the States instead of Western Canada. In fact, I rather wonder, considering the course which has been followed by the Reform party in the past, that so many of our people have gone to Western Canada at all. I have in my trunk at the Russell House, and I will be very glad to show it to any hon. gentleman who wishes to see it, a pamphlet issued by the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway, as it was at that time, now the Great Northern Railway; I have a pamphlet issued for the purpose of inducing settlers to come to the lands which belong to that railway company, and on the front page of that pamphlet is a photograph of the Hon. Edward Blake, who was at that time the leader of the Reform party. The greater part of that pamphlet is taken up with quotations from the speeches of that hon. gentleman, in which he showed that Dakota in many respects, was a much more desireable field for emigration than our own North-west Territories. I am happy to say that no prominent member of the Conservative party has ever, either in this House or on the public platform delivered speeches which have induced either the American Government or any American railway company or other American corporation, to use his speeches or quotations from his speeches for immigration purposes.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) who founded the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway which is sued this pamphlet.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Mr. James J. Hill, if I am not mistaken, supported by Sir Donald Smith, Lord Mount Stephen, and several others. The railway was incorporated many years ago. It had a grant of lands in the States. These lands were bonded to what are known as the Dutch bondholders, and Mr. James J. Hill and the gentlemen I have mentioned, as well as others, bought out the Dutch bondholders and acquired control of the road. I am not thoroughly conversant with the matter, as I have had nothing to do with the line except to travel over it.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact the present High Commissioner to London has been the head and front of the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway, and is now the controlling spirit of the Great Northern.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I do not see what that has to do with the immigration question. It is quite possible that my hon. friend's statement is correct, but I am not familiar with the affairs of the road. Mr. Chairman, when I came to the House this evening and found that the immigration estimates were under discussion, I intended to speak on only one point, and, had it not been for the speech of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I would not have occupied the time of the House for nearly so long as I have done. What I intended to say, and what I wish to say now, is this: I would like to call the attention of my hon.

friend the leader of the Government, who I believe is interested in the development of that western country—because I have no doubt in my own mind that he wishes to see Canada prosper, and, however we may differ in our view as to how that prosperity is to be brought about, I believe he has that wish in his heart—I consequently wish to call his attention to the fact, that last year an immigration association was formed in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That association is altogether apart from politics, and is composed of men who support him to as large an extent—I am not sure of the relative proportions of the members of that association, divided on political lines—but I can say they support him to as large an extent as they do the Conservative party. The object of the association is to see that country filled up with a desirable class of settlers. For the first time, last year this association held a convention in Winnipeg, which was attended by some three or four hundred delegates, embracing the leading men from all sections of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. They formed a permanent organization, with a view of aiding, so far as lay in their power, the immigration of a desirable class of men to the North-west. When I say the North-west, I desire to include Manitoba as well as the Territories, and to speak of the prairie section in general. They were men who had no lands to sell to the incoming settlers. They were men who were willing to give a portion of their time and a portion of their talents to this work; and I would ask the hon. gentleman, in considering the expenditure of money for immigration, to consider whether it would not be desirable to devote a small part of this vote to aid those people in the good work they are doing. During the short time I held the office of Minister of the Interior, which was a very short time—in my opinion, it would have been much better for the interests of Canada, if I had held it longer, but the electors of Canada thought differently, and I bowed gracefully to their judgment—during the short time I held that office, I was able, with the consent of my hon. leader and the other members of the Government, to allow them a small sum to enable them to perfect their organization; and now that it is perfected, I believe they can do a good work for Canada; and, as their interests are not centred in one particular section of the west, but extend from the Red River of the North to the Rocky Mountains, and from the boundary line to the Saskatchewan, they are in a position to give the most valuable advice and assistance to the Government, in telling them what sections of the country suit particular classes of settlers, and what classes of settlers suit particular sections of the country. My only intention now is to ask the hon. leader of the Government to take the trouble, when the session is over and he has a few spare moments on his hands, to look into this matter for himself, to find out what this association is, what its objects are, what work it has done, and what it intends to do; and, if he does that for himself, and does not rely on the information he receives from others, I am sure that he will see his way to give assistance, and very material assistance, to this excellent organization. I would also ask him, as there is no Minister of the Interior in the House to whom I can appeal, to pay attention to immigration from the Scandinavian countries. In Manitoba we possess a climate of which we all feel proud. I know we are often chaffed in the east, and are told that we say you can go round there in gossamer when the thermometer is at 40 degrees below zero. I do not pretend to say anything of that sort. I am here to talk of facts, and not to repeat nonsense; but I will say this, that I doubt if there is any country in the northern hemisphere or on the Continent of America, whether it lies to the north or the south, which possesses a more fruitful soil or a more healthful climate. Still, the winters are undoubtedly severe, and it is of consequence to us to obtain settlers who come from the north, who are not afraid of the cold, and who are able and willing to adapt themselves to our habits and usages. We find these settlers in the Scandinavian countries, and I believe that, if proper attention is given to encouraging immigration from Denmark, Norway and Sweden, as well as from Iceland, we shall get a largely increased immigration from those countries, and an immigration which will add greatly to our prosperity and wealth.

Before sitting down, I wish to allude to a remark which, I believe, my hon. friend the leader of the Government made earlier in the evening, when I was not in the House, when speaking of a proposition which had been made in the newspapers to appoint Mr. Martin to a judgeship in British Columbia. I believe my hon. friend said, and, no doubt, said in all good faith, that, from what I said last night, I would be quite ready to appoint him to that position. I know that my hon. friend did not wish to do me any injustice, when he made that remark, because, from what I said last night, he would see that I knew, at any rate, that he had a high opinion of Mr. Martin, and that I knew that Mr. Martin had a thorough knowledge of the wants of the west. But I wish to state that I do not believe in sending a member of my profession from any province to fill a judgeship in another province, to the bar of which he does not belong. I think it would be just as unfair to send Mr. Martin, or myself, or any other member of the Manitoba bar to fill a judgeship in British Columbia, as it would be to send us to fill one in Ontario or Quebec; and I think my hon. friend will acknowledge that that is what even he, with the majority he has at his back, dare not do. I just wish

to make this remark, because although I impressed upon him that, situated as he is towards Mr. Martin, I thought he ought not to overlook the claims of that gentleman to the portfolio of the Interior, I never said that I thought Mr. Martin ought to get a judgeship in British Columbia or in any other province of whose bar he is not a member; nor did I say, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) seemed to imply last night, that if I occupied the position which my hon. friend does—a position which I am perfectly conscious I am unequal to fill, and which I may add I have no ambition to fill—I would at once call upon Mr. Martin or Mr. Sifton to hold the portfolio of the Interior. I did not say anything of that sort. Their views on other questions, quite apart from those on matters pertaining to the North-west, differ so much from mine, that I could never think of asking them to join me. But I will say this, that had I accepted the services which my opponent in the last election rendered to my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and were I leader of the Government, I certainly should not overlook those services when there was in my gift a position which he could fill ably and well, and which could be given to him without any trouble, so far as the House is aware.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The question of freight rates having been introduced, I wish to state my position in regard thereto. I intended to state it when I spoke first. After an earnest study of the disabilities under which the North-west has laboured for many years, it is my deep conviction that the question of freight rates is a more serious one even than the question of the tariff, and I would urge upon the Government the desirability of making some arrangement whereby that country can be relieved from the disadvantage of excessive freight rates. A request will doubtless be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company within a very short time for a large subsidy in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I would urge in that connection that the Government make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway whereby the Government will control the rates existing in that country. Relief might be afforded by the construction of another railway through that country but after all that would cost a great deal of money and might not result in the permanent benefit we expect. We do not wish to do the Canadian Pacific Railway any injury whatever. The Canadian Pacific Railway is managed with an amount of ability which cannot be overrated. It is, however, the duty of the Government to make some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to secure us relief in the matter of freight rates; and when the Canadian Pacific Railway ask for a subsidy to build through to the Crow's Nest Pass would be the proper time to make such an arrangement.

Resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DOBELL. Before the House adjourns, I wish to say a few words of personal explanation with regard to a question which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) put the night before last. I am sorry to trouble the House at this late hour, but I do not wish to defer the explanation longer in justice to parties upon whom an unjust reflection has been cast, under which I do not desire they should labour any longer. The hon. member asked me if I had sent a telegram which was published in the "L'Electeur," and I replied, without hesitation and without the least mental reservation, that I had seen that telegram in "L'Electeur," but that that was the first time I had seen it and I knew nothing of it. Well, yesterday I received a message that made me look through the replies I had sent to several telegrams which I had received just a week ago, and I found that I had sent a message to a private friend, a week ago, exactly in the terms of the message which appeared in "L'Electeur," but I never expected that message to be published in that newspaper, and I did not send it for that purpose, and did not give my consent in any way to its publication. I think it is due to my hon. friend from Three Rivers that I should make this explanation.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 25th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE presented the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates, as follows:—

Resolved, that Messrs. J. B. Vanasse, P. McLeod and Joseph Bouchard, whose services as translators of the official report of the debates have been dispensed with, be allowed to continue the work of translation for the remainder of the

session, and that they be paid therefor at the usual rate of remuneration.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Act to incorporate the Eastern Trust Company.

DAIRY PRODUCTS ACT.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 37) to amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893. He said: The House no doubt understands that at this stage of the session I can hardly expect to have this measure carried into law at this session. I was asked by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) to adopt as a Government measure a Bill which that hon. gentleman introduced and succeeded in having passed to its second reading. I was asked to do so, because it was not likely that a public Bill in the hands of a private member would become law this session. Desiring to meet the views of that hon. gentleman and others who had this matter of the branding of dairy products at heart, I looked into the matter, and I found that I was not quite prepared to adopt that Bill in its entirety as a Government measure. But, having examined into the matter pretty carefully and having consulted Professor Robertson, who has studied it much more exhaustively, I decided to introduce a measure which I thought would perhaps cover the necessities of the case, for the purpose of bringing it before the public, so that in the dairy conventions and other meetings which may be held throughout the country during the fall of this year, the details of the measure may be thoroughly threshed out, and the people interested in the matter may be able to make such representations to the Government and to Parliament as may enable us to put through a perfect measure at the next session of Parliament. The Bill provides that our dairy products shall be branded, not only as they now are, with the word "Canadian," but that they shall also have the name or number of the factory at which they are produced stamped upon them, and also, in the case of cheese, the date of manufacture. This is an innovation which has been a little discussed in the country; but at the same time it is one that seems to have met the desires of the great majority of the dairymen who have expressed their opinion on this question. The principle of the measure is the same as that advocated by the hon. member for Glengarry; but there were some details in his Bill which did not seem to me to quite cover the whole ground, and I thought it was best to put before the House and before the country a little more detail and a little more carefully worded sections. I may say that some time ago, Professor Robertson, in view of the discussion which had arisen on this matter in the country, sent out a circular to the owners and patrons of factories in the country, asking whether they wished to have the branding of the date of manufacture on cheese made compulsory. I have here a summary of the replies. There were, altogether 617 replies received. Of these, 554 answered "Yes," and only 63 answered "No"—a practically unanimous expression of opinion. Under these circumstances, I think I am perfectly safe in saying—and from my own knowledge of the condition of the trade, I agree in the conclusion—that it is the desire of the trade that the date of manufacture shall be branded on cheese. This Bill provides for that in a way which, I think, will be effective, and will in the least possible degree interfere with any liberty of action on the part of the producers or those engaged in the trade. The Bill also provides that the word "Canada" shall be put upon all products of Canadian manufacture. It also provides that with regard to butter, the word "Canada" and the name or number of the factory where produced shall be stamped upon the product, and in the matter of cheese, not only the name of the factory or number but also the date of the manufacture must be stamped. The Bill provides that the date, down to the very day, shall be placed upon the cheese itself, but that upon the box containing the cheese, there shall only be stamped the month of the year of production. The reason of this slight difference in stamping is because the shippers find that it will be very difficult for them to replace the brand, giving the date of manufacture, upon such boxes as may be injured or broken and have to be replaced. I think it is desirable that the month, at any rate, should be put on, and there can be no difficulty in obtaining information to enable the shippers to put the month on, even if they cannot get the date. This being an amendment to the Act of 1893, leaves those sections of that Act which are not amended still in force. It is my desire that this Bill should be printed and brought before the various bodies connected with the dairy interests of the country during this coming fall and winter. This being an amendment to the Act of 1893, leaves the other sections as they are, with the exception of section 7. I wish to state that it is my desire that this Bill should be printed and brought before the various bodies connected with the dairying interests of the country during this coming fall and winter; and if they can show, as is possible, that there may be some details of the Bill which they would wish to have changed, I would be very glad indeed to make such changes in the Act, as may be required in the interests of the general producers and dealers in these products.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. gentleman consulted the Justice Department to find out whether, when these articles are not intended for export, you have jurisdiction to compel the manufacturer of cheese or butter to put upon it the date or month of manufacture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not done so, but I take the ground that as we have a law requiring them to be stamped with the word " Canadian," we are authorized to require the date of manufacture to be stamped on them.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). When I introduced this Bill first I also included butter, but the then Minister of Agriculture explained that there was no demand made why butter should be branded, and, at his request, I erased it from my Bill. I have to thank the hon. Minister for bringing this measure before the House, and I must say that he has shown me every courtesy and consideration that could be expected, which I appreciate very much. I am glad that the Bill is in such good hands, and I trust that the hon. Minister will put it through at as early a date as possible. He is carrying out the principles laid down in my Bill and is adding to it by including butter. I wish to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that it will be very dangerous to delay the passing of this Bill. I have memorials from people in England, interested in that trade, complaining that this article is placed on the market in an unfair way and under misrepresentation, some of these documents I have already read in the House. Of the amount of cheese exported from this country, we export over 99½ per cent to Great Britain, a small fraction of 1 per cent being exported to Newfoundland, the United States and the West Indies. It is therefore evident that our sole dependence for our export trade must be upon the British market, and when we find other countries competing in that market against us, and that the United States are legislating to improve their products and get their cheese and butter placed favourably upon the English market again, it behooves us to be awake to our own interests and see that our products are placed upon the British market in a fair and honest way. If they are placed in such a way that doubts are cast upon them, then some of those competing countries will get in the thin end of the wedge and we may lose the market completely. I hope that the policy of locking the stable after the horse is stolen will not be followed by Canada, as it has been by the United States, and that we will thus be saved the necessity of legislating every session of Parliament, as that country is now doing, in order to try and recover lost ground upon the English market. There are very great complaints from Great Britain regarding the methods in which our cheese is placed upon that market. As there are many new members in the House who perhaps are not aware of the complaints made I will read a memorial that has been sent out to Canada, asking us to legislate in such a manner that the English traders will know that they are getting our products as they are represented to them :

HOME AND FOREIGN PRODUCE EXCHANGE (LIMITED).—CHEESE SUB-COMMITTEE.

Hibernia Chambers, London Bridge,
London, E.C., 1895.

To the producers of Canadian Cheese :

It has, no doubt, come to your knowledge that there has been considerable dissatisfaction among the cheese distributors on this side of the Atlantic as to the course of the business during the last two or three years, especially as to buyers, who in many cases alleged that they did not receive the special month's make they had contracted for, which called for frequent arbitration during the season just closed.

The result has been to injure the good reputation of the Canadian product, and to destroy that confidence in dealing which is so essential between seller and buyer.

As the result of a conference representing a great majority of the trade in Great Britain, suggestions have been made to your Government as to the desirability of an Act making it compulsory to brand the date at the time of manufacture upon each cheese. It is fully believed that such protection will be a decided advantage to the factorymen and to the distributors throughout the United Kingdom, as it will at once restore confidence on this side, and effectually prevent any speculative or unscrupulous shipper covering his transactions by substituting one month's make for another. It is earnestly hoped that the factorymen throughout the Dominion will at once commence dating their cheese, especially as the desire is pretty general among the importers to favour those factories adopting this system.

Our interest is as yours, that goods should be sold honestly for what they are, and that the reputation and market price of fine fall makes should not be destroyed by the improper substitution of the earlier summer product.

The shippers all have but one opinion. Here is a memorial from Bristol from the largest importers of Canadian cheese, and they say :

That we, the undersigned importers of Canadian product are strongly of opinion that it would be to the distinct advantage to both producers and distributors of Canadian cheese, if the date and make were legibly and indelibly marked on each cheese before it leaves the factory where made.

Your memorialists therefore pray your Honourable House to pass a law making it compulsory upon all manufacturers of cheese in Canada to so mark each cheese before it leaves the factory where made.

This is signed by sixteen of the most important firms in Bristol. There is a demand in that country to have this done, and there is a demand in this country by the people most interested in the same direction. This subject has been before Parliament for two or three years, and the English people are crying out and complaining that they are being imposed upon by parties in Canada sending out cheese to that country under misrepresentation as to the date of its make. I draw your attention again

to the fact that 99½ per cent of the Canadian cheese finds a market in Great Britain. And in these papers that I have read is the best evidence that can be given that those who are interested in this business in the mother country, those who buy our cheese product, strongly desire a measure of this kind. I wish to call attention to another fact which none can dispute, and that is if we lose the confidence of the people of that country, and they refuse to purchase from us we cannot get another such market for this product which is the mainstay of the farmers of this country. Why, Sir, only a small fraction of one per cent of our cheese output finds a market in other countries than Great Britain. I trust the Minister will change his mind, and, if at all possible, put this Bill through this session. If it is necessary to alter the Bill in any way to meet the Minister's views, or if he can suggest any amendment which will make it more acceptable to the people of the country, I am quite willing that that should be done. In the meantime, I must insist upon making this demand that there shall not be a moment lost in placing ourselves, properly on record with the people of the old country, upon whose confidence and good-will we are wholly dependent for success in this most important industry that we have in this country. I have talked over this matter with Prof. Robertson. He suggested certain changes in respect of which I quite agreed with him. There is no dispute between us as to the principle of the Bill or as to the Bill as a whole, and I do not see what should prevent the House from putting it through. I feel confident that it will meet no opposition in this House, for I have no doubt every member is in favour of it. I understood the Minister to say that a second circular had been sent out by Prof. Robertson in addition to the one previously sent out by the then chairman of the Agriculture Committe, and the responses to it showed that the people interested are almost unanimously in favour of having this made law. The farmer who furnishes the milk wants it, the owner of the factory wants it, the people of the country generally want it, the people who are buying the goods from us are making demand almost every month for it, and are complaining that they are not properly treated in the matter, that the goods are misrepresented and that they do not know what they are buying. Is there any member in this House who will undertake to rise in his place and say one word against this measure? Is it not the proper and honest thing to do, to place these goods fairly before the people upon whom we have to depend for our market, or is it proper that parties should be encouraged and allowed to send goods there under misrepresentation, perpetrating a fraud upon the people who buy these goods? And do not forget that not only is Great Britain our sole market, but other countries are competing against us for that market, and are ready to take advantage of the situation. If doubt is cast upon the product of this country, it will be ruinous to the people who are interested in this industry. And I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that if anything happens in the meantime, while this suspense exists, and if we suffer loss thereby, a serious responsibility will rest upon the shoulders of any one who has anything to do with delay in the matter. Therefore, I trust he will see his way clear to press this Bill through Parliament. I do not think that any more evidence is required. And there never was a Bill introduced in this House that has had so fully the sanction of the people interested. If all those who are interested want this measure passed, why not give it to them. It must be admitted that there is no reason why this Bill should not be put through now, and I will deem it a great favour if the hon. Minister will carry it to completion this session. This is not a political issue, nor is it one in which I seek any credit, for I am quite satisfied so long as the Bill is put through and the people are given the advantage they so earnestly desire.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HER MAJESTY'S LONG REIGN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to suggest to my hon. friend the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) that as an unparalleled and important event has occurred, it would not be inadvisable that this House should mark its appreciation of that event. I refer to the fact of Her Majesty the Queen having entered upon the sixtieth year of her reign, and I would like to say that if the hon. gentleman would introduce an address, this side of the House will be only too glad to support it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I would be very glad to confer with my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) privately upon this subject. It occurred to me that it would be proper to propose such an address; but I did not take that step for certain reasons which I would like as well not to mention publicly, but which I will mention to my hon. friend privately, and we will agree upon the action to be taken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have been only waiting for an opportunity of seeing the First Minister disengaged a moment to mention this matter to him, and it was because the Orders of the Day were called and there was not time to mention it to him personally that I spoke of it as I did.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia—Clothing and necessaries, ordinary vote $90,000

Mr. TISDALE. Before the item is adopted, I want to call the attention of the committee and of the Minister of Militia to a matter that I brought briefly before the House on a previous occasion when moving for some papers, which have since been brought down. Even at this stage of the session I must trespass a short time upon the time of the committee, because I consider this matter one of great importance. It is a matter involving an entire change in the method of securing supplies to the Militia Department of clothing, a very large item every year, and one that I hope will grow larger from year to year, because I think that the new arming of the militia is a matter of such importance that the department and the House should take even greater interest than has heretofore been taken in that important organization. I can assure the Minister of Militia that I believe this side of the House will be prepared to back him up in taking all necessary steps and going to all necessary expense in order to put that force in the best possible position. Now, this matter of clothing is one, as I said, of great importance. It is a matter that had the consideration of the member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) some years ago when he was Minister of Militia. About 1886 or 1887 that hon. gentleman, after full consultation with the officials of his department, inaugurated a radical change in the manner and mode of supplying clothing for the militia. Up to that time the clothing had been advertised for, and had largely been purchased in England, and an attempt had been made to purchase it to some extent in Canada. At the time he desired to accomplish two changes. One object was to secure, if possible, that it should be of Canadian material and Canadian make; and in conjunction with that object, he desired if possible to get a cheaper article, an article that would fit better, and he desired a system under which the department might have a more direct control over the manufacture of the clothing. Up to that time it had been very difficult, first, to get the supply, and second, to get better material. Neither the material, nor the make, nor the fit had been satisfactory; and further, when the supplies were furnished by contractors at a distance, it sometimes happened that supplies came in so late that we had to take clothing that was imperfect, either in make, in quality, or in fit. After the fullest consultation and advice with the officials in his department who had charge of this matter, and who have since had charge of it, he took the responsibility of inaugurating two important changes. He wished to accomplish the object I have mentioned, and he resolved upon two things, first, to abolish advertising and to try the experiment of getting tenders for clothing by circular, and secondly, to adopt the system of three-year contracts. Now, he found, and I think probably his officials had pointed out, the difficulties of getting Canadian material, and he had to put the matter in such a shape as would justify manufacturers in this country in purchasing very expensive machinery, and also in investing largely in the proper kind of vats to enable them to get the right sort of colours, because it was a very difficult matter to get fixed colours for the clothing. He made it a condition that the material should be Canadian, and that the make should be Canadian, so as to give Canadian manufacturers and Canadian workmen the benefit of producing the material for our militia. In the next place he made contracts for three year terms. I am quite aware, and no doubt the Minister of Militia and other hon. gentlemen are aware, that there was a difficulty about the three-year contracts; but I will come to that later in the remarks I propose to offer. Having inaugurated this system, he took the plan of issuing a very full circular. I will not trouble the House with reading it, though I have it here; but it gave all the particulars and specifications as to the conditions of the contract, and as to quantity, style and material of the clothing. They required a first-class article in every way. Now, on this point I may say that I quite agree that in acquiring supplies for the public service, the rule should be to advertise for tenders and not to do it by circular; and it is only in a special case that I think a departure from that rule can be justified. Now, the question whether this was a special case, would be settled in the affirmative if the result was satisfactory. Now, this system has been tested for about nine years. The results have proved that the system has been successful beyond a peradventure, and within the last nine years we have caused hundreds of thousands of dollars of material to be manufactured and supplied by our own people and to be made by our own people in our own country. The clothing to-day is better than that we got before, the make is better, the fit is better, and the department have been relieved from a great deal of friction and almost insuperable difficulties in getting the same results by one year's contract and by the old system of advertising, because it has enabled a number of manufacturers in this country to invest capital in making a superior article. One of the great advantages of a three years contract has been this: The department has secured the control of the manufacture to a certain extent so that they can exact the right sort of material in every way. The difficulty in a one-year contract is that Parliament generally rises somewhere about May or June, and if you stick strictly to the technical rule that the Crown ought not to contract until the money is voted, it would be so late in the season before you could get in tenders and have the work com-

menced, that there would be a continual rush to get it in time. Experience has shown, and I think it would show again if this system was abolished, that there is danger of the material not being of the proper sort. It is not sufficient to say that you can collect damages if the contract is not complied with, because the clothing is already supplied, and you have to use it. That happened under the old system. In the second place, the department being close in touch with the manufacturers, and being able to give the notice plenty of time ahead, the officers of the department have a chance to make samples, and during actual construction to supervise the manufacture, and to see that everything is of the proper material and of a proper fit. In every way therefore, the result has been most satisfactory. In this way the results obtained have been and are most satisfactory. The clothing is better, the fit is better; further, the contracts have resulted in less friction and difficulty, and the whole prices have been reduced under this system. Coming to the subject of letting the present contracts, because this is introductory to them, what happened ? The time had arrived when the contracts for a large quantity of supplies expired and it became necessary for new contracts to be entered into. The letting of the contracts was deferred until it was found that money could not be voted even for the first year. At that time the usual plan was resorted to, and tenders were asked by circular. Eleven firms were notified, eight of whom put in tenders for clothing and boots and shoes. Of those eight which put in tenders, seven firms obtained portions of the contracts. These were principally large firms engaged in the business, because the circulars were only sent to those who were directly in the business of making or manufacturers. Under the old system it was found that middlemen intervened, and the result was that while the price might be lessened in some cases, difficulty was liable to arise, even if security was put up. That was the result of the tenders. I would read the names, but the Minister has them under his view and no doubt thoroughly understands the contracts. I now propose to allude to charges made in the newspapers, published before the election took place, that because these contracts were let at about the time when the election contest was going on, there was something improper or unfair taking place, and indeed it was alleged that there was some corrupt motive in letting contracts at that particular time. All I have to say in regard to this matter is that this year no new rule has been adopted. For nine years the present system has been in force. Except as regards Sanford & Co., of Hamilton, I had not the pleasure of knowing the gentlemen who sent in tenders or to whom contracts were awarded, nor did I know the political convictions of those gentlemen. I am informed that the contractors are not all Conservatives. Further, the lowest prices ever obtained on contracts for those articles were secured this year, and I was assured by the officers of the department when the samples were examined on which the contracts were let, that the materials were of the best quality ever submitted, even though the materials had been very satisfactory before. I propose to read the figures. It is not necessary to go over the prices for the whole nine years ; they were very low last year, and this year they are very much lower. The figures are as follows :—

Quantity.	—	Cost under old contract.	Cost under new contract	Saving for Year 1896-7.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
100	R. C. Dragoon tunics	5 89	5 78	11 00
500	Hussars do	7 64	7 55	45 00
8,000	Infantry do	5 25	5 19	480 00
300	R. C. Dragoon jackets	3 85	3 19	198 00
1,000	Hussars do	3 85	3 72	130 00
200	Pair R. C. Dragoon pantaloons	5 55	4 60	190 00
100	do Artillery do	5 55	4 75	80 00
150	do R. C. Dragoon trousers	4 78	4 36	63 00
1,500	do Artillery serge do	2 78½	2 53	382 50
10,000	do Infantry do do	2 82	2 59	2,300 00
100	Great-coats, mounted, D. C	10 55	8 30	225 00
5,000	do dismounted	5 73	5 59	700 00
				4,804 50
1,500	Pair ankle boots	2 50	2 25	375 00
750	do winter boots	3 25	3 20	37 50
200	do Wellington boots	4 00	3 95	10 00
				422 50
	Saving per year			5,277 00

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the total cost of the articles on which the saving is effected ?

Mr. TISDALE. I did not add up the figures. The total sum, however, is between $80,000 and $90,000. One further calculation, and I have done with details. As I have explained before, there were two sets of contracts, some for two and others for three years. Under the two-year contracts there was a saving in each year of about $2,500 per year.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Was there not a contract let which was not to commence until a year or two hence ?

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, I am going to the contracts presently.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What is the object of letting a contract to commence a year or two afterwards ?

Mr. TISDALE. I will, with the permission of the hon. gentleman, go into this matter in my own way, and thus save the time of the House. In regard to the two-year contracts, which did not commence until a year from June, 1897, the prices were as follows :—

	Cost under old contract.	Cost under new contract	Saving per Garment.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	cts.
Cavalry, Dragoon, tunics	5 89½	5 48	41½
Artillery do	5 72	5 55	17
Rifles do	5 40	5 25	15
Artillery jackets	3 85	3 72	13
Cavalry pantaloons, Hussars	5 68	4 90	78
Rifles serge trousers	2 80	2 60	20
Average over			$2,500 00 per year.

That would make on these articles alone, none of which were supplied this year, about $2,500 a year. The total result would be, taking last year's contract, and taking this year and the next two years to come, that the savings made would amount to nearly 10 per cent, and taking the same price as last year, there would be a saving of twenty or thirty thousand dollars. These prices that I have mentioned bind the contractors for three years, and it does not matter whether the prices go up or down. The system which has resulted in that saving should therefore be very carefully considered before the advantage of it is lost. I venture to say further that never will you be able to get these articles of a better quality, make and colour at as cheap, or at all events, a cheaper price, than you can get them this year. I am quite satisfied, and I put it as a common-sense proposition, that you can get no firm to take these supplies as cheap for one year as you can for three years. We all know as a business principle that the larger the contract the cheaper the price. But there is more than that in the proposition. I am told by those who take these contracts that they dare not take them for three years until they have made their arrangements with the factories which manufacture the material, because they cannot control and they cannot afford the risk at the rate of profits, unless they have a long time to look ahead. I want to press this point upon the hon. Minister. I want him to consider not only the quality, but particularly the fit, and also the certainty that his department will have plenty of time to watch, as it were, the progress of the manufacture in regard to fit and quality. Now, in regard to the two or three years' contract. The system of the three-year contract was inaugurated a number of years ago, and this is the first time that two-year contracts were given. The reason of that is, that there were some articles that they did not need that year, and so they let two-year contracts subsequently, and it left them on an uneven basis. The department and the officers in charge of this matter, the inspector and the general, and the others responsible for the clothing, were well satisfied with this system because they had sufficient time to look ahead and every opportunity to see that the contracts were fully complied with. This year it was suggested for the convenience of the department to bring in the contracts all at the one time, and taking advantage of the low tenders, it was considered well that for the contracts that were not expiring this year there should be two-year contracts given. That was the reason and the sole reason for asking for the two-year contracts. I conclude, from some newspaper articles, that there was a wrong impression about the matter, for it was hinted that these articles might come in long before they were needed for use. Now, I want to set that right. The contracts provide against that. The supplies for each year can only come in the year for which they are required, and it is entirely within the control of the department when they

will have them, because they are required to give the contractor so many days' notice each year, as to what articles they require. In this way they can always take care to give that notice long enough ahead so that there can be this supervision which officers of long experience in the department think almost equally important with the question of price. Now, in regard to the point as to there being two and three-year contracts ahead. I grant at first view that this might seem extraordinary, and more particularly so as the Minister of Justice has given the opinion that these contracts are not binding. I will tell the House how the officials inaugurated this system so that no possible mischief could arise from that. In every one of these contracts, the following clause is inserted:—

Always provided Parliament has before these dates (that is, the date of payment or either of them, as the case may be, sanctioned the vote for the purchase of such articles.

The contract, therefore, provides that no possible difficulty could arise in this matter. Now, let me ask, why should these contracts be cancelled? I propose under that head to read the remarks of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) on the occasion I brought this matter up in the House on the 11th September. He said:

When I found the contract for supplying clothing after the first day of July, 1897, I thought that was an extraordinary condition of things, and I said at once to the officers of my department that I thought that contract ought to be annulled. My deputy advised me not to take any action without first consulting the Department of Justice; and that is what led me to send the contracts and all papers over to the Department of Justice for their opinion. The Department of Justice have had the matter before them for some weeks, and within a few days they have sent a carefully prepared opinion to the Militia Department stating that that department had no authority whatever to make any of those contracts; and upon the strength of that advice I have proceeded to annul the contract which agreed to supply goods after the 1st of July, 1897. I take this further view with regard to the three-year contract. The opinion of the Department of Justice, which is very clear and distinct, is that the Department of Militia had no power to enter into a contract for three years, or even one year, unless the money was voted, and that, had the money been voted for one year, the contract would be good for that year. Now, although the money was not voted, I am giving the contractors the benefit of the first year. I assume that the money will be voted this year, and we are actually receiving the goods, as they are required, and I propose to accept the contract from 1896 to 1897, subject to the will of Parliament.

I shall now read the opinion of the Minister of Justice, which is as follows:—

Department of Justice, Canada,
Ottawa, September 7th, 1896.

Colonel Panet,
Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 11th ult., in which you submit the following case for the opinion of this department:—

1. By Order in Council of 28th April, 1893, a system of contracts for three years' supplies of militia clothing was approved.

2. Under this system tenders were called for and contracts awarded for such articles as were then deemed requisite for the coming three years.

3. Subsequently supplies of further articles were found to be necessary and a supplementary series of contracts was in like manner awarded for the three fiscal years following the first year in which the new system was adopted; thus one set of contracts expired a year in advance of the other set.

4. In order to avoid the inconvenience thus caused and to have all the contracts terminate at the same time, the Department of Militia and Defence, in calling for tenders for clothing required for the fiscal years 1896-97, 1897-98 and 1898-99, also invited tenders for that portion of the clothing which, being as above explained under contract to expire only on the 30th June, 1897, could only be awarded by the department for the fiscal years 1897-98, 1898-99.

5. The department thus undertook to make contracts for supplies, not only those for which the contracts were just about to expire, and would consequently require to be immediately renewed, but also for supplies which were under contract for a whole year to come, and stood in no need of immediate renewal.

Under these circumstances the Minister of Militia and Defence desires to be advised as to whether or not the contracts awarded for a period which will not commence until the 1st of July, 1897, are valid, or should be cancelled and only awarded when the proper time for so doing arrives.

I am directed by the Minister of Justice to state that the Executive has no constitutional authority to make a contract binding on the House of Commons, and that in his opinion in order to give a contract entered into by the Executive binding effect as against the Crown, it is necessary either that it should be expressly approved by the House of Commons or that the money necessary for carrying it out should be granted, and in the latter case it is binding for the period for which the money is granted by Parliament and no longer.

The Minister thinks, therefore, that the contracts in question are not binding. Whether or not, under the circumstances, they should be cancelled would seem to be a question for the consideration of the Minister of Militia and Defence.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,
D. M. J.

Now I propose to read, so as to get this part of the case fully before the House, the letter from the hon. Minister—I presume the letters to all the contractors were alike—notifying one of the contractors that he had cancelled the contract:

Department of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, 11th September, 1896.

Gentlemen,—I have the honour to inform you, by direction of the Honourable the Minister of Militia and Defence, that, in the opinion of the Honourable the Minister of Justice, the contract awarded you, in May last, for certain clothing required by this department for the years 1896-97, 1897-98 and 1898-99, or either of them, is not binding upon the Crown.

I am, therefore, to inform you that our Minister has cancelled that portion of the contract in question purporting to bind this department to obtain from you for the years 1897-98 and 1898-99 the clothing, or any of it, therein described, and that only that part of it relating to the year 1896-97 shall be regarded as valid, and on condition that the necessary money is voted at the present session of Parliament.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) A. BENOIT,
Captain,
Secretary, Department of Militia and Defence.

It will be noticed that the Minister's statement to the House, which I quoted, hardly expressed the opinion of the Minister of Justice. I do not think he fully appreciated the important distinction in that opinion. The hon. Minister said that the opinion of the Minister of Justice was that the department had no authority whatever to make any of these contracts, whereas, according to my idea, he made a very different statement. He said the contracts were not binding. But, as to the policy or the advisability of cancelling the contracts, he was careful to guard himself, and, I think, properly so. He said the responsibility for that must rest on the hon. gentleman who controls the department. Now, what is the reason underlying the opinion of the Minister of Justice that those contracts are not binding? It is the plain constitutional reason which, I suppose, all gentlemen in this House will agree upon, which these very contractors knew, that it was conditional with the Crown to carry them out—that the Crown or the department need not fulfil them, though the contractors were bound to do it. The contracts were made with that condition. But what did the contractors rely upon? They relied upon two things. Most of all they relied upon this: where a department of the Government, through its duly authorized Minister, enters into a contract in good faith, they accept that as a sort of guarantee of its fulfilment. Mind you, I am not saying that that in any way binds the Minister at all. Afterwards, if there was found to be anything improper in connection with a contract, the Crown might not vote the money for the purpose. This matter was all investigated some years ago by the Public Accounts Committee, and it was impossible to produce a scintilla of evidence to show that there had been anything wrong. I do not think any one has charged, and I am glad to see that my hon. friend has not charged, anything corrupt in the matter. He is quite free, after that opinion of the Minister of Justice, to take the responsibility of cancelling the contracts: but it is beyond peradventure that my hon. friend's courage and wisdom in taking this new departure can only be justified by the results of his action. While I am not saying that everything that the Minister of Justice says is true, yet he very properly says that the contracts are not binding. At the same time, the wisdom or the policy of cancelling them rests upon my hon. friend; and, if my hon. friend thinks that their cancellation will result in an advantage to the department, if he thinks he can get better articles or get them cheaper, I am not saying that it is not within his province, under the opinion of the Minister of Justice, to cancel them. But let me call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he has contradicted himself and has justified this contract, because he has seen fit, and I think wisely, to do the very same thing. The Minister of Justice says that no part of this contract is binding; yet my hon. friend has done his predecessor the compliment of accepting one year under it before the money is voted. A principle is a principle. He may say it was wise to do so, and I think it was wise, because the articles were immediately needed. Now, my hon. friend's justification is entirely this. The Minister of Justice says the contract is not binding; my hon. friend says "the contract being not binding, I, therefore, thought it right to cancel it." That is his whole case, as put by himself. He will have to be responsible for it; he is, I suppose, prepared to accept the responsibility: but I venture to call his attention to this, that, when another year he asks for a contract, and waits till Parliament votes the money, unless the session ends earlier than it usually does, I think he will find it impossible to get articles of the same quality and the same make, as cheaply as he had them already provided for under contract with competent parties who had hitherto not failed to meet the requirements of the case. With regard to competition, the competition was there. These circulars were sent to manufacturers of both parties. They were not sent to middlemen.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Have you the names of those to whom you sent them?

Mr. TISDALE. I have. Do you want me to read them?

Names of (a) parties invited to tender to furnish clothing to the department for the fiscal years 1896-97, 1897-98 and 1898-99:—Messrs. W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company, Hamilton; E. A. Small & Co., Montreal; E. Boisseau & Co., Toronto; H. Shorey & Co., Montreal; Gillespie, Ansley & Dixon, Toronto; Joseph Horsfall & Sons, Montreal; The Auburn Woollen Co., Peterborough; Doull & Gibson, Montreal; A. Dupuis & Co., Montreal; Hodgson Bros. & Co., boots and shoes, Alexandria; A. E. Whitehead & Co., Montreal.

(b) Parties who tendered:—Messrs. W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Co., Hamilton; H. Shorey & Co., Montreal; Doull & Gibson, Montreal; E. Boisseau & Co., Toronto; Gillespie, Ansley & Dixon, Toronto; The Auburn Woollen Co., Peterborough; Hodgson Bros. & Co., Alexandria; A. E. Whitehead, Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It never struck you

there was such a place as the maritime provinces ?

Mr. TISDALE. I should gather from this that the manufacturers down there had not gone to the expense I have pointed out. It is only a certain number who have provided the machinery to enable them to carry out contracts of this kind.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Why were John Colborne & Company, of Hamilton, one of the largest clothiers in Canada, left out, and good, sound Conservatives ?

Mr. TISDALE. There was a large enough number to make active competition. It was not the Minister who selected the names, for I certainly was not consulted, but these invitations to tender were sent out by the deputy head, as he told me, in the usual way. When the tenders came in, I am not sure that there were not some more invitations to tender sent out to the boot and shoemakers. I did not ask for a return giving the names of those to whom notices were sent. I was given the name of the contractor to whom was awarded the contract, and I remember that the officers of the department were surprised at the lowness of his tender.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). How many Liberals in that list ?

Mr. TISDALE. I do not know, but I know that there were three Conservatives. I judged from what I saw in a Hamilton paper that Doull & Gibson are Liberals.

Mr. LOUNT. There is not a Liberal in the whole list.

Mr. TISDALE. I did not know the politics of one of them except Sanford & Company, and have never inquired since, but I learned afterwards, long after the contracts were signed, that Shorey & Co. were Conservatives, and I know that the manager of the Auburn Woollen Company was one, because I know the gentleman, but did not know he had anything to do with that company until subsequently. After all, this question narrows itself down to a question of responsibility. Hon. gentlemen opposite say the contracts are not binding, but the advisability of cancelling them rests with the Minister. In the remarks he made the other day, the hon. Minister told us that, he simply cancelled those contracts because they were not binding, but nevertheless he accepted the contract for this year, so that if there was anything improper, if there was any reason why they should be cancelled except that they were not binding, he ought not to have accepted the contract for this year.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). He wanted the clothes.

Mr. TISDALE. If it was illegal for us to make the contracts, is it not illegal for him to accept one of them ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). He could not help himself.

Mr. TISDALE. Unless some better explanation can be given, the hon. gentleman leaves himself open to the suspicion that he simply cancelled them because they were made by political opponents, and he preferred that some other party should have them. He certainly cannot get lower contracts from any one who will fulfil the conditions which the department exact. The contracts are excellent ones, they worked for the benefit of the public and the department, the special provisions in them have been a success, and this is a department into which the least possible politics should be allowed to have influence. I quite agree that it is impossible for any hon. gentleman to quite clear himself from politics, under our system, but if I did not believe that the present system was a good one, I would not appeal to the hon. gentleman to follow it. It would be a great mistake, in my opinion, a loss to the public and an unfortunate thing for the department, if the hon. Minister was to depart from this system, which has been found to work satisfactorily, and which I believe he would persist in if he gave it a trial. I think he will find on inquiry that these men are not all Conservatives. The firms whose tenders were the lowest obtained the contracts, and they are firms which are prepared to furnish excellent articles, and I ask the hon. gentleman not to cancel the contracts. Why, the contracts were advisably drawn in that shape. Was there anything improper in providing that these contracts were only binding on the Crown, so long as the Crown was satisfied, from year to year, but they are to be cancelled not on the ground that there is dissatisfaction or that the firms are not competent, or that the prices are now not low, but on the grounds simply that the contracts are not binding. The hon. gentleman has the right to say that he will change the whole system. Now, I am appealing to the hon. Minister for his own sake and for the sake of getting the militia properly clothed, not to cancel these contracts. To get the militia clothes is a difficult problem, as the hon. gentleman's officers—the same gentlemen who have so long and so well filled these positions—will tell him. These gentlemen have been thoroughly impartial so far as I know, no complaint that I have ever heard being made about the staff here by either party. I believe that they are a mixed staff in politics, so far as they can be said to have any politics at all, and in my contact with them I never found any indications of political leanings on the part of those gentlemen. I came among them as a stranger, but they knew my politics, of course, as did everybody who knew anything about me, but to their credit be it said, when these contracts were being awarded, they manifested no bias in favour of anybody on account of his

politics. I thoroughly believe that the hon. gentleman has an excellent staff. I believe also that he has a chance to benefit the department and the public, and to enhance his own reputation, by allowing the system to continue as it has done, and the next time to make the contracts in the same way. At all events I hope he will do me the credit to remember that in the most courteous way I could, and in the most sincere and honest way, I have urged this course upon him. For I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that however strong a partisan I may be in other matters, and I am a party politician, I put the interests of the militia of Canada far above party. And I make this appeal because I believe that the course I urge upon him is the best course that can be taken in the interest of the service and the country.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Will the hon. gentleman kindly answer me a question? How many of these contractors received contracts for the same classes of goods? Did each contractor have a different class of goods, or did some two or more of them have the same class of goods to make?

Mr. TISDALE. The great-coats would go separately. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question off-hand. I have the contracts here and could look them up. My recollection is that certain gentlemen have the facilities for more than one class of goods, while others have not gone to the expense of it. The boots and shoes were a separate contract.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I speak of the clothing alone. Was the price allowed for a given class of goods the same no matter who furnished them?

Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) will look at the contracts, he can ascertain that. I did not look into the details before I rose to speak. Though I accept the full responsibility of signing the contracts as Minister of Militia when those contracts were made, I had to rely very largely upon the staff as to matters of detail.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). My object was to find out where the objection came in——

Mr. TISDALE. I really could not inform the hon. gentleman, as I have not looked into that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale), who was Minister of Militia at the time the contracts under discussion were entered into, has rightly said that I have not made any charge against him or against the department of any corrupt act with reference to these contracts. I certainly have not done so and have no desire to do so. I have, however, said, and I repeat now, that I think an impropriety was committed in entering into a contract which did not begin to run until the 1st of July, 1897, for goods which were not wanted until after that date. To have entered into a contract of that kind fourteen or fifteen months before the date at which the goods were wanted seemed to me to be an extraordinary thing to do, and seemed to me to be a thing requiring explanation, which explanation I have not heard. It seemed to me a proper case to refer to the Department of Justice for an opinion as to whether the department was bound by a contract of that kind or not. In justice to the hon. gentleman, I must answer the explanation which he proffered with reference to why this contract beginning 1st July, 1897, was entered into. The explanation seemed to me to be a very weak one. That explanation was this: There were two sets of three-year contracts, the first ending 1st July, 1896, and the other ending 1st July, 1897. Having made up his mind to make new contracts from the 1st July, 1896, he was anxious that the other three years contracts, which did not terminate till a year later, should terminate at the same time as the contracts he was making. Well, Sir, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman might have arrived at the same result by another and very much fairer way, by making his contract for one year to cover the year until the three-year contracts were completed on the 1st July, 1897. But he chose the other course of entering into contracts for goods which were not wanted for fifteen months after the date when the contract was made. As I explained in the remarks which the hon. gentleman has quoted, that was why I referred the matter to the Department of Justice. Now, the hon. gentleman has charged me with inconsistency. He read the report of the Minister of Justice, and he pointed out that the report threw upon me the responsibility of cancelling these contracts. Of course it did. That report pointed out that these contracts were not legal——

Mr. TISDALE. Not binding.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not legal. If they were legal they would be binding, and not being binding, they are not legal. The opinion of the Minister of Justice was that these contracts were not legal. Well, it seems to me, that the subsequent words are altogether superfluous. It was a matter for the Minister of Militia to deal with, most certainly; and I accept the full responsibility of dealing with it. There were two courses open to me as Minister of Militia. One was to come down to this House and ask this House to pass a Bill ratifying these three years contracts and the contract which did not begin to run until the 1st July, 1897. The other course was to terminate the contracts which the Department of Justice had pointed out were illegal. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) says that I have accepted a contract for one year. Why, Mr. Chairman,

I took very good care to say in the letter which was written to the contractors that I was prepared to take the goods which they were actually delivering and which we wanted, which it was a matter of policy and convenience to this Government to receive,—I was prepared to receive these goods, how? Subject to the approval of Parliament. These are the words of my letter. I cannot see any inconsistency there. We wanted the goods, and we are taking the goods and will pay for them when this vote is passed by Parliament. Now, the hon. gentleman has discussed the question of policy. That is an important question—the question whether it is the best policy to enter into these three-year contracts, assuming, of course, that if we adopt that policy, we shall ask for special legislation of this Parliament to make that policy legal. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has adduced arguments here which should satisfy this House that that is the best policy. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) stated here the other night that when it was determined that this clothing should be manufactured in Canada, it was necessary to give some permanence to the contracts in order to induce manufacturers in Canada to provide themselves with the expensive machinery necessary to do the work. I think that was the statement the hon. gentleman made. Well, I admit there is some force in that statement, but that is over. It cannot be said now that that argument, which may have been good at the outset, continues to be a good argument to-day. The hon. gentleman has pointed to the favourable character of this contract in regard to prices as compared with the former contract. That simply goes to show that goods are cheaper to-day than they were three, or two years ago; and that is the case, not only in military clothing, but in all kinds of goods. And here is an argument against the three years contract. Goods are cheapening year by year, methods of manufacturing are improved; let us, then, have the advantage of this lowering of prices, and not tie ourselves up for a term of three years, and pay three years hence prices which ought to be much lower than the prices which we agreed to pay. I think the arguments are all against the policy of a three-years contract. I think my hon. friend read a list of the persons who were asked to tender.

Mr. TISDALE. I read a list of those who were asked to tender.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have a list of persons who were invited to furnish clothing to the department for the fiscal years 1896-97-98-99, composed of nine firms, or individuals, namely: The Sanford Manufacturing Company; E. A. Small & Co.; Boisseau & Co.; Shorey & Co.; Gillespie, Ansley & Dickson; Joseph Horsfall & Sons; The Auburn Woollen Co.; Doull & Gibson; A Dupuis & Co. Three of these firms did not tender, namely, E. A. Small & Co.; Joseph Horsfall & Sons, and A. Dupuis & Co.; and the fact is that the six who did tender all got contracts. Now, I do not intend to draw any unfair conclusion from that fact, but I may say that there is a suspicion that these gentlemen had a perfect understanding among each other; there is that feeling. With regard to boots and shoes, my hon. friend gave two names.

Mr. TISDALE. Two names that tendered.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have only one firm, Messrs. Hodgson Bros. & Co., as the only parties who were invited to tender.

Mr. TISDALE. I marked those tenders myself. There were only two tenders, but I do not know how many notices were sent out.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is correct, there were two firms asked to tender.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not know how many were asked.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Did any of these tenderers for clothing offer the same class of goods as were furnished by the Sanford Company, and at the same prices?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There were other tenders received on sealed patterns. Now there is another matter to be considered with reference to the present system. The hon. gentleman remarked that it was necessary for these men to know beforehand whether they were going to have these goods to supply in order to make their arrangements with the factories, and buy the cloth. Now, I am informed that the scarlet serge which is used to manufacture this clothing, is supplied at only one place, that is the Sherbrooke Mills; and I am further informed that Mr. Sanford has engaged the whole output, has an absolute monopoly of the output of that mill; and that, therefore, it was absolutely impossible for anybody else, unless he made terms with Mr. Sanford, to tender for any class of clothing made out of scarlet serge—that is the statement made to me. If that is true, I think it shows how desirable it is that the present system of sending out requests to certain selected individuals, should be abandoned, and that advertisements should be published in the newspapers asking the country at large to tender for these supplies if they wish to do so, thus opening up this business to all the people engaged in the manufacture of clothing in the Dominion of Canada. I am also told that the cloth for overcoats is made exclusively at that one mill.

Now, my hon. friend spoke of the fact that prices were cheaper. I have already

alluded to that. He seems to think that the price of these goods was lower in Canada than elsewhere. Now, I am informed in the department that the same class of goods can be bought in England 40 per cent below the price we pay here.

Mr. TISDALE. Not for the same quality of articles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The same quality. Now, I accept the full responsibility in this matter, for I believe that the action I have taken was such as I could not, under the advice received from the Department of Justice, refuse to take. I believe that it will be in the interests of the country, and it will only be fair to those people who are engaged in industries of this kind, in the manufacture of clothing and cloth in Canada, that large Government contracts of this kind should be thrown open to the trade throughout the country. I believe it will be to the advantage of the department, and it will give all those people engaged in manufactures in Canada an equal chance to supply the clothing. I am sure that this department does not desire to discriminate in favour of any particular class, I care not whether they are Liberals or Conservatives. I am here to act in the interest of the public, and I propose that, other things being equal, the quality being the same, the people who can manufacture at the lowest figure, whether Conservatives or Liberals, shall have these contracts in future.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may be permitted, as the Minister of Militia under whose administration of the department the new system was introduced, to say a few words in relation to the matter now under consideration. Sir, I do not rise for the purpose of entering into the question as to the legality or illegality of the contracts which the hon. gentleman is discussing at the present moment, but I am quite free to admit that they are not binding on the Crown. To my mind, that is not the question, as I view it, which is of the greatest importance at the present moment. The special point to consider is whether three-year contracts are in the interest of the Crown, or if the system introduced by that new departure in the old one is more in the interest of the Crown and of the public than the system which obtained previously, that of one-year contracts. I must state to hon. members, and the older members of the House will remember the fact, that in 1889 the whole question was thoroughly ventilated during a discussion extending over several weeks before the Committee of Public Accounts. I had no reason whatever to complain of the discussion which took place, nor the motives which induced hon. gentlemen to bring up that question before the committee for the purpose of discussing the whole subject. It is sufficient for me to say, however, that that question having been brought before the committee, it was under discussion for several weeks, and I think the committee and this House by means of that investigation were placed in full possession of the facts which induced the department to enter into the new system to which I refer. When I first came into office as Minister of Militia, this subject was considered, and it will be within the recollection of the officers of the department, who at that time were valuable ones, and who have been continued in office under the hon. gentleman who now occupies that prominent position, that the change was made because we learned from experience that the system of yearly contracts was open to considerable objection. I can recall—and I am speaking merely from memory and not from notes—the contract given to a man named Auclair, who was a tailor and a manufacturer. He tendered for the manufacturing of the clothing for the year, and, if my memory serves me, upon that contract we lost $2,000 or $3,000. He was unable to carry it out; he had not the means at his disposal to carry it out. His acceptance of that contract led to financial difficulties on his part, and also to the necessity of the Government expending, over and above the contract price, $2,000 or $3,000 for the purpose of obtaining some other manufacturer to take the contract off his hands and provide the department with the clothing which it required. I can recollect, also, a contract which was given, if I recollect rightly, in the city of Sherbrooke, for heavy coats, and in that case also the department suffered considerable loss. The inspector of military stores rejected the goods which were furnished by the manufacturer under the contract entered into with the Crown, and this led to heavy loss, the amount of which I am not prepared to state. The whole subject was gone into by the department. I never for one moment contended, although I occupied the office longer than any other Minister of Militia, that my experience could be relied upon to enable me to give judgment upon a question which came more properly under the men who have made a study of the matter, such as the inspector and Colonel Macpherson, who have had charge of that branch for a number of years, and who have shown, by the manner in which they have administered its affairs, that they understand thoroughly the affairs of that branch. But it was after consultation with all the officers of my department, and those who were capable of expressing an opinion upon the point, that I decided to go into the three years contract. On that point, I refer the Minister of Militia to the report of the investigation to which I have referred, made by the Public Accounts Committee in 1889, on expenditure for clothing. Colonel Macpherson, when under examination, was asked the reasons why the system had been changed, and, in reply, he said:

Did you from your practical experience of the past make such a recommendation to the Minister ?—Yes ; I joined with Colonel Panet on the subject, recommending that it would be desirable to continue the same contractors, as it will save the department a great deal of trouble and expense.

Every year it was found expensive to advertise for tenders all over the Dominion. But that is not a strong point, according to my own judgment, because, if that system is preferable to the old one, it is the duty of the Minister of Militia, whatever the expense may be, to adopt the system that will guard the interests of the Crown and the people. But my object in making this quotation from the report is to show that it is not a question of viewing the matter from a political standpoint, or from the standpoint of a preference for certain contractors, and leaving out other contractors, but because the judgment of the officers of the Department of Militia, whose experience covered several years, led them to arrive at the conclusion that it was in the interest of the department to put an end to the yearly contract system and adopt the three years system. Before any decision was arrived at by the then Minister of Militia, the whole matter was submitted to Council, and it was upon the authority of Orders in Council, not upon departmental action, that the system was changed.

It may very properly be asked : What advantage do you see in the three-year contract system over the one-year system. Sir. I leave it again to the officers of the department, and if the Minister looks into the records he will find that from the time we entered into the three-year contracts, prices went down and the quality and fit of the uniform were greatly improved. The reason of that is obvious. It is because men who have the capital and enter into these contracts for an extended period, consider it to their advantage to improve the manufacture of their goods by importing machinery which lead to the perfecting of the uniforms. It is well known to those who have studied the question, that if you go to Pimlico in England, where most of the uniforms not only for Great Britain, but for many continental nations, are manufactured, you will find that every year there are great improvements in the dies and in the hydraulic machinery used for the purpose of cutting out the cavalry breeches, and other articles of uniform. There are dies which will cut hundreds of sleeves at the one time, and these dies are so absolutely perfect that there is great economy in manufacturing, while at the same time the uniforms are produced in a more perfect manner than they could be by any other method. One of the reasons why the three-year system was adopted was that experience had shown to the officers in charge of that branch of the department, and many of them are still in the department, that the articles manufactured under the longer period contracts, were much better in every way than they had been before. I received that information from my officers, when I was head of the department, and I believe that the hon. Minister will receive the same information to-day. I have referred to Mr. Auclair, who had a contract for one year. I suppose his financial capabilities were rather limited, and he went about and bought his goods where probably he could get them at such low prices that he thought it was to his advantage. Subsequently it turned out not to be to his advantage, and it certainly was not to the advantage of the Crown, because it gave to our militia force uniforms which were quite unfit for use, and some of which I believe are still lying in the stores. I venture to prophesy that the Minister of Militia, taking, as I know he does, great interest in the department over which he presides, and, as I am quite certain, anxious to do everything that can be done to help on the militia force of Canada as every true Canadian should wish to do ; I venture to prophesy that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden), if he reverts to the one-year system, will discover that it is a system which cannot obtain. I admit that these contracts are not binding upon the Crown, and when we adopted the system we never anticipated that they would be binding. The fact of putting into the contract a clause whereby the contractors cannot hold the Crown responsible unless the money is voted every session of Parliament to pay for these goods, indicated plainly that we did not consider the contract as anything binding upon the Crown. But we did consider that if the contractors were prepared to run that risk it was to the advantage of the Crown to adopt that system. I say again, that if the hon. Minister tries for one year the system of advertising all over the country, he will find that the trouble to the officers of his department is multiplied to an extent that makes it altogether inconvenient, to say the least, from the standpoint of departmental work. The camps under ordinary circumstances, are generally held from June to September, in view of the close of the harvest season in the different provinces, so as to suit the convenience of the men. We found under the one-year contract system, that just the very moment we required clothing we had to telegraph all over the country to get the contractors to send in the goods. Very frequently we were put to very considerable inconvenience, and very frequently we felt that it was next to impossible to meet the requirements of the forces under that system. Now, I am not partial to three-year contracts, except for one reason. Indeed, I would go so far as to give contracts for four or five years, say the life of a Parliament, because I think the Minister of Mili-

tia will find that he can enter into contracts in that way under more favourable conditions, in so far as the Crown is concerned, than he could by adopting the system of yearly contracts. I am quite certain that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) does adopt the one-year system, he will find that the goods are much inferior to those which have been furnished by contractors of great experience. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) says that one mill was given the monopoly. I can tell the hon. gentleman that so far as scarlet cloth is concerned, there is only one mill in Canada that manufactures it. The manufacture of scarlet cloth is very expensive and that expense is entailed largely by the dye. When the dyeing process is going on, it is necessary to drape the whole factory with white canvas in order to prevent the slightest possible speck from dropping on the cloth when it is placed in the scarlet dye vat. In England or on the continent, where scarlet cloth is universally used for military purposes, there is a very large demand; but the demand is very limited in Canada, and so there is only one mill engaged in the manufacture of this particular kind of cloth. The hon. gentleman also mentioned what would be a very strong point if the experience of the department had not shown the reverse; that is, that the goods furnished by the Canadian manufacturers are more expensive and not any better than the English goods. We have found that the life of a Canadian tunic is much longer than the life of an English tunic, and why? Because the best material is used by the Canadian manufacturers, as we all know, in manufacturing the cloth of which the tunics are made. The tunics made in England, it is true, look smart and are properly cut, but they are manufactured out of shoddy. That was proved during that investigation, and I ask the hon. gentleman at his leisure to look into that. It was proved by the testimony of several leading officers in the various regiments composing the militia force of Canada, that the goods manufactured in Canada were of a better quality than the goods we received from England. That is a matter of some importance, because I know that every year Canada sent to English manufacturers $200,000 of Canadian money to purchase tunics and uniforms for our militia force. When we adopted the system of obtaining that clothing from Canadian manufacturers, we kept the $200,000 of Canadian money for Canadians, we employed Canadian labour, and we obtained goods superior to what we had been getting from England. These were the reasons which influenced me; and when the hon. gentleman goes into the whole question, I think he will find that the new system was adopted because it was a vast improvement on the one which obtained when I became Minister of Militia. I regret that my hon. friend the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) is not here. He intended to say a few words on this question, as there are in the city of Montreal several leading firms who have made a specialty of this kind of clothing, and I think he would have expressed views similar to mine, gathered from the opinion prevailing among those manufacturers. The point I wish to make is that if the hon. gentleman adopts the other system, he will have inferior contractors—men whose financial capabilities are not sufficient to enable them to carry out a large contract; because it is not to the advantage of a manufacturer of any standing to take a contract merely for one year. It would be well enough for an ordinary contract; but when it becomes necessary for a manufacturer to supplement the regular plant in his factory, by importing from Europe or elsewhere the machinery he requires for the manufacture of these military goods, a contract for one year would not justify his going to that trouble and expense. But if you grant the contract for three years, and the contractor readers justice to the department, then you can extend it as we did. It was only after we had acquired great experience as to the manufacturers that we selected probably ten or twelve of them, not more. There were very few to tender; but out of the whole number, we set aside those whose contracts had not been satisfactory to the department, and, under the advice of the officers of the department, as the hon. gentleman will see in that investigation, we sent circulars to the men who had complied with the requirements of the department, and had carried out their contracts satisfactorily. Admitting as I do that everything in the shape of political bias should be put aside for the purpose of doing the greatest possible justice to the militia force of Canada, I consider that, large as the sum may be for Canada, we expend very little money upon our citizen soldiers per annum, compared with the wants of the force. If the hon. gentleman goes into the whole question, I think he will arrive at the conclusion at which I arrived, after studying the subject as I did, and after being several years in the department.

Mr. DOMVILLE. In accordance with the understanding arrived at with the hon. Minister of Militia, I may be allowed at this time to bring up a question which I had intended to bring up in the form of a motion, leaving it to the Minister to act as he thinks fit. I do not wish to find any fault with the previous Administration, nor do I wish to introduce politics at all into the matter, or trench on the authority of the Minister of Militia, or interfere with any action he may propose to take in the future. But I cannot help feeling—and I express, I think, the opinion of a great many militia officers whom I have seen during the shooting contests here, and in Montreal and elsewhere, and I have had letters from a great many—the militia of

Canada are the men who will have to do the fighting if Canada should ever be in peril; and that force will have to be commanded by officers skilled and capable to lead them, and there must be a proper and judicious administration of the force at headquarters, to see that the army is in a proper shape to take the field. Now, the militia of this country—and I speak for them as well as for myself—are not satisfied with the results of the expenditure of the money taken from the people of Canada. It is our money, and the 40,000 officers and men who do the work have a right to have something to say in regard to the management of the force. They feel that they are not simply like British soldiers, who are equipped with everything they can possibly require, who are simply scientific fighters trained to kill and supplied with all the requisites, but they are men who give their services voluntarily at great sacrifice to themselves and who are not at all equipped as they should be to take action when called upon. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) said that the trouble was that the Government have never been able to spend that amount which the militia required and were entitled to. In my opinion if we could get the matter properly before the taxpayers, the people would come to the conclusion that they must either have a militia fit for its duty or do away with it altogether. Let me read to you what General Herbert said, who was one of the finest soldiers that ever took the field in modern days. I have the right to speak of him now because I am not under his command, and I take this opportunity of saying that there are not many better officers in the British service. As an evidence of his fitness, he was sent out here by the Imperial Government. I can readily understand how a general officer, trying to do his duty, would find himself blocked at all points. I could readily understand how he would find that retrenchment and reconstruction were out of the way because they would interfere with vested rights. General Herbert was treading on everybody's toes. Whenever he made a move, he knocked up against somebody, who felt that a new broom was about to sweep the decks, and resented it. Here is what he said of the militia of Canada:

> That the Militia Act has not fulfilled the expectations formed 25 years ago, is sufficiently evident to any one who carefully examines the present condition of the force, and compares that condition with the objects, held in view by the commission, to which I have referred. This is due to many causes, not the least of which is indicated by the fact that many important sections of the Act have remained wholly in abeyance. They never could and never can be practically applied, and their existence is calculated to give a delusive character to the power of defence possessed by the Dominion.
>
> The time seems to have arrived when a fresh inquiry should be made into the working of the Militia Act, in order to ascertain how far it has provided an organization capable of adapting itself to ever-changing conditions and increasing responsibilities. Such an inquiry would furnish a fresh starting point and firm ground, for those who are called upon to guide the policy of the Dominion on the question of the defence of its territory.

That justifies me in asking the hon. Minister of Militia to appoint a royal commission, composed of members of this House belonging to the militia, taken from both sides, and drop politics for the moment. So far from this interfering with the Minister of Militia, I believe that when he would see it at work he would consider it a step taken in the right direction. This commission would place before the people the requirements of the militia, which the Government itself hardly dares to do, lest it might be accused of extravagance and exaggerated ideas. So far from this commission being an attack on the Militia Department, it is really strengthening the department, and the whole of Canada would believe it was a step taken in the right direction and give the highest credit to the hon. Minister of Militia. I propose to lay this matter, as shortly as I can, before the House, but the occasion is one which does not often occur. England expects her colonies to help her, England has thanked Canada for offering to send her assistance on various occasions, and we find great authorities in England, Lord Wolseley for example, expressing the hope that the day is not far off when the colonies will be auxiliaries and allies of the British Crown, and take their place on the army list. It is true they should not be forced to go abroad on active service, but they should feel that they are soldiers of the Empire and not have the finger of scorn pointed at them as they pass, and be derided as swashbucklers and militia instead of being considered soldiers. If we are to become auxiliaries of the Empire, we ought to show England that we are moving in a line to become part and parcel of that great country which has conquered the world. We ought also to be able to show England that we have some practical soldiers of our own in this country. We have young men trained at Kingston, some of whom have done credit to the Empire in Africa and on the Soudan, but it seems that to be educated at the Kingston College is a barrier to prevent our young men taking any prominent position in the militia of Canada. If that college is to be of any service to us, the young men who graduate from it should be given the preference in filling positions on the militia force. The young men are the men to fight. When thy get to a certain age, like myself and others, it may perhaps be necessary to retain some of them because of some information they have, but the day must come when we shall have a thoroughly trained militia, practically equipped, and ready at a moment's notice to take the field. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) showed the necessity for an inquiry,

when he said there was no clothing when the Militia Department wanted on some occasion to do something, and they had to send everywhere to get clothing. The hon. gentleman points to the fact that he had advocated a three or five years contract, and this would be good grounds for the Minister of Militia to look into the whole matter of equipment. Supposing Parliament should vote $3,000,000 to equip the forces or even more, it would be his duty to consult the soldiers and see what the opinions of their officers were as to what was required. If you are going to have a carbine for the cavalry, take cavalry officers opinion of the weapon; do not order a lot of saddles and then find them useless. Ask your cavalry men what is the best and most serviceable saddle. Get them together and ask their opinion. They do that in England; the Imperial Government takes advice from its officers. I am not saying that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) will not do that. They have had commissions sitting in England, and they called before them men representing the several arms of the service and get their advice, and, by comparing their opinions found out what was necessary for the service. It does not do to have one rifle bought to-day and another rifle bought to-morrow. Ten thousand are now ordered. I might find fault with the buying of these rifles, even though it were the act of my friends. I might find fault with the act of the late Government; I might say: Gentlemen, I think you should have hesitated before you bought these rifles. And I will give you my reason for that opinion. I would prefer to see my soldiers able to shoot before they are armed with such perfect weapons. How many of our volunteers can shoot? Some of them can come here to Ottawa, a few of them can go to England and sustain the credit of Canadian marksmanship. But I see several colonels on the other side of the House and on this, and I would appeal to them, how many regiments, in their opinion, can use the Snider-Enfield to advantage, to say nothing of the much superior weapon we are getting now? Very few of them, I venture to say. That is not their fault. The material is there, the men are good men; but how are they to learn to shoot? They cannot come up to these rifle meetings at Ottawa for many of them live at a great distance, and they could not bear the expense, nor could they afford to lose the time. Besides, they feel that they could not compete with crack shots. The soldier who cannot shoot is of no use in active service. We must adopt a system wihch will teach them to shoot, by giving them practice at their local headquarters. You could then compel them to become efficient, to a certain extent, before allowing them into camp or allowing them to take any part in militia drill. But, to my mind, it would be time to place such a perfect weapon as the new rifle in their hands when this was done. Take my own regiment, which is as good, I venture to say, as any of its class in Canada. I do not want to disparage them, but I venture to say that not one-third of them are able to handle the new weapon that is given out to them. It is a beautiful rifle, but requires skill to handle it to advantage. Our men should be able to march, but they must have boots. My hon. friend says that contracts were given to run three years, covering the supply of boots. What boots have they for the cavalry? A boot the cavalryman would not put on his foot; a boot he would not be seen walking about in. Yet we are committed to buy this cavalry boot for three years. I do not find fault with the Minister or, perhaps, with the General, or with the officers of the department; but the fact is that a good cavalry boot is not provided, because those who have this matter in hand, do not know a cavalry boot. They do not know a saddle. They think because the thing is made of leather and has stirrups and will go on a horse, it is a saddle. But, if the pommel is not made at the proper angle, it will cut the withers. It may not be known, but the horses in this country are differently shaped in the withers from those in England. These are things that officers who have the service at heart know, and they have a right to be heard as to the equipment of the men in their charge. It is very well for you gentlemen to buy everything; but you do not always know what we want or what will satisfy us. No doubt, your intentions are good, but there are some of these points upon which we could enlighten you. I would like to take back something I said about Surgeon General Oliver—or rather to straighten it out. I had no desire to disparage him or his equipment. All I was trying to do was to prevent this Oliver equipment being purchased until we get some other things now necessary at this moment, especially as the cost would be three or four thousand dollars. I make this explanation because he cannot defend himself in the House and I would be the last man in the House to find fault with an officer who has done such eminent service in the past as Surgeon General Oliver. It must not be overlooked that our needs are changing all the time. Everything is changing in relation to the art of war. My hon. friend talks about a three-year contract for clothing. But it cannot be known so far in advance exactly what we shall want. We might require kharkees, and we might want surges according to circumstances. We must dress according to the country we are going to. Take the case of the handsome new tunics for the cavalry. Fancy a man wearing a jacket ornamented with a beautiful imitation of gold lace while cleaning out a stable. That is not reasonable; it does not look soldier-like. We know that the officers in the olden days went about camp in full uniform. To-day, we have

nothing but the roughest stuff for such work. We have what we call an active service rig. These things come from experience as we go along. But the greatest question, and the question at the foundation of all, is the question, who commands the militia. If you consult the Act, you will find that the militia is really commanded by the Queen. The Act does provide for an officer as Major General, but it gives him no authority; you cannot find in that Act where his duties are laid down. So he must either run counter to the department, or he must sit down and do nothing. That is, according to the Act, he cannot be of any use to the militia. In England, the statute called the Royal Warrant lays down the duties of the Commander-in-Chief, and says distinctly what he can do and what he cannot do. Therefore, there is no conflict of opinion between himself and the money department, presided over by the Secretary of State for War. In Canada, I suppose, our Secretary of State for War is the Minister of Militia. If that is the case, he has his general, and the general should be given some definite position. If we do not provide this for the present general, we might change the law so as to make it apply in the future, or it may be worked in by degrees. The Militia Act is far from perfect. I doubt whether a commander can convict a soldier or officer under it, because it contains the ambiguous words "provided he gets authority from headquarters." Suppose you are going into camp, and some trifling difficulty has arisen, and you want to make an example. You cannot court-martial a man without getting authority from Ottawa, and it will cost $2 to $5 to try a man before the civil authorities. You cannot take him before the civil courts, you cannot commit him; and so you have to let the matter slide. And so I could pass along from one branch to the other until we come down to the question of military education. We have got the raw material, as General Herbert says—there are no better men to fight than there are in Canada—and intelligent officers as well, and Parliament has given us the money to equip our corps. But if we are to have an efficient militia, we must have trained officers to command. Where are we to get the skilled officers? In England they have officers who go through their course in the regiment and then must go to Sandhurst and take the staff course before they can get any important position in the service. It might be well to consider whether we should not take the present military college at Kingston, and make that into a staff college for officers, and whether the Minister should not arrange in England to allow our cadets who wish to do so, to attend Sandhurst for the line and Woolwich for the artillery. Perhaps it might be found that it would be more economical and better to take our captains and majors and give them a staff training before allowing them to take charge of a regiment. An hon. gentleman says that the college might be abolished. I am not going to take that into consideration at all. I am trying to take up the various points which may be of advantage to the Minister and which will commend themselves to both sides of the House. The hon. gentleman has spoken about overcoats. I do not agree with him, because I do not think they are what they should be, but I do not wish to make any political point out of the matter. We have many precedents for having a royal commission. We have had such commissions in regard to agriculture and other matters, and I am satisfied that we could get several officers in this House who would be willing to serve and to prepare a report to submit to the Minister, under the advice of the department, which would show that we Canadians know something about military matters as well as other nations, perhaps not so skilled for lack of opportunity, but moving in the right direction, realizing that Canada may be called upon to do her part, for we are ready and willing, and the militia has nothing to gain except perhaps a little glory for ourselves and the Empire possibly. We could, however, show the world that we possess material, organization, and mobilization, and that we are thoroughly equipped. Without casting blame on anybody, I am dissatisfied with the position of the militia of Canada. I find that no less than $347,000 is expended for staff and permanent charges. That is too much money. Of a total of a million and a half no less than one-fifth is devoted to the permanent staff and permanent corps. If there are skilled officers, there are not men ready to take the field. They have neither boots to march in, nor kits, accoutrements, nor saddles for horses. In my own corps there are six kinds of saddles, and yet some hon. gentlemen were surprised that General Herbert should call attention to the fact that the militia is not fully equipped, and that the officers are grumbling from one end of the country to the other. I speak on behalf of the officers and men, and I am satisfied there is no newspaper that will not back me up to-morrow morning in the expression of my views, and will not admit that this is a movement in the right direction; that the officers should be allowed to come before a commission and say what they please, such an inquiry being conducted, for example, by three colonels selected from this side of the House and two from the Opposition. Officers would be asked what they thought about the artillery, whether they favoured guns in position or small field pieces, whether they favoured muzzle-loaders or breech-loaders. They would also be asked their views about cavalry, the engineering corps and other matters. Having made a thorough investigation and obtained the views of the service in this way the commission would be able to call on the Minister and lay their views before him, and state that if he could

carry out some of the suggestions they would be glad. I should like to know how many Generals we have had in this country. There have been Generals Luard, Smith, Herbert, Middleton, and others, all Generals from England, and continuously we have followed a policy of drift—the militia affairs have been allowed to drift with the best intention on the part of the department. What is the use of an army such as reported to have been possessed by the King of Greece, consisting of 1,000 men and 2,000 generals. It may very properly be considered whether we want a General here at all. If hon. members will turn up the Militia Act they will find that the moment any difficulty occurs in this country—if Great Britain gets into trouble in this country—the General at Halifax supersedes the Governor General in Canada in case of actual war. If that be the case, might we not well consider the propriety of securing some smart, active, well-drilled and thoroughly up-to-date Lieutenant-Colonel and call him Adjutant General. Why should we not have the General at Halifax for purposes of discipline—he could come here and have a pretty good time. As to stores: if I had been leaving for the Soudan the other day I would have cabled to England, according to the army tables, and have thus ordered an equipment for 500 men. Then I would have gone home, and clothing, harness and full equipment would have been ready. Why should we not be able to make requisitions on the stores department of the British service for what we require? Such requisitions would be filled, and at the same time we would get rid of all questions respecting tenders and contracts. There would be no jobbery in regard to saddles; some of those supplied in Canada would not have lasted six weeks in camp, and the bridles were no better.

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

After Recess.

HULL AND AYLMER ELECTRIC RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 20) to change the name of the Hull Electric Company to the Hull and Aylmer Railway Company, and for other purposes. —(Mr. Devlin.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BELCOURT. I have several amendments to move. The first objection I take is, that the Bill has been reprinted in English and distributed only this afternoon. Several objections of a public and private character may be made, and it is of the highest importance that a Bill of this kind should receive the mature consideration of the committee. The brief time the Bill has been in the hands of hon. members has not afforded an opportunity of giving it that consideration to which it is entitled. Another objection is that the Bill has not been printed in French. I think that is a serious objection, and I urge it now; and I ask the ruling of the Chair as to whether, under these circumstances, it is not better to defer consideration of the Bill. I would ask the ruling of the Chair whether the Bill should be now considered.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before that ruling is given, I desire to mention that the same objection was taken previously, and was disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Beausoleil). The question should have been raised on the second reading In committee, we can only proceed with the consideration of the clauses. I understand that the same question was raised on the second reading by the hon. member for Dorchester, and it was waived. Now the Bill is being considered in committee, and we cannot do otherwise than proceed with the consideration of the clauses.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand, the point previously taken that the Bill was not printed in French, was overruled, and properly so. I understand, however, the objection is that, while it is printed in English, the text has been entirely changed. No hon. member would recognize the Bill, which has just been distributed. The question as to whether the Bill should be pushed forward at the present sitting, is one for the consideration of the committee. I was not able to attend the Railway Committee, when it was considered, and I know nothing about its provisions. Since I returned from dinner, I find this Bill in my post office box, and, without having an opportunity of reading the clauses, we are asked to consider it. I have no intention of opposing the Bill, but I suggest that, as there are other important private Bills on the paper, they should be first considered, and this Bill afterwards taken up. This Bill now contains three or four clauses, whereas formerly it covered several pages.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am quite sure that hon. members have been able to read the Bill even while my hon. friend was delivering his short speech. I admit that the Bill originally was a rather long Bill; it contained 21 clauses, and these have been reduced to 5. Those hon. members who attended the committee, know the reason why the Bill was changed from 21 clauses to 5 clauses. I press the Bill for various reasons. There was strong opposition manifested, as I had reason to feel, because for four hours I met the opposition in committee. I gave every concession that could be asked of me, and I gave these concessions to such an extent, that a Bill of 21 clauses as introduced finds itself cut down to one of five

clauses now. There is every reason why this Bill should be pressed now, and put through the committee. It is an important work. It is not a short street railway for it brings the population of the county of Pontiac into the city of Ottawa. As things stand to-day the entire population of that county, coming from the province of Quebec, passing through the county of Wright, and anxious to come into the capital of Canada dare not do so, simply because a certain railway existing in this city says they shall not enter. I protest against such conduct. In the interest of this large and populous county of Pontiac, as well as in the interests of the county which I have the honour to represent, this Bill should pass. But there are stronger reasons than this in favour of the Bill. During the last week this railway has brought thousands and thousands of passengers into this city, but how were they treated? The moment they got to Hull they had to step into the street and walk over half a mile in order to reach the Ottawa Street Railway, and even then, that street railway could not accommodate them. Yet they contend that we shall not have entrance into this city. I ask: shall this House declare that the city of Ottawa must be closed to this railway, but open to every other railway that thinks proper to come to it? Both the Canada Atlantic and the Canadian Pacific Railway have now entrance into this city. It is true that this line is only about ten miles in length, but it is a connecting branch between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Pontiac Pacific Railway, and, therefore, it constitutes a line of some eighty miles long. Is this road to be prevented entering the capital of Canada simply because the Ottawa Street Railway, selfish in every possible way, says it shall not. I protest against that action. There is more than that, Sir. This Bill not only asks that the railway shall enter into Ottawa, but as the branch line running from the city of Hull to the town of Aylmer was leased a few months ago by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Hull Electric Railway Company, this Bill asks for the confirmation of that lease. It is absolutely necessary that this lease shall be confirmed by a Dominion charter, or otherwise the lease cannot be valid or legal. In consideration of all the great interests at stake, in consideration of the immense advantages which this Bill will confer upon the great county of Pontiac, in consideration of the rights which are held in this road, I ask that the committee shall at once consider this Bill, and I hope that the House will pass it now.

Mr. LISTER. We have not much time for the consideration of this Bill and speeches must be necessarily short. It is very important in the interests of Ottawa and in the interests of the surrounding country, that the Bill shall become law in some shape. As introduced the Bill was very lengthy but in committee a practically new Bill was framed covering the points that seemed to be of vital importance to the promoters of the measure. In order that this Hull Electric Railway may continue its existence, it is necessary that the lease made between it and the Canadian Pacific Railway should be confirmed, and confirmed by this Parliament. The Bill before us proposes to confirm that lease, and unless it passes within the next day or two it cannot become law. I, therefore, do not wonder at my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) speaking somewhat warmly in the interests of the Bill. The first object of the measure is to confirm the lease which I have referred to. The Hull Electric Railway was incorporated by the province of Quebec, and under that incorporation it has no power to enter the city of Ottawa, and so the people have to leave its cars and travel a greater or lesser distance in order to make connection with the Ottawa Street Railway. Consequently, the second object of the Bill is to allow the Hull Electric Railway Company to extend their line of rail way into the city of Ottawa. The Bill as originally introduced was referred to a subcommittee for the purpose of drafting a measure that would cover these two points, and they are now included in the present Bill. I see, however, that the draftsmen in preparing the Bill have inserted a further provision which gives to this Hull Electric Railway Company the right, not only to enter the city of Ottawa, but to construct lines upon the highways of the city,—with the consent, it is true, of the city council. But the difficulty as I understand it is this: that there is an agreement between the city and the Ottawa Street Railway Company, whereby the latter company are to have the exclusive right of the streets up to the year 1899. Therefore, it is proposed by this Bill to ignore the contract entered into between the city corporation and the Ottawa Street Railway Company, and thus deprive one of the parties to that contract of the rights which they hold under it. The period fixed by the contract is short, but if such is the contract, then I take it that neither this legislature nor any other legislature in the world would think of destroying the rights of one of the parties under an existing contract. So far as the Bill provides for the confirmation of the lease, and for giving the Hull Electric Railway the right to enter the city of Ottawa the Bill should be passed now. But it is clear that if the city of Ottawa have a contract with the present Street Railway Company, giving it the exclusive right of the streets for a fixed period, then it would not be fair to the Street Railway Company to ignore the provisions of that contract and give to another railway the rights which they have under their contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) up to the extent which he goes, but I should like to ask the Government, if the

Department of Justice has gone into this Bill? We all know that it is a Bill of very considerable importance as affecting a question of jurisdiction, and in a matter of that kind it would be quite reasonable for the ordinary members of the House to hear the Government upon that point. I also agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) that a Bill of this importance should have more time for its consideration, and that would apply not only to the present Bill but to every other Bill coming before the House. This Bill, from being one of 21 clauses when first introduced, has been boiled down to five or six clauses. It was distributed only a short time ago, and hon. members who are called upon to express an opinion upon it can know nothing at all about it. It would be important to compare the new Bill with the old Bill, to see what changes have been made by the sub-committee to whom the Bill was referred. I speak without any possible opposition to justice being done to the Hull Company; but I speak under a sense of the responsibility of dealing with important matters like this which come before Parliament without a moment's notice, so to speak. Acquired rights have to be guarded. The Ottawa Electric Railway Company have rights, and if the Hull Company can be given privileges and advantages without our interfering with acquired rights, I am quite prepared to help them. But I think it is wrong practice, and one which may be fraught with many disadvantages, to take up and deal with a measure of the importance of this one at the last moment, especially in view of the fact that the Department of Justice holds that it involves important questions of jurisdiction. Therefore I think we should not be asked to pass this measure without having had time to look into it and compare the new Bill with the old one, to see that ample justice is done to the parties interested.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is a good deal in what has been said by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, as to the quick transformations that have taken place in the Bill. However, as it is now, it is not a difficult Bill to understand. I would be in favour of giving the company the right to come into Ottawa, and I would be in favour also of having the agreement which they have made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made legal, as they wish, and as we have power to make it. But I certainly would not be in favour of passing the second part of the first clause, which interferes with contracts that have been made, and of which I for my part do not understand the nature, nor do I think there is a pressing necessity for it. What that railway wants to do now is to get into the city, and to get its contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway legalized by this Parliament. Let us do that; and we shall be here next winter, and if the company want these other powers, and the city of Ottawa want them to have them, and it is right and fair that they should have them, we can have a little more than an hour or two to go into the question of contract rights, and dispose of it. Certainly a delay of three months will not avail anything to the disadvantage of the road. I think that latter part of clause 1 should go out.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I entirely concur in what has fallen from the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). What objection my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has to the last clause of the first section I cannot understand. This is the first time in all my experience of railway legislation in this House that fault has been found, as it has been by my hon. friend at my left (Sir Adolphe Caron), with a Bill because we have not had time to consider it, when the fact is that the volume of the Bill had been reduced from a great many clauses down to two clauses. The Bill simply asks for two things: first, that this company may come into the city of Ottawa instead of being compelled, as it is now, to dump its passengers into the mud about half a mile from the Canadian Pacific Railway, with which railway it seeks connection; secondly, that an agreement between the town of Aylmer and this company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be ratified.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the last clause of section 2?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is all to be done subject to the express consent of the city of Ottawa by by-law.

Mr. FOSTER. If that clause were passed as it is, would not the company have an absolute right to build on the streets of Ottawa, and would the city council have the right to refuse them the use of the streets on fair conditions?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think the city council could impose whatever conditions they would have a right to impose under the general act of the province of Ontario. We were very careful, in shaping this Bill as it is now, to be guided by the rules we observed in regard to questions of provincial and federal jurisdiction when the Ottawa Electric Railway Company got its Bill through the House. I think the Bill is a fair one and ought to meet with the assent of every member of this House.

Mr. DEVLIN. In regard to this clause 2, there was a great deal of discussion before the committee. Finally it was referred to the lawyers of the different companies interested, and they came back to the committee with this clause prepared. The Committee on Railways and Canals adopted it without objection, and reported it to this House; but now objections are raised against it, and we are told that we are

going to interfere with vested rights. What rights? Rights granted by the municipal council of the city of Ottawa. But the last clause provides that we can interfere with nothing given by the council of the city of Ottawa, for it says that "as regards so much of its line of railway as is or may be in the city of Ottawa, the company shall only exercise the powers conferred by this Act as to the location, construction and operation of its railway upon such streets, and upon such terms and conditions and for such periods as the council of the said city may approve by by-law." Not an inch of railroad can be constructed without the permission of the city council of Ottawa. More than that, not an inch of this road can be constructed in Ottawa or in the province of Ontario that is not subject to the laws of the province of Ontario governing street railways. So they have full and ample protection. We ask for no invasion of any rights granted by the city of Ottawa to the street railway company or any other company. But we ask that we shall not be stopped at a bridge where a station cannot be erected, but that we shall be allowed to go to a point where we can take our passengers for a road ninety miles in length. I ask, therefore, that that should be considered. If this objection were a valid one, why was it not put forward in the committee and not kept in reserve to be sprung on this House by the solicitor of the company? This clause was carefully considered in the committee and adopted, and now, simply for the purpose of killing my Bill, objections are made which I hope will not be entertained by the committee.

Mr. TISDALE. I know nothing about the merits of the Bill one way or another, except what I have heard in the House, for I was not in the committee, but I call attention to this objection. Clauses 1, 2 and 3, taken together, are an entire departure from the practice of the Railway Committee during the past seven or eight years. After a good deal of contention we laid down the rule in that committee that when that committee has any legislation before it in connection with a railway, under a dual charter, the committee should take the whole charge or have nothing to do with the Bill. We decided that we would not put ourselves in the position of legislating concerning a corporation that had part of its law under one legislature and part under another. This Bill not only leaves one part of the road under the Railway Act of the province of Quebec, but it absolutely declares that the balance, the part we are asked to incorporate, shall come under the railway laws of Ontario. In other words, the part of the road which we are asked to legislate into existence, we are asked to put under the railway laws of the province of Ontario. What should have been done, if we had followed out our rule, was to have considered everything that the company had done, and then provide what their powers should be in the future, and make them a corporation under the laws of the Dominion and under the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. When hon. gentlemen say that this Bill only confirms specific railway agreements, they quite mistake the section, because it goes on to provide:

> And the company and the Canadian Pacific Railway are hereby respectively authorized and empowered to make such other and further deeds and agreements as they may deem expedient or proper for the purpose of securing to the said Hull and Aylmer Company the right of running its trains and cars over the bridges of the Canadian Pacific Railway between the cities of Ottawa and Hull, and so on.

We therefore give them additional powers.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What is the object?

Mr. TISDALE. That is what I want to know. When the hon. gentleman tells me that I am obstructing his Bill, I tell him that he is mistaken. I have yet to learn in the nine years I have been in this House, that I have ever been guilty of obstruction. I feel it my duty to make this objection, because the rule to which I refer has saved us a great deal of time in discussion. If the attention of the Railway Committee had been called to what they were doing and they were prepared to change their ruling, I would bow to their decision, but I do not think they did. In all seriousness, I ask that the hon. gentleman should give us some time to consider this measure. Then there is the declaration in the first clause that this is a work for the general benefit of Canada. That is an important change which demands more than hasty consideration. Some gentlemen hold the view that such a clause is not necessary, because this Parliament has jurisdiction over any railway that runs from one province to another, and I think we ought to have the opinion of the Government on this point. It is all very well to say that this Bill is giving effect to what the solicitors of the parties interested have agreed to, but that does not relieve the committee of this House from responsibility. On the contrary, my practice has always been, in cases of that kind, to give really more attention to the legislation.

Mr. DEVLIN. In reply to the hon. gentleman's objection to this work being declared for the general advantage of Canada, all I have to say is that that question was raised before the committee, and formed subject for discussion during half an hour. But as this Bill was largely opposed by the Ottawa Street Railway, and as the committee remembered that, at a time when my hon. friend was chairman of that committee, it gave a charter to the Ottawa Street Railway, with the concurrence of my hon. friend, and declared that

railway to be for the general advantage of Canada, the committee admitted at once that this company deserved a hundred-fold more to be declared a work for the general benefit of Canada.

Mr. TISDALE. If we make it in accordance with our legislation, it would have a perfect right to this clause.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then my hon. friend admits the proposition that it should be declared for the general advantage of Canada to be correct, because we have to come to this Parliament for a charter. A charter was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway which disposed of seven miles of this road to this company, which to-day constitutes the Hull Electric Railway. The lease which passed between both companies has to be confirmed by this Parliament, which gave the charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that we have to come here and ask for what is in this Bill. My hon. friend finds it strange that we should ask for the power of running our trains over a bridge of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway assented to this proposal and urged on the committee the advisability of adopting it. Why then should my hon. friend oppose it? It is absolutely necessary to this road, in order that it may connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway and other roads in the city of Ottawa. It is not a small line of a mile long, it is not a road running through a village, it is the great competing line between the Pontiac and Pacific Junction and the only means that road has of conveying its passengers and baggage and freight to the capital and other points in Canada. So that we have to ask the right to run over that bridge, and the Canadian Pacific Railway consents.

Mr. BELCOURT. When I rose to object to this Bill, I raised a point which I considered of some importance. I asked the Chairman to rule on the point and resumed my seat, not because I had no more objections against the Bill, but because I wanted a decision on the question. Is the Bill to be proceeded with, notwithstanding the fact that it has not been printed in French?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Beausoleil). Yes.

Mr. BELCOURT. I think the House is under a misapprehension with reference to that point, but since the Chairman has ruled against me, I propose to address my remarks to the first section.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend has made a mistake. The Bill originally was printed in both languages. It received the second reading, and the only point raised to-night was whether the re-printed copy should be in French or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is a new Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As to the question of propriety, whether the House is prepared to go on with the Bill, whether in English or French, that is a proper question to raise; but it has not been the custom of Parliament to ask that a Bill going into committee should be printed in both languages. My hon. friend is somewhat mistaken as to the rule of the House. The rule of the House has been observed. As to whether the Bill has been materially changed and involves great principles regarding conflicting provincial and Dominion jurisdiction, and as to whether the House is prepared to consider it upon this short notice, is a different thing.

Mr. BELCOURT. I object to the first clause being carried. I wish to raise the point that this Parliament ought not to decide that the works in question are for the general advantage of Canada, and I would crave the indulgence of the House while I lay the facts before them. There are three things asked for by the Bill. First, there is the confirmation of the lease made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Hull Electric Railway Company. This is a lease of a piece of railway situated entirely within the province of Quebec, which the Canadian Pacific Railway formerly operated from the city of Hull to the town of Aylmer. It therefore relates only to a section of the Canadian Pacific Railway situate entirely within the province of Quebec, a distance of eight miles. I would invite the attention of the hon. Solicitor General and ask him whether it is competent for the Parliament of Canada to declare that a piece of railway, built and operated entirely within the territorial limits of one province, can be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I submit it cannot, unless the work connects one province with another.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is what we want to do.

Mr. BELCOURT. If that lease is confirmed this railway company will only acquire the right to run over eight miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the province of Quebec, and will not have obtained the right to go to Ottawa and consequently will not connect one province with the other. The second object of the Bill is to obtain permission to build a spur line, extending from the main line of this electric railway, in the city of Hull, to pass over the Dominion slides and other Dominion Government works at the Chaudiere and over the Suspension Bridge into the city of Ottawa. The third part of the Bill relates to the erection and operation of a railway in the streets of the city of Ottawa. Having raised the point whether this is for the general advantage of Canada, it will perhaps be better for me to defer the remarks I have to make until the opinion of

the Minister of Justice is obtained. I think this is a matter in which we ought not to proceed without due consideration. There is another very serious objection which is germane to the one to which I have just referred, and that is that if we pass this Bill and confirm the lease in question, we shall be giving this corporation power to build a road partly in the city of Ottawa and partly in the city of Hull. The spur line to which I have referred is situated entirely on the Quebec side of the river. The whole of these works are on the other side, and every portion of the road, including this spur line, would really belong to the province of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen looking at this Bill, will see, as was very well pointed out by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), that by passing the Bill in question, we shall have a local corporation subject to three different sets of laws—part of the works in question being governed and regulated by the laws of Quebec, another part by the laws of Ontario, still another part being under the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Was it built under a Quebec charter?

Mr. BELCOURT. Entirely under a Quebec charter. To which of these legislatures will application be made for further legislation affecting or concerning this company? Will it be the legislature of the province of Quebec, the legislature of the province of Ontario, or the Dominion Parliament? Then again, this Bill, in order to make it one entitled to the consideration of this Parliament, I submit, should have proceeded in the first instance to form this company into a Dominion corporation. If hon. gentlemen read the Bill they will see that there is nothing to make it a Dominion corporation. It still remains a Quebec corporation, with the works themselves in the province of Quebec. Under these circumstances, it seems to me, the works in question cannot be said to be for the general advantage of Canada, and I oppose the adoption of the first clause on this ground.

Mr. DAVIN. I think we ought to have the opinion of the Department of Justice on the very important point that is involved in this Bill. I am informed that the Department of Justice did pronounce a very important opinion with regard to the Bill in its original form, and in its present form the legal difficulty is enhanced; and I think the committee, before we pass this Bill, ought to have some light from the Department of Justice; and I hope my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will enlighten us on this matter.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not think that any opinion was given by the Department of Justice. It was said that there were important points involved, but that is all.

But the Bill now before the committee is not the original Bill, and, as I understand, there was a consensus of opinion—indeed an agreement was reached or something equivalent to that—that this Bill, as remodelled, was acceptable——

Mr. BELCOURT. If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him, I would like to refer him to the report of the committee which shows that he is entirely mistaken. By referring to page 2 of the last Votes and Proceedings, he will find that the reference to the Bill is as follows:—

> With respect to the first mentioned Bill your committee point out that they have amended the said Bill so as to restrict the powers granted to confirming the agreement made between the company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to authorize the company to extend its line from Hull to Ottawa, and recommend that the title be changed to "An Act respecting the Hull Electric Company."

So the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken when he says that it was agreed that the Bill was acceptable.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That proves nothing; it shows simply that they changed the Bill. I know that the solicitors of the various parties went out and brought us in a new Bill, and I, as one of the committee, felt that there was a general agreement among them, which was equivalent to saying, Well, in this new form the Bill is not very objectionable. I know that almost everything that was suggested was accepted, and I thought it was settled. But, if objection is now to be raised, is it because the Bill is not to the general advantage of Canada? I fear there is something back of all that, and that this is made a bumper for an objection of another kind. Is it not a fact that in this Bill the company, with the consent of the city of Ottawa and of the Governor General in Council, are permitted to build a road over to Ottawa, and is not that sufficient? It might be argued, as matter of law, that, without the authority of this Bill, they could not do that. The question was raised before the committee last year as to whether Parliament should not authorize an electric railway to run from one province to another. It was not pressed, because the Bill was withdrawn, except so far as it related to Ontario. But we have the precedent of this very company operating an electric railway here in Ottawa, having the same powers to go across to the other side. Now, if we have given that power to cross to the Quebec side, I submit that it is in the general interest of Canada that the people of Quebec should be allowed to come to this side. Where is the difference? There was no objection made against the Bill on behalf of the Ottawa Street Railway, that it was not to the general advantage of Canada that the company should be allowed to go over to Hull. Surely, if the people of Hull come over here, it is just as

much to the general advantage of Canada that the people of Ottawa should go over to Hull. Now, this was hedged in by these two things, namely, that the road cannot be built except with the consent of the council of Ottawa, and next, that the Governor in Council must approve of it, the Governor in Council, who are now made the general sinking ground for giving authority to almost every Act that is passed. The Act is simply an Act to permit these people to do just what the others have done, and I consider that it is to the general advantage of Canada that this Bill should pass.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The Bill, as originally printed, came under the notice of the Department of Justice, but not sufficiently to enable the department to declare whether the Bill was objectionable to such an extent as to be unworthy of the consideration of the House. But I am now dealing exclusively with the first clause of the Bill. If I properly understood what was said here to-night with reference to this first clause, I think there are serious legal objections to it as now drafted. I do not say that it cannot be amended as it now stands. I may say at the outset that I think it is rather a dangerous principle to adopt that this House may simply declare a work to be for the general benefit of Canada without its being in reality a work for the general benefit of Canada, taking it in that way out of the power of the local legislature, and making it one of Dominion concern. That is in itself a serious matter so far as legislation is concerned. Although I know that it has been the practice heretofore, I do not think it should be sanctioned by the Department of Justice under its present control. But, leaving that aside, if we adopt this first clause, what are we going to have ? I am not sure that I have got the facts correctly, but, if I have, this is a piece of railway built under a provincial statute, entirely in the province of Quebec. It is intended that from that railway so built in the province of Quebec, a branch line should extend across the river into the city of Ottawa. Now, this clause, as at present drafted, would mean that anything done under this statute would come under the operation, in part, of the Federal Parliament and federal law, and in part, under the operation of Ontario law; that is to say, that you would have this railway composed of three parts, one part now in existence in the province of Quebec, which will remain under the operation of the Quebec law ; and then you will have that portion which connects the railway in the province of Quebec with the city of Ottawa, across the river, which would be under the operation of the federal law ; then you will have that other portion in the province of Ontario, in the city of Ottawa, which will be brought under the operation of the Ontario Act. You will have, as a result, if this legislation is adopted in its present form, one enterprise under the control of a corporation that we are bringing into existence now, one enterprise subject to three different systems of law. I think that is objectionable. The clause reads thus :

> The works hereinafter authorized are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

That is to say, the work authorized by this Bill. Now, the works authorized by the Bill are works to enable this company to connect a branch with the existing railway in the province of Quebec and bring it across the River Ottawa into the city of Ottawa, and, when it comes across the river into Ontario, it comes under the operation of the Ontario Act, by clause 3. Therefore, the connecting link between the existing railway and the new railway in Ontario, which is not provided for, will come under the operation of federal law. Now, the way to remedy that, I think, would be to draw a clause which, I think, is the clause generally found in Bills of this sort, under which the whole undertaking, that already in existence in the province of Quebec, and that to be brought into existence in this province, and the connecting link between the existing Quebec enterprise and the new Ontario enterprise—to bring the whole thing under the operation of the federal statute. I think that clause ought to be amended, as was done with the Montreal Belt Line, so as to bring the whole operation under one system of law ; otherwise, it would be intolerable. That is my own personal opinion of this case, expressed somewhat hastily, after hearing the discussion here to-night. But the facts being as I have stated, I have no hesitation in declaring the law to be as I have explained it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Does not the fact that this road crosses from one province into another, make it a work for the general advantage of Canada to begin with? I think, according to our interpretation of the Railway Act, a work becomes to the general advantage of Canada, when it crosses from one province into another, and, if there are clauses inconsistent with that, would it not be more proper to amend those clauses ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My idea would be to drop the clause altogether, because if the Bill has for its object to establish an undertaking connecting two provinces or to cross a navigable river then it comes within the operation of the federal law and is within the control of the Dominion legislature. But in that case it is unnecessary to declare it a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. We always do it.

Mr. LISTER. I do not agree with the view taken by the Solicitor General in re-

gard to difficulties arising from this subject coming under three sections, one being under the jurisdiction of the province of Quebec, another under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and a third under the legislature of Ontario. That difficulty would be obviated by eliminating clause 3.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am dealing with this clause, reading it with the surrounding clauses. I am stating my proposition of law on the Bill as I find it.

Mr. LISTER. There is no doubt a double jurisdiction so far as the provinces and the Dominion are concerned, but the difficulty can be got over by declaring the work to be for the general advantage of Canada. I do not think, however, that the point is a material one, because this Parliament has undoubtedly the right to legislate. The difficulty I feel is that there is a conflict between the Ottawa Street Railway Company and the corporation of the city of Ottawa. The sanction of Ottawa city to this railway extending its line into the streets would not be sufficient, for not only is the sanction of the corporation of Ottawa necessary, but the sanction of other party to the agreement, the Ottawa Street Railway Company. If this company were allowed to enter Ottawa city, it would be depriving the Ottawa Street Railway Company of rights under its contract. That is the only real objection to the Bill. If the hon. gentleman would consent to eliminate the latter portion of clause 2 there could be no objection to this Bill. It is in the interest of the whole community, and should be passed without trouble. It would enable connection to be made with the Ottawa Street Railway, and it would enable the new company to take over the line from Hull to Aylmer. Those were the two points before the Railway Committee, and I must confess my surprise at finding powers given in the Bill to build a line into Ottawa.

The hour for Private Bills having expired, the committee rose.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia clothing and necessaries—Ordinary vote $90,000

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not propose to occupy very much of the time of the committee on this subject, which is a very extensive one, because I think it is only necessary to indicate briefly and concisely the lines that should be followed. In 1872, Sir George Cartier was Minister of Militia and Col. Robertson Ross was Adjutant General. Col. Ross at that time said :

> The difficult task of reorganizing the military forces of Great Britain has been confided to a committee, of which General Macdougall is chairman.

If in England it was found necessary to appoint a committee to look into military affairs, although there are dozens of generals in the country, it would be quite justifiable to have a similar investigation here. I find that General Macdougall, in 1868, reported :

> It will always be difficult to form rules and regulations of a general nature on one basis for the government of a volunteer force such as that organized in Canada to meet the circumstances of the different localities on the one hand and city and rural corps on the other ; but it is satisfactory to observe that during the past few years a large amount of practical experience has been acquired, and we know the patriotic desire of the volunteers themselves.

I might give quotations from the report by General Smith and General Herbert and the General at present commanding, each of whom finds something new to discuss, but each differs in opinion. One takes up rifled ordnance, another equipment, a third establishment, and a fourth something else, but after a number of years we are just where we were, and to-day the force is not in that state of organization we desire. We must look into the organization of the militia for ourselves, into its equipment, its staff, and in fact we must thoroughly overhaul the system. This is a large question involving the interests of 40,000 men now in the force, also 40,000 men who preceded them, and we are not trespassing on the committee or on the department in asking that notwithstanding they employ scientific men from England, we should look into the organization of the force, for colonels of regiments pay money out of their own pockets and spend their time for the benefit of the people, and they should not be treated as if it was a matter of favour for anything to be conceded to the militia, and they should not be treated with superciliousness as sometimes occurs. If the committee feel with me in regard to this matter, I will ask the Minister of Militia—I do not intend to move a motion as I contemplated—to consider this matter, and I can assure him I have no desire except to strengthen his hands and improve the position of the militia force, and if he can see his way clear to appoint a commission such as I have suggested, no doubt the militia force from Nova Scotia to British Columbia will consider it to be a step in their interest. The taxpayers of Canada will feel also that their own sons who are doing the active service have something to say as to how the money is expended. They will be more content when they find we are not rushing headforemost into contracts for rifles, as we did, without consulting one another. They will feel also that we are not rushing into large contracts for clothing for three years, and that we are not equipping our men with something that we know nothing about. The Canadians who are paying the bills are willing to submit that their own commanding officers in Canada, should give an expression of opinion to the Government as to what the men really want. I do not wish

to take up the time of the House any longer, but I do trust that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) will think over what I have said, and will feel with those who do the work, that they want to be recognized and want to have an opportunity of expressing their opinion, even if it be different from the opinion of some of those in authority. When we find general officers differing one from the other, then we might fairly suppose that it would not do much harm if the officers who actually do the work of the militia, differ from those who are differing amongst themselves. I trust the Minister shortly after this session would see his way clear to grant a royal commission composed of officers in and out of this House irrespective of politics, and get their report after a thorough investigation of the present system.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I am sure the House will agree with me that anything falling from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) upon a question of this kind, is entitled to the very greatest respect and consideration. That hon. gentleman is a soldier by birth, by education, and by experience, and I would be very glad if time permitted me now to enter into a discussion of some of the matters to which he referred, although I feel myself at the present moment quite unable to do so. But I will promise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) that the suggestions which he has made to-night will receive the most careful consideration of the Government. I shall take the opportunity of reading his statement at my leisure, and of reporting to him and to this House the result of the investigations which I shall make into the matters to which he has called our attention.

For a line of steamers which runs between St. John, Halifax, London or Liverpool $25,000

Mr. FOSTER. Who has charge of these items ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has, but as he is not present just now, if there is objection to any particular item it can stand over.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be well to allow this item to stand. Has the Government come to any decision yet with reference to the proposed winter service from St. John or Halifax, other than the regular service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter is under the consideration of the Government. If action should be taken in the direction asked by the applicants it would involve a supplementary estimate which would have to be brought down. For the present the matter has not been decided upon.

Mr. FOSTER. This estimate is for the regular service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The word "Liverpool" could be taken out if thought proper, as the steamers run to London only.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no reason for that. It gives my hon. friend a chance if he should think well of it, to run for half the year to Liverpool and for the other half to London.

Steam communication from 1st April, 1896, to 31st March, 1897, between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso, and between Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, and from 1st April to 30th November, 1896, between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood $5,000

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the Minister in charge of this particular branch whether it is the intention of the Government to have the boat which is now plying between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso continued as a daily service ? I had this service established last summer by getting a Dominion subsidy, and I wish to see it continued, as it is a most necessary service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think it probable that the Supplementary Estimates will add something to this vote, in order that there may be a daily service, as the hon. gentleman proposes.

Lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America..... $78,000

Mr. ELLIS. What is the service covered by this item ?

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that this vote covers the direct services which have been running for about two years under the present contract, and have yet about three years to run. These include the regular service from St. John, touching at Halifax and going around the West Indian Islands as far as British Guiana and back, and another from Halifax to the Island of Jamaica and back, touching, I think, at Turk's Island. Does my hon. friend know whether any decision has been come to by the Government as to the proposal to have a vessel running from St. John to Hayti and Porto Rico ? Is that provided for in this vote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That is not provided for in this vote. The hon. gentleman's statement is a reply to the question asked by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). The service is that conducted by Pickford & Black, running from St. John and Halifax to Demerara, and also from Halifax to Jamaica. These contracts have been running for some years, and have not yet expired.

Mr. ELLIS. As the votes appear on the pages of these Estimates, the inference to be drawn is that these services are from St. John as well as from Halifax. What I want is that the Minister should make

a statement as to which of them is from St. John and which from Halifax. A great many members, looking at these sums, divide them between St. John and Halifax, as if each got half. That is not a fair impression, and I think the Minister should make a clear statement of the case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The larger portion of the item, I think $60,000, is for a service from St. John and Halifax, touching at Bermuda, St. Thomas, four or five of the West Indian Islands, and terminating at Georgetown, Demerara.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at Bermuda ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may not be required by the contract, but, as a matter of fact, the vessel touches at Bermuda, as I can testify, for I have been there. The other service is from Halifax to Jamaica, and I believe it does not touch at St. John at all.

Mr. ELLIS. Is there not a third service included in this item ?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a line to Cuba, but that has been discontinued.

Indians, Nova Scotia..... $7,850

Mr. GILLIES. Before this item passes, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister in charge of it to a certain matter in connection with the Indian fund in my county. In the Island of Cape Breton we have a tribe of Indians called the Micmac tribe, of which there are several bands placed on the several reserves in the different counties of the Island. In my county there is a band on an Indian reserve at Salmon River, in charge of the Indian agent at St. Peter's. The late Indian agent was the Rev. Mr. Chisholm. He left the parish of St. Peter's to go to another parish on the mainland. His successor was a Rev. Mr. Fraser. Owing to the office becoming vacant last May, in consequence of Mr. Chisholm's removal from the county, I was asked by the department to nominate some one for the vacancy. I thought I could not do better than send in the name of the Rev. Mr. Chisholm's successor in the parish, and consequently I sent in the name of the Rev. Mr. Fraser. He was not appointed at the time. That appointment was made by one of those Orders in Council that had not been ratified before the late Government went out of office ; but I notice that it was one of the Orders in Council which the Governor General took cognizance of and signed. Consequently the Rev. Mr. Fraser has been since then filling the position of Indian agent at St. Peter's, and the Indians of Salmon River are therefore under his charge. The medical attendant of the Indians at Salmon River for a great number of years has been Dr. Macdonald, who lives at St. Peter's, and practices his profession all over the county of Richmond. He is a gentleman in whom there is the utmost confidence personally and professionally, and he is on good terms with the Indians.

It has been brought to my notice that since the change took place in the position of Indian agent at St. Peter's, a change in the medical attendance has been brought about by some one, I do not know by whom. A very strong remonstrance was sent to the department, through me, by the chief of the Indian tribe and three of his captains, strongly objecting to any change of medical attendant being made. I called at the department and was referred to the Secretary of State (Senator Scott). He admitted having received the remonstrance, but could not lay his hands on it, and he said he would communicate with me later on. Although that petition has been in the department nearly three weeks, I have not yet had a reply to the letter I sent in with it. I therefore now call the attention of the hon. Minister to the matter and shall read to him the remonstrance, which is as follows :—

St. Peter's, Cape Breton,
September 3rd, 1896.

To the Minister of the Interior :

Sir,—We, the undersigned, in behalf of the Indians of Salmon River Reserve, desire to bring to your notice the gross injustice of being coerced by the Indian agent here of employing a physician who is objectionable to us. We deplore the prospect of being deprived of the services of our old physician, Dr. J. A. Macdonald, who has treated us for years successfully, in whose generosity, ability, and skill we have the most implicit confidence, and for whom we entertain every feeling of respect. In politics he has never been known to be an active partisan ; on the contrary, we are well aware that during party conflicts he has quietly attended to the duties of his profession.

We have full confidence in your generosity, and sense of justice to have our grievances remedied, and humbly desire you to have our old and trusted physician's services continued.

On behalf of the Indians of Salmon River Reserve.

Your obedient servants,

JOHN DENNIS, Chief.
THOMAS W. SCOTCHMAN,
ALEX. SCOTCHMAN,
PETER RICHARD,
} Captains.

That was sent to me to be handed in to the department. I did so, and I assumed that as soon as it came to the notice of the Minister in charge that an innovation was being attempted by the new agent and that the services of this well-tried and experienced physician were being dispensed with and a stranger employed, he would have this medical attendant immediately restored to his position. I ask the hon. Minister now if any order has gone forth from his department to the Indian agent at St. Peter's requiring a change of medical attendance to the Indians. If so, why was it issued, and will the old order of things be restored.

Mr. DOBELL. No order has been given to change the physician and to discontinue

the services of Dr. Macdonald, and no order on the subject will be given without grave consideration.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. Minister see to it that instructions are at once sent to the Indian Agent at St. Peter's to have Dr. J. A. Macdonald's services engaged ?

Mr. DOBELL. I cannot promise that ; I can only promise that the matter shall receive favourable consideration, and all the more after what the hon. member has said to the House.

Mr. GILLIES. I assume that the Indians should be allowed to employ whatever physician they wish without coercion ; and that, if the Indian agent, who is the servant of the department should attempt to interfere, instructions would be given by the department to prevent the rights of the Indians being trenched upon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it not true that these physicians are appointed either by the Minister departmentally or by Order in Council?

Mr. DOBELL. Some are appointed by Order in Council and some departmentally.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How was this appointment made ?

Mr. DOBELL Departmentally.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the Indian Agent would not have authority to give instructions on a matter of this kind ?

Mr. DOBELL. Instructions come from the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Taking the facts as stated by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) either the agent has gone beyond his instructions or he has had instructions from the department.

Mr. DOBELL. I stated that no instructions had been given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then my hon. friend will see that the agent has gone beyond his powers.

Mr. DOBELL. I would suggest that the Indian Agent may have acted that way under the late administration and not under the present one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have been asking my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) when Dr. Macdonald got his letter of dismissal.

Mr. GILLIES. I do not understand that there was any dismissal. But the agent compels the Indians, as this remonstrance states, to go to a new doctor ; and since the new agent was sent to St. Peter's——

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the date of the remonstrance ?

Mr. GILLIES. September 3rd, 1896. The agent was appointed last June on the retirement of the former incumbent and on my recommendation. But since his appointment the agent has been compelling the Indians to employ another doctor, a man in whom they have not the same confidence, evidently, as they had in their old physician. They wish that this coercion should cease and that they should be allowed to employ the doctor they prefer.

Mr BETHUNE. How many Indians are there in the county of Victoria, N.S. ?

Mr. DOBELL. The hon. gentleman will find the figures in the report. I cannot give him the number at the moment.

Mr. BETHUNE. I desire to call attention to the amount paid for medical attendance upon the Indians in my county—$457 last year. This is about twice as much as is paid for a similar service in any other county in the maritime provinces.

Mr. LAURIER. There is room for reform.

Mr. BETHUNE. I notice that most of the salaried officers in this service are paid $100 a year. I should think it might be well to consider the advisability of extending that system to Victoria county.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With regard to the point I raised, I suppose I might properly ask the Minister what his policy would be if an Indian agent practically dismissed an officer who had been engaged in this medical work.

Mr. DOBELL. The hon. gentleman may rely upon it that the Government will give due consideration to the circumstances of the case and that no orders will be given until the facts have been ascertained. No Indian Agent will be allowed to give them orders.

Mr. GILLIES. I understand the acting Minister (Mr. Dobell) to say that the Indian Agent at St. Peter's will not be allowed to employ a doctor without orders ?

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly.

Mr. GILLIES. That being the case I want to know whether the request of the Indians will be complied with and they be allowed to employ their own physicians.

Mr. DOBELL. I think I have told the hon. gentleman three times already that due consideration will be given to what he has stated and due respect paid to it.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there has been any demand on the part of the Caughnawaga Indians for emancipation ?

Mr. DOBELL. No ; we have had no petition to that effect.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) if he has had such communication from the Caughnawaga Indians.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not remember having received such a communication.

Mr. BERGERON. I ask the question because I was told by one of the Indians that there was such a demand, and I understood that it had been laid before the Indian Department or before my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier).

The PRIME MINISTER. The petition has not reached me yet.

Mr. BERGERON. I know it is the intention to send it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Do you favour emancipation ?

Mr. BERGERON. So far as they have the right to vote, I wish they were on the same footing as other tax-payers, because I think their present position is anomalous. But, of course, that is their own business. Now, as to another matter. I see in the Estimates an item "Removal, Lake of Two Mountains Indians, $300." How does that matter stand now ? I remember that this is an old thing and I thought it was finished. I think it is about eighteen years since it was decided to begin the removal of these Indians from Two Mountains.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps I am more familiar with this question than is my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell). The information I have is this—that the Indians have shown little disposition to be removed from Oka to their proposed new home in Gibson township near Lake Superior, and very few have been removed. The greater number have remained at Oka ; but from year to year a few families are induced to remove from Oka to Gibson, and the amount here voted is spent in continuance of the old policy. Of course we cannot compel the Indians to remove, but the policy adopted long ago after the serious trouble that took place was to remove the whole tribe to Gibson, because, so long as they remained where they were, there would be no peace. They cannot be compelled to remove, as I have said, but they are being removed gradually and slowly.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the policy of the Government to have the Indians removing from Oka to the Gibson reserve without having a fixed date when this expenditure shall end ? My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), I am sure, must remember the old feud that existed which led to the decision to remove these Indians to Gibson reserve, and that the seminary of St. Sulpice was glad that they were going if they would remain away. But now they go too and fro——

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say that.

Mr. BERGERON. No ; I know the hon. gentleman did not say it. But I would like to know whether the Government will put a stop to it and compel the Indians to stay either at Oka or at the Gibson reserve, because I have every reason to believe that they are making a play of it, and that there will be no end to this transporting of them unless they are told that they must stay in one place or the other.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend cannot suppose, as we have undergone the trouble and expense of removing these Indians from Oka to Gibson, that we favour their going back to Oka. Moreover, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) must remember that if anything of that kind has been allowed, if they are allowed to make a play of it, as he says, that was done under the late Administration, this Administration having been less than two months in office. I am not informed that under the late Administration the Indians were allowed to make a play of it ; but we know that the Indians are nomadic in their instincts, and a few may come back to Oka. The disposition of the present Government is as I believe the disposition of the late Government was, as far as practicable to carry out the policy adopted some years ago in order to put a stop to the feud which was going on at Oka. The policy is gradually to remove all the families from Oka to Gibson. But my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows the habits of the Indians well enough to know that that is a policy that cannot be carried out except with great caution.

Mr. BERGERON. But is any of this $300 for the purpose of transporting Indians back to Oka from Gibson ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to transport them from Oka to Gibson, and not from Gibson back to Oka.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the answer I want.

Mr. SPROULE. How many have been removed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not say.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask an explanation of the appropriation for seed grain. What is given and who receives this grain ?

Mr. DOBELL. The record merely states that the agent was authorized to expend a certain amount, and properly certified vouchers accompanied each distribution of seed.

Mr. WILSON. Is that used entirely at the discretion of the agent ?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes, but there are certain restrictions. He cannot give it to every one.

Mr. WILSON. Are there no general instructions governing the distribution ?

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly, the general instructions are that seed grain is to be given only to those who are unable to buy.

Mr. BERGERON. I see there is an increase of $300 for blankets, and I imagine that must be in Caugnawaga, because during the last election they complained they had not been well treated in respect to blankets. I am sorry to see that the member for that county is not present. These Indians are very cute, they generally vote in such a way as to give a small majority to the Queen, that is the Government, in order that they may be well treated. But it seems they had not been well treated lately, for in June last, they were angry at the Queen, and gave a small majority against her. So I suppose this $300 is to reward them for the vote they gave.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is surprising, considering the great progress they made in industry.

Mr. GUILLET. I see there is an item for seed grain in the appropriation for all the provinces except Ontario. We have a large number of Indians on reserves in Ontario, and I would like to know how it is that there is no appropriation for seed grain to Indians in that province. I do not say that there is anything improper about it, but I would like to know why it is. There are a large number of Indians cultivating land in my riding.

Mr. DOBELL. The reason is, as I stated about the Indians in Nova Scotia, that we only grant seed grain to those who are unable to buy it. In Ontario, fortunately, the Indians are so well off that they do not need any assistance to buy grain.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is absolutely wrong, because they are supplied on certain occasions with seed grain.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Those that are not so well off.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is quite true. The plan adopted in Ontario as regards Indians has been to grant supplies of seed grain on some occasions on the requisition of the agent, who goes over the whole reserve and sees whether there are any whose crops have not been sufficient to supply them with a living until spring, and he gives grain to those who need it. I know all the instances myself in which seed grain has been supplied to the Six Nations Reserve.

Mr. DOBELL. The hon. gentleman does not state the case quite correctly when he says I am absolutely wrong, because I find that although seed grain is given to a few, the money required to buy it is paid by the other Indans out of a common fund. Therefore, I think I was correct in saying that no seed grain is given to the Indians there, because they have their own funds to buy grain with.

Mr. GUILLET. I am aware that on the reserves in the county of Northumberland there are Indians who have applied for seed grain, or for a loan, or an advance to buy seed grain, and they have, in every case, been required to pay for it, although some of them are extremely poor, and it takes the whole of their year's annuity to buy the grain. I know that no relief has been accorded to the poor Indians in that province. I draw the attention of the Minister to this matter, hoping that he will give fair-play to those Indians who are absolutely destitute.

Department of Indian Affairs—
Manitoba and the North-west Territories $758,700 52

Mr. CAMERON. I think this is the proper time to make a few observations upon the enormous expense connected with the administration of Indian Affairs in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Some years ago I complained in Parliament, not only of the enormous expense, but of the absolute waste of public money involved in the management of our Indians. I did not complain so much, nor do I now complain so much, of what goes to the Indians for their support, but I did then complain and I complain now, that the staff in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is stuffed from beginning to end, that every office there is unnecessarily filled, and filled with nominees of the late Administration. I complain that the expenses here and the expenses there are not at all in proportion to the benefits received either by the country or by the Indians. Now, I do not propose discussing at length this important question, because it is late in the session and the time will not admit of it. Start at Ottawa. There is, unfortunately, no Minister appointed yet to fill that important position ; I say that the circumstances, unfortunately, are such that the First Minister is not able, I suppose to make the appointment he desires to make : but there is an hon. gentleman on the floor of Parliament quite capable of making the necessary explanations, and, therefore, the country has not suffered anything yet from the non-appointment of a Minister. I find the Ottawa department costs $52,000, there being 65 employees in the office. I contend that expense is absolutely unnecessary. The Department of Indian Affairs having at its head office at Ottawa no less than 65 officials, is certainly overburdening the public service, and I trust the new Minister will, at the earliest possible moment, make careful scrutiny and a thorough investigation, and, wherever he finds a man paid for doing duties when there are no duties to perform, he will discharge that man, not on account of his politics, but simply because he has nothing to do. I find the commissioner's office at Winnipeg cost $6,799. We pay for salaries of that office $5,233, and for travelling expenses the enormous sum of $2,060. There are in the employ of the commissioner six or eight officers, and altogether they absorb from the public funds very

nearly $7,000. I ask the Government to deal with this question, and to deal with it as promptly as the circumstances of the case will admit. The hon. members on the Treasury benches are not responsible for the enormous staff they employ in the North-west and Manitoba to take care of the Indians, but they will be responsible if they do not deal effectually with this expenditure, after reasonable time has been allowed. I am sure the new Minister will have a full investigation made and see how many men in the service can be dispensed with. At the Regina office the expense is run up to $24,395. The travelling expenses reach the enormous sum of $4,854. How, in the name of common sense, could the travelling expenses amount to that sum? I can only account for it by a statement made to me, that, when our officials travel to visit the Indian bands, they go with coach and four and with the paraphernalia of royalty. In this way we can well understand how large sums can be paid for travelling expenses. If there is a department in the public service that requires the pruning knife and a strong and vigorous hand from the Treasury benches, it is the Department of Indian Affairs. The cost of the Regina office was $24,395, with 31 employees. There is a commissioner at $2,400; chief inspector, $2,200; surveyor, $1,400; storekeeper, $1,300; chief clerk, $1,300; another inspector, $2,199; another clerk, $1,200; an inspector of schools, $1,200, and an assistant inspector to an inspector, $45 or $50 per month. I am perfectly satisfied that the office is overstocked, that it is stuffed, and it is staffed nearly altogether with friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not blame those hon. gentlemen for putting their friends in offices, but I blame them when there are no places for their friends to fill. What is the necessity of offices at Regina and at Winnipeg? Why should there be two inspectors, an assistant and 16 clerks in one office, besides an enormous number of other employees? There is no necessity for such an expenditure, and I am satisfied, when the new Minister of the Interior investigates the condition of affairs, he will be able to make enormous reductions. The fact is that this year we are asked to vote $50,000 more than last year, notwithstanding we have the reports from the inspectors declaring that the Indian bands are largely self-sustaining—that this band has so many acres under wheat, that the other band has so many acres in potatoes, and so on, yet the Indians cost very nearly as much to sustain them as ten or fourteen years ago. Not only in the commissioner's office and in the inspector's office, but also at the agencies, does the same condition of affairs prevail. I do not make these observations with a view to blaming the Treasury benches. They are wholly irresponsible; they have not had anything to do with these appointments; and I venture to say that they have not made any appointments of commissioner or inspector, or dismissed any of them. All these matters have been under he management of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they alone are responsible for them. My theory and plan of retrenchment is to dismiss one of these commissioners and inspectors, and abolish the Winnipeg office, and thereby save money. Hon. gentlemen should dismiss them and appoint nobody else in their places, and then it could not be said that men were dismissed for the purpose of making places for political friends. Every one knows that fifteen or sixteen years ago every Conservative who was unfit for a position in Ontario, was dumped into Manitoba and the North-west, with the result we have to-day—an enormous staff and an enormous expense that, year after year, the people are called upon to pay. Then, look for a moment at the agencies. Take the agency of Portage la Prairie. There are 478 Indians, male and females, boys and girls in the bands. The annuities distributed in 1895 amounted to $5,388. What was the expense connected with distributing that sum? I find, by the Auditor General's report that "expenses" are placed at $1,920; salaries, $1,250; travelling expenses, $643; or, in all, $3,813 necessary to pay a sum of $5,388. The annuities payable to Indians at that agency amounted to $2,950, and, in order to pay them, $3,833, including "expenses" was expended, or $7 to pay $5. Do hon. gentlemen opposite believe that is a right system? Is that the way to economize and husband the resources of the country? Quite the contrary. In the Assiniboine agency there are 180, all told, males, females, boys and girls. During the fiscal year ended 1895, we expended there $6,445. I find under the head of expenses there was a sum of $1,575, and what these are I do not know. Then there were salaries $1,260, and an amount for travel which made the total $2,887. The annuities payable under treaty to that band amount to $1,055, so that you will see that it took $2,887 to disburse $6,445, and it took $2,887, including "expenses" to pay annuities amounting to $1,055. Then take the Birtle agency. In that band there are 491 males and females, boys and girls. We disbursed last year in that agency $9,425. The amount of annuities payable to the band under treaty is $2,840. In connection with the payment of these annuities there were general expenses $3,770, salaries $2,340, travelling expenses $788, or a total of $6,898. So that to disburse $9,485 it appears to have cost the taxpayers of Canada the sum of $6,898, or in other words, to pay those Indians their annuities of $2,840, with "expenses," it appears, if I understand the Auditor General correctly, to have cost us nearly $7,000. Well, is there no room for improvement and for economy there. Verily there is, and I trust the Minister of Finance, who is looking at me

now, if he has anything to do with it, will see that these enormous expenses are greatly curtailed. I find in the File Hills Agency that the band consists of 255, males, females, boys and girls. The amount expended, according to the Auditor General, in that band was $6,470. The annuities payable to that band under treaty obligation amount to $1,400. We find in connection with that band that the general expenses were $1,633, the salaries $922, and the travelling expenses $262, or in all $2,817. It would therefore appear that it cost the people of Canada $2,817, including "expenses" to pay $6,470, or $2,817 to pay the annuities of $1,400. I think there is room for change there. I give these as only a few sample bricks from the structure. Any one who takes the trouble to read the Auditor General's Report, and I assume that report to be correct, will be amazed and astounded at the extraordinary condition of affairs that prevails in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, in connection with the management of the Indians. How it is in the other provinces I have not taken the time or the trouble to inquire. I satisfied myself that in the west there was a condition of things that required reformation, and that there was an amount of extravagance that required the vigorous application of the pruning knife. I trust that the hon. gentlemen in the Government who are responsible now will see to it that this is done. I find that in one agency there are three farm instructors and two farm labourers, and yet there are only 147 Indians in the whole band. Surely now that these Indians have attained to a state of understanding agriculture, and that many of the bands are practically self-sustaining, it is not necessary to maintain the same number of farm instructors and farm labourers that we had ten of fifteen years ago, when we undertook the task of teaching the Indians agriculture, and to be self-sustaining. Why in the name of common-sense should the agents employ white men as labourers on the farms. The Indians are willing and have been taught to labour, and if any money is to be expended it ought to be expended in giving employment to the Indians. They are the men whom we are trying to Christianize and civilize, and according to the Indian reports we have largely succeeded in doing so. I challenge you to find in the Indian reports, hardly a band that has not shown a marvellous advance in Christianity, education and agriculture. Take for example the Roseau River band. I find that they sowed last year 114 acres of wheat and fourteen acres of barley, and they sold from that reserve 11,000 pounds of Seneca at 17 cents a pound, and yet that band costs us nearly as much to-day as it cost us years ago, while at the present time the produce of their land ought to be practically enough to sustain them. In the face of that we are asked to vote hundreds of thousands of dollars for destitute Indians. According to the report of the Government last year the Long Plain band, a small band, had 93 acres under cultivation and the Swan Lake band had also 93 acres under cultivation. I give you these specimens of the condition in which the affairs of this country are managed in connection with Indians, and I trust, and I know that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will see to it that there is a great reformation in the management of the Indian agencies, and of the Indian Commissioner's office in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches may rest assured that if there is not a reformation, it will not give satisfaction to the great tax-paying masses of the people of this country. I do not propose, Sir, to discuss this question any further to-night. If I happen to be here next session of Parliament, I intend to point out more fully and clearly, not only the extravagance, but the absolute waste of money which has taken place under the late Government in connection with the management of our Indias in Manitoba and the North-west.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted ?

Mr. FOSTER. We surely cannot have this item adopted after such an arraignment of the policy of the Government as we have just heard. I would like to have the opinion of the acting Minister as to whether he thinks these suggestions are true or not, and if he thinks they are true, is he justified in asking for this amount of money.

Mr. CAMERON. I blamed you for it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) looked straight at the acting Minister, and he wanted to know why it took $6,000 expenditure to pay $2,000 annuities to the Indians of one particular band. Surely we must have an answer to that ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Does my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) think that the statement of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) is correct ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) is not in a position to question me now with reference to that. One of his own supporters has made a most tremendous onslaught against the department for which you are now asking about $900,000. He has charged that the department is literally stuffed with useless officials, and he demands why they are to be kept there. He also has charged that in one place $6,000 is the cost of paying $2,000 of annuities to a band of Indians. Now, the Minister must give this House and the country to understand whether he thinks that is true or not. If he thinks it is true, he cannot ask for money from this House, and this

House would not grant it. We must hear from the Minister.

Mr. CAMERON. Just let me say to the hon. gentleman before the Minister replies that the same charge practically was made on the floor of Parliament by the Hon. David Mills, and nobody knew better than he did what he was talking about when he spoke of the Indians of the North-west Territories. The same charge was made in the face of the hon. gentleman, and he will search "Hansard" in vain for a reply to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad my hon. friend has added that. I was going to add it myself, but he has saved me the trouble. That makes the case stronger. The First Minister sat beside the Hon. David Mills and heard that statement, year after year, and did not dissent from it. Therefore, he agreed with it. Yet he now comes, with his Ministers about him, and takes $9,000. We want to know whether, having been advised years and years beforehand, the acting Minister is going now to perpetrate this terrible outrage and iniquity any longer. My blood fairly ran cold when I heard these atrocious statements. I might take leave to doubt whether the Hon. David Mills ever made such a statement in this House as that it took $6,000 to pay $2,000 of annuities to a band of Indians.

Mr. CAMERON. I did not say so. I said it took seven dollars to pay five dollars.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Hon. Mr. Mills made that statement within the hearing of the hon. gentleman repeatedly, year after year, and he now asks, what are you going to do about it? My hon. friend should not ask such a question. He knows very well that in such an important department as the Department of the Interior, it was not possible for the Administration coming into office as we did only a few days before we had to face Parliament to get the supplies voted, to see whether there were any items in these Estimates which should not be introduced. The hon. gentleman is aware that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, when he brought down these Estimates, stated that they were practically the Estimates of the late Administration, as we had not time to look into matters and correct all those errors which we brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman opposite for years, and which he had time to correct and failed to correct, but which this Administration will be bound to correct. Everybody must understand that in order to have an effective economy it was not possible for this Administration, in the short time at their disposal, to inaugurate a system of economy which would be effective. When we had so many officials to dispose of, one inspector to look after another, and a second to look after a third, how was it possible for us to have a systematic plan for bringing harmony into this confusion? The new Minister of the Interior will have to spend several weeks looking into matters before he can have a plan ready to submit to Parliament; but he will have a plan to submit next session; and if my hon. friend is here next session, and he will be here, and he finds that we have not done anything better than was done by the late Administration, after all the criticism we poured on the late Administration, we shall have to bear the consequence of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt my hon. friend will bear it, and in the same calm way that he takes the strictures at the present time. My hon. friend cannot get out of this position, that for years he heard his colleague sitting beside him make these statements about office-stuffing and extravagance—such statements, for instance, as that it took $6,000 simply to distribute $2,000 to a band of Indians; and if he heard that and believed it for all those years, it would not take him five minutes now to say: We can take off at least 30 or 40 per cent of the vote, and show that he meant what he said when in Opposition. I must have this from the acting Minister. Is there any case where $6,000 is paid for the simple work of paying $2,000 of annuities to a band of Indians?

Mr. DOBELL. I would like to say to the hon. member that my experience of Indian affairs is of so recent a date that if he will only give me until next January I shall hope to be able then to answer him more fully.

Mr. FOSTER. But how can you get over the fact of one of your able and honest and truthful and veracious supporters telling you, in the baldest of Queen's English, right in your face, and shaking his fist at you, that these offices are stuffed, while you are still keeping them stuffed? How can you for a single moment hesitate, and not draw your pen through five or six thousand dollars at least? I do not see how the Minister can avoid reducing the vote. I think I shall have to move that it be reduced.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I just want to add one word which I got while in the North-west from a former member of this House employed there. First of all, I may state that the Government could not do anything different from what it has done, for this reason. It must assume that there are contracts pending with these parties for distributing this money, and that they must be paid this year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, as a lawyer, must not forget the ruling given by the Minister of Justice that there can be no contract unless the money is voted.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The statement made by this gentleman to me was this, that at least 50 per cent of the money intended for the Indians in the North-west would be found, if the matter were investigated, to go into the pockets of the officials and not to the Indians. But the hon. gentleman does

not seem to see his own shade. This is the state of things that exists, and he laughs and treats as a joke the statement that is made. He thinks there is nothing in this at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Very serious.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am satisfied that the statement made to me was a correct statement, and I have no doubt that the Government will see that this money is not paid out unless it is in the interest of the Indians. The first thing is to see that the Indians are attended to. It is a smaller matter to see that the officials are paid. So far as the Indians of Nova Scotia are concerned, I did not make a careful analysis of the case. I did a year or two ago, and found this much, that the Liberal doctor in the county of Antigonish was dismissed and another doctor put in, and that it took about four dollars to pay the second doctor for about each dollar formerly paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, here is corroborative evidence. One of my hon. friend's supporters gets up and tells the House that $6,000 is paid to distribute $2,000 of annuities. He has not been on the ground lately: but the hon. member for Guysborough has been there lately, and he had private information while there which made him believe exactly the same thing. Here are two witnesses. Surely my hon. friend cannot have this. But, ah, the selfishness of human nature! The hon. member for Guysborough gets up and talks about the extravagant expenditure on the Indians away up in the North-west, but took good care not to be here when the vote for the Nova Scotia Indians was being discussed.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I brought the matter up in the House.

Mr. CAMERON. Since that is about the sixth time the hon. gentleman has repeated that I said it took $6,000 to pay $2,000, let me tell him that I do not recollect making any such statement. I have none such in my notes. I say it would take $2.50 or so to pay $1.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman that way. But, of course, if he says he did not, I must accept the correction.

Mr. CAMERON. If I did say so, it was a slip, and, when we get the figures from the reporter, we shall see.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has a right to revise it.

Mr. CAMERON. I am not going to revise it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend going to throw off anything?

Mr. DAVIN. This is a very interesting subject to us. I listened to the statements made by my hon. friend, with some surprise. When the Estimates have been before the House so long, I do not think there can be any excuse for the acting Minister not being able to tell us whether it takes $6,000 or $3,500 to pay $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend who is acting Minister, is not weighed down with the active duty of attending to the details. If the Finance Minister had not been able to turn his attention to it, we would not have said anything about it, because he has been growing gray, the last few days, getting out the Supplementary Estimates, and he has not got them yet. Or even if the First Minister had this work in hand, he would be excused, because he has been struggling with a vacant portfolio, and has not yet succeeded in filling it. But my hon. friend from Quebec, who had nothing to do but look after those details, should have read up what the Hon. David Mills said. He should have counselled with the Prime Minister, who sat alongside Mr. Mills and imbibed, by the very contact and nearness, this doctrine of the utter extravagance in the Indian Department, and he should have been able to say how much stuffing there was, and have brought down the figures.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman has some charity, will he not tell us whether this is true that it takes $6,000 to pay $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had so little information from hon. gentlemen opposite thus far, that I thought we might be able to put it on record that we did get a definite answer to one question.

Mr. CLANCY. In one of the campaign documents circulated by the Liberal party in the last campaign, I find it stated that the Indians cost in 1878 only $421,503, yet under Conservative rule in 1893, that was increased to $956,552, or an increase of $535,449, or 136 per cent. That must have come under the notice of every hon. gentleman opposite, as well as the First Minister, and, when they came to that one conclusion, they must have been in possession of such information as would guide them in reducing the estimates of their predecessors. It does seem to me that, before the items pass, these hon. gentlemen must take the responsibility either of having made a statement that was not true, or must be prepared to reduce the estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I notice here an item of $4,000 for buildings. I would like to ask the Government whether any sum is included in that to replace the building of the industrial school at Elkhorn destroyed by fire a few months ago. I know that there is no school in the west doing better work than this school.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is not included in these estimates.

Mr. BETHUNE. I see no item here for medical attendance and medicine as in the votes for other provinces. I would like an explanation of that.

Mr. DOBELL. That is provided for in the vote for destitute Indians.

Indians, British Columbia $124,380

Mr. BOSTOCK. I would like to know whether in the item for industrial and boarding schools anything is included for the industrial school at Williams Lake ?

Mr. DOBELL. The Williams industrial school was established in 1891. The buildings, originally erected by a missionary society were placed at the disposal of the department. As the buildings were hardly suitable, the department drew plans for an addition to accommodate the boys and granted $2,000 to cover a portion of the cost, which is in the neighbourhood of $5,000. Application has later been received for a similar grant to assist in erecting buildings for the girls, which application is now receiving the earnest attention of the Government.

Mr. GILLIES. I would ask whether these schools are under inspection by British Columbia inspectors or by officers appointed by the department ?

Mr. DOBELL. They are inspected by the agents of the locality, as well as by the commission.

Mr. GILLIES. I cannot understand that system of inspection, but let that pass. I would like to ask if the teachers are certificated by the authorities of British Columbia, or are they licensed by some authority issued by the department ? And I would ask also how they are paid, those holding first, second, and those holding third class certificates ?

Mr. DOBELL. There is no certificate, and the pay——

Mr. GILLIES. What is their qualification as teachers ?

Mr. DOBELL. The schools receive a grant of so much per capita and the authorities of the schools pay the teachers.

Mr. GILLIES. How is the department made aware of the standing of the different teachers ? Do they undergo any examination ?

Mr. DOBELL. They make the best selection they can of those best qualified to teach the Indians.

Mr. WILSON. Is it the intention of the department to see hereafter that the teachers do pass an examination to prove that they are qualified to teach ?

Mr. DOBELL. It is rather difficult to get teachers at all in these remote districts, and I fancy if we insisted upon having teachers who had taken a university degree we should be without teachers. We make the best selection we can.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us what salaries these teachers get and what distinction is made in salary by reason of qualification ?

Mr. DOBELL. They receive $200 to $300 per annum.

Mr. WILSON. What proportion are males and what females ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). And what is the colour of their eyes ?

Mr. WILSON. I think this is a perfectly legitimate question that I put, and the answer will enable us to judge as to the salaries.

Mr. DOBELL. In reply to the hon. gentleman's question I do not think I shall be wrong when I say they are about half and half.

North-west Mounted Police $530,000

Mr. CAMERON. I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to make any investigation as to the necessity of keeping up this enormous force. A gentleman who has lived in the North-west ever since the Mounted Police force was established, a prominent man there who was in the city a week or ten days ago, assured me that one half the present force would be quite enough.

The PRIME MINISTER. Up to the present time it had never occurred to me that there should be an investigation into the question of reducing the force. I took it for granted that the force should not be reduced, that it is not more than adequate for the requirements of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. The force has been largely reduced within the last five years.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it has been somewhat reduced. I think it now has a strength of 700 men. I am sorry the North-west members are not present, but I see one (Mr. Davin) before me. The demands upon us are rather to the extension of the force, so that they may extend their work north to the Arthabasca River and so on. At the present time we have some officers and men on the Yukon River. The mining development there makes it improbable that we shall be able to reduce the number of men there. Whatever number we withdraw from older settlements, we shall probably have to carry to the newer settlements. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) thinks the investigation ought to be held and if he feels strongly upon the matter, the department may consider the propriety of making an investigation. But I tell him frankly that the opinion that

comes to us from all parts of the North-west is that the force is not too large.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to hear this expression of opinion from the First Minister. My hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) who wails doubt as to whether this force is too large, is ill-informed as to the needs of the North-west and as to the demands upon the North-west Mounted Police at the present moment. Within the past few years the Mounted Police have been reduced to an extent that most of us in the North-west think, as we thought at the time, is inadvisable. If the members from the North-west Territories had had any hint whatever that it was the intention of the Government to reduce the Mounted Police, we would have protested in the strongest manner against that reduction. And I can assure my hon. friend that instead of the Government reducing the police, if they have the investigation referred to, the chances are that they may come to the conclusion that it is necessary to restore the force to its former strength. The Mounted Police of the North-west for the work it has to do, is one of the most efficient bodies as well as one of the cheapest that has ever existed. If my hon. friend will compare the cost of this force with that of police forces in other parts of the world, he will find that this force is not only efficient, but is economically managed and economically paid. As this vote is on, I would ask the hon. First Minister whether there is any chance of his taking the Bill that I have on the paper as a Government measure. I think, Sir, that it will commend itself to the First Minister who has charge of this department. I am glad that he has charge of it, and I may say that it was a source of great gratification to the people of the North-west Territories to know that the hon. gentleman had taken charge of the department himself. As he has taken charge of that department himself, I hope that the Bill I have put on the paper will at all events commend itself to him, and that he will consider whether he will not take away from the Mounted Police what might be called disabilities. For instance, at the present time they have no relative rank with the militia. When they co-operated in the North-west in 1885, if a militia officer of very short standing was to go up there, he would take command and take superior rank of any of the police officers. Therefore, I suggest to him whether he will not give the officers of the Mounted Police relative grade with the militia, and also do the justice I propose to do myself in that Bill in regard to the superannuation matter. And above all it is of the first importance to his own peace of mind, if he continues to manage that department, as well as to the efficiency of that force, that he should fence himself around by law against the importunities of politicians who will press him to put men into that police force with the rank of officer. If it is made by law the rule that all promotions to the rank of officer shall be made from men who have served in the ranks or who have degrees from the Royal Military College, I can assure him that it is the opinion of every officer and non-commissioned officer I have talked with, that it would add greatly to the efficiency of the force. When I say non-commissioned officer, I bring out a feature of that force that many are not aware of. That police force stands apart, I believe, from any other force I have read of except the police force in South Africa, in this respect, that men of good social rank and education have been up to the present time accustomed to go into that force as troopers. It is no uncommon thing to meet a man who has been at Cambridge, or an Oxford man, or to meet a man of noble family or of gentle blood from England, Ireland or Scotland, serving in the ranks in that police force. Therefore, the social objection that might be used with regard to promotions from the ranks in the regular army, could not be used in regard to this force. As the hon. gentleman has taken that department under his own charge, I press these views on him, with the hope that either at the coming session, or as early as possible, he will embody them into law.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am rather pleased on the whole with the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and especially with his concluding remarks, showing that he does not expect me to bring down any modification during the present session. I am sorry to say that I have not given to his Bill the attention which otherwise I would have given it, had I believed it possible to have any legislation on this or any other subject during the present session. But while I have no opinion on the matter at present, I can say this, however, that speaking from the best judgment I have been able to form, I consider that the closer the force is made to a military organization, the better it will be for the force itself and for the country at large. It is largely a military organization at the present time, and I think that it is to this fact that we owe the great success of the police in the North-west, and the good services they have rendered to the country. Whether it would be advisable to make it still more a military organization, is a question which I am sure is entitled to much consideration, and I may say to favourable consideration. I view with favour anything which would make the police force an absolutely military organization, so far as that is possible. With regard to superannuation, that is a matter which will engage the attention of the Government, not only as respects the Mounted Police, but with regard to the whole civil service.

To meet cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Prime Minister know whether any appeals have been taken against the judgments given by the arbitrators ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give any information on that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. gentleman to make a note of it, and be able to inform us if there have been any appeals since the accession to office of the present Government.

Excise $398,631

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) I should like to ask the Controller of Inland Revenue whether any inspector of inland revenue has been appointed at Halifax. If I understand it, H. H. Grant, the former collector, was appointed to the position of inspector.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). No appointment has been made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) I understood by the return brought down that H. H. Grant was promoted, and that his promotion, which was made by the late Government, was within the class which was confirmed by Order in Council passed by the present Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was nothing specially confirmed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) The position seems to be this, that Mr. Grant having been appointed by the late Government, and his appointment sanctioned by His Excellency, he should hold office at the present time. I am asking if such is the case ; if not, what is the position of the matter ? Mr. Grant is a very capable officer, who has served in the Department of Inland Revenue for a great number of years, and is in every way qualified for promotion. I should like to know what is the present position of the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is right. This is one of the appointments which came within the category of those that were not accepted by His Excellency.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) Then, has Mr. Grant been notified as to whether he is collector of inland revenue, or not ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have not notified him yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) When will he be notified, or is there any intention to notify him ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. My intention is, as soon as possible, to organize the service so as to diminish the expenditures, and it has been impossible for me to go over the staff of over 500 officers, scattered all over the Dominion, and arrive at any definite conclusion in regard to them. But my intention is to avail myself of every possible means in order to reorganize the service, with a view to secure economy, without interfering in any way with efficiency.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With all deference to what the hon. Controller has stated, I do not see how that affects the question of Mr. Grant being notified of his appointment. Either he has been promoted to the position of inspector of inland revenue, or not. I understood, from the return, that he had been promoted to that office. If he has been so promoted, it would be only right to give him the usual notification of it, whatever may be the view of the Government with respect to the reorganization of the department. The ordinary courtesy extended by the department should entitle Mr. Grant to that notification, if he has been appointed, which I understand from the return and from the statement of the First Minister to have been the case. Has Mr. Grant been notified ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Does that hold true with respect to the deputy collector at Halifax, Mr. King ? I understood he was to be promoted to collector, in the event of Mr. Grant being made inspector.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. As I have explained, I wish to consider, if possible, the question of reorganization, with a view to retrenchment without interfering with efficiency.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is no answer. What is desired is an answer from the Government as to whether it is their intention to promote the inspector.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not quite clear as to the purport of the answer made by the Prime Minister the other night. I should like to have the matter clearly stated. As I understand it, Mr. Grant falls within the category of those whose appointments, on the recommendation of the Treasury Board and report to Council, was actually signed by the Governor General. Am I right in that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that they were actually signed—the hon. gentleman knows as well as myself what took place. His Excellency returned all these Treasury Board recommendations approved, with three classes of exceptions, and we understand this does not come within the exceptions.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the direct conclusion from that, is that all who do not come within those three exceptions, were approved by His Excellency, and are, therefore, executive documents. My hon. friend, the other night, in answer to the question, stated that

all that class of appointments would stand until the Government made other arrangements. Now we hear they are not operative, they are waiting, unappointed, until the hon. Controller sees what economies he can effect. The direct corollary to my hon. friend's answer was that, no matter what changes might take place afterwards, dismissal, reorganization, promotion or distribution, those appointments approved by the Governor General, were in force, and the officers should be doing the work. Surely no other inference could be drawn. The answer given to-night goes to show that, in this case, and in all other cases, these appointments are not standing, for the Government are not executing the terms of these Orders, but are simply keeping on the officers in the old capacity.

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer is quite plain, as I stated it the other day. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) asks whether Mr. Grant has been notified. The Controller of Inland Revenue replies that he has not been notified, and will not be notified until he has had time to see what changes he may have to make in the service, and what recommendations he may have to suggest to His Excellency in regard to it. My hon. friend is not able to find out what changes are immediately necessary, with a view to diminishing the cost of the service, while at the same time not impairing its efficiency, and he says that, so long as he is not able to come to that conclusion, it is not his intention to notify the officer in regard to this position.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. First Minister must modify his answer given the other evening, so far as we understood it, that, for instance, in the case of Mr. Grant, he not having come under any of the three categories of exceptions, and the Order in Council having been signed, he was collector of inland revenue. My hon. friend says that there is now no Inspector of Inland Revenue. Mr. Grant was the collector until the Treasury Board report was signed by His Excellency, and then Mr. Grant became the inspector. According to the answer given by the Prime Minister the other night, he is the Inspector. But my hon. friend (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) says that in this case Mr. Grant is not the Inspector, although that Order in Council was approved by the Governor General, and as the Prime Minister says, stood. It now seems that Mr. Grant is still Collector, and there is no Inspector, and he is going to remain in that position until the Controller finds out whether he can do without an Inspector or not, and if he can do without an Inspector then he will not give effect to the Order in Council signed by His Excellency the Governor General.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the Controller of Inland Revenue is of the opinion that the services of Mr. Grant are to be dispensed with, a new recommendation will have to be made to His Excellency.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime Mr. Grant is not Inspector.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the meantime, Mr. Grant must give the Controller of Inland Revenue the time to consider whether or not his services are to be retained.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Controller of Inland Revenue any idea that he can do without an Inspector of Inland Revenue in Nova Scotia ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) what I propose to do. What appears to be perfectly practicable, and which would be the means of saving $2,500 a year, would be to consolidate the three maritime provinces and have only one Inspector there instead of two.

Mr. FOSTER That might be done.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope I may be able to succeed in doing that, and it would at once be the beginning of the retrenchment which I propose. With this in view I cannot admit that Mr. Grant should be notified.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing to be found fault with in uniting the maritime provinces under one Inspector, and it quite meets my view, in fact. It appears, however, that if any Minister feels that he may reorganize his department, he simply does not notify those persons whose appointment was signed by the Governor General, and the document has no force.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In the meantime is Mr. Borrodaile acting Inspector in Nova Scotia.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Borrodaile was superannuated several weeks before the last election, and he is not acting now. Mr. Grant is acting.

Mr. MONTAGUE. While these Estimates are under consideration, I should like to mention a matter arising out of the classification of the Orders in Council, which seems to have been made by the present Government. I am sure that when I mention the name it will have that consideration which is always vouchsafed to those of our late colleagues, whether they come from one side of the House or the other. A vacancy existed some little time ago in the inland revenue service in the city of London. I am not sure whether it was by death or superannuation the vacancy occurred, but it certainly took place within the last five or six months. The late Government passed an Order in Council, if I remember the circumstances correctly, removing the deputy collector at Petrolea, and giving him the vacancy in London, and then

they appointed to the vacancy at Petrolea the son of the late member for Middlesex, Dr. Roome, who was highly respected on both sides of the House. I notice, however, that his appointment is placed in that category which nullifies it. It was approved by the Governor General along with the other appointments, but I understand that His Excellency made a memorandum that under certain circumstances they were not to go into effect. I do not think that this case comes within either of the exceptions to which His Excellency refers. It was not a new office, and a vacancy did not exist for over a year. I do not mention this in the way of criticism, because I know my hon. friend the leader of the Government, as well as his colleague the Controller of Inland Revenue, would be glad to do justice to the son of an old colleague, whether he belonged to one side of the House or the other.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) certain that the appointment was in the Inland Revenue Department?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Are you sure?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Positive. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) to look that up, and if it does not come within the exceptions, I am sure he will treat the case fairly. If it does come within the exceptions I do not ask for it.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is in the list "A."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know, but I think it is there by mistake.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will look into it.

Weights and Measures, Gas and Electric Light Inspection $100,950

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue whether he has taken any steps in the direction that I suggested, to have the Inspector of Weights and Measures in the North-west Territories inspect the manner by which the wheat of the settler is weighed when he comes to the elevator to sell it?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have considered this matter already, and we are going to send directions in regard to it. They complain, whether right or wrong it is impossible to say, about the manner in which the wheat is weighed at the railway elevators and others. We are going to see whether their complaints are right or not. The habit was not to allow fractions, and if there were 104 pounds, the four pounds would not be allowed. This is a private transaction between the buyer and seller, and I do not see how the Government can interfere. But what we can interefere in, and I think it is our duty to do so, is to ascertain that all the appliances connected with the weighing and gauging and measuring of grain are correct. I hope we will be able to give satisfaction to the farmers of the North-west on that point.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue will remember that at an early period of the session I brought before the House the importance of taking steps with regard to making grain standards permanent, and securing that the farmers would have a fair representation on any board that would have to do with the grain standards. I should like to know if any steps have been taken towards that, and whether next session we shall have from the Government an Act that will give a permanent standard and not a variable standard from year to year. I also wish to know whether it is the intention of the department to arrange that the standard shall be made in such a way as will secure to the farmer the full justice that he is entitled to. As my hon. friend remembers, I brought to his attention the objection, the well-grounded objection, which the farmers have to mixing scoured wheat with their wheat, holding that the standard should be made in such a way as to bring before the public the wheat of the North-west Territories in its best and purest quality. The system pursued of mixing the wheat is a system entirely to the advantage of the dealer and to the disadvantage of the farmer, and I hope my hon. friend will be able to assure us that steps are being taken to meet the disadvantages of which the farmers complain, whose complaints were brought before him by me early in the session.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. While my hon. friend intimated that the department proposed to effect retrenchment and economy in other directions, in my opinion the greater part of this item of weights and measures might be wiped out. So far as my section of the country is concerned, the whole thing is a farce. The duties, I think, could be performed, probably better, by other officers of the Government, and a great saving effected. It is to a great extent a waste of money, in my section of the country at least. I merely draw the matter to the attention of the Minister, for I think that if he looks into it he will find that the greater part of this expenditure might be saved by some reorganization such as I suggest. In addition to their salaries, these officers collect fees in many cases.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the department is very nearly self-sustaining.

Mr. FOSTER. These men do not get salaries and fees, too.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The total expenditure is $70,000 and the fees amount to about $40,000, so that at this moment the clear cost to the country is about $30,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That would no doubt be a good saving, and I would still press on the Minister the desirability of looking into the matter. The fees are often outrageously high, and, in my opinion, the work is perfectly useless to the community.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I assure you that the most gentle pressure would be sufficient to induce me to meet the views of my hon. friend. Only you must remember that in 1879, the whole system of inspection of weights and measures was abolished, and the whole staff dismissed, with a view to retrenchment and economy, only to be reorganized a few months afterwards. Only the late Government did not reappoint the same men. We must take that matter into careful consideration.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Do as they did.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, I do not want to follow their bad example; but the Government will see what can be done in the way of making considerable economy in that department. I might answer what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said about the standard of wheat. I may tell him that His Excellency has been recommended to organize the board which is going to sit at Winnipeg, in order to settle this in such a way as appears perfectly fair, that is, by giving the farmers one-half of the representation on the board and dividing the other half between the millers and the dealers. The farmers had certainly strong claims to be considered and I do not think we have exaggerated their right.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is news to me to learn that the farmers are going to be put on the board for the first time. They have always had representation on the board.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not so much as now proposed.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). From the remarks of the hon. gentleman, it would be inferred that the farmers had hitherto no representation. When I first took charge of the department, one of the first things I did was to increase the representation of the farmers on that board. I sympathize most heartily with the hon. Controller in the difficult task he has on hand, that of satisfying all parties interested in the cultivation and sale of wheat. Much has been said on the subject, and entirely aside of the mark—the subject of mixing wheat, to my mind, is not applicable. Can the hon. Controller give an idea whether there will be any definite order made regarding the fixing of the grain standards permanently, or whether they will be changed from year to year, as at present?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Up to this time the standard was sixty pounds and two-thirds of Red Fife, and the farmers ask us to raise the quality of that grade to 61 pounds, and require three-fourths of Red Fife, instead of two-thirds. The second grade is raised in the same proportion to 60 pounds. Then, the scoured wheat is to be turned into a quality by itself. There is a long document, covering nearly two pages of regulations, which has been submitted to His Excellency for adoption, but these are the principal changes. The idea is to make the standards permanent. It appears to have met with the approval of the boards of trade of Montreal and Toronto, and the main objection raised in Winnipeg was to the great proportion of farmers on the board.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am very glad to see the Controller take the position of trying to make the standard of grain permanent, and I hope he will be able to do so. So far as the raising of the standard is concerned, it makes but little difference what you fix the grade at, because the value of the grain will determine its price in the end, but the great object is to have the standard fixed permanently. The idea hitherto has been that, when the crop was poor, the standard might be lowered, and, when the crop was good, it could be raised. The mixing of scoured wheat with the other wheat should certainly be prevented, and the grading instead of scoured wheat should be adopted. In no case should scoured wheat be mixed up with grades 1 or 2.

Mr. CLANCY. A good deal of dissatisfaction exists in the province of Ontario, in consequence of a want of uniformity in reaching conclusions as to testing grain. Some three or four years ago, when wheat was 80 cents a bushel, the Millers' Association fixed a certain means of grading by testing wheat. Wheat that tested 60 pounds was taken as a standard, was given the ordinary price, but if it went a pound lower, a reduction of 1 cent per bushel was made; if it went 2 pounds lower, a reduction of 3 cents was made; if it went 3 pounds lower, there was a reduction of 5 cents, and so on, until it went to 53 pounds weight, when there was a reduction of 20 cents. The farmers want some disinterested tribunal to step between the grain-buyers and the producers, and, if necessary, to fix a table. It may be said that the Millers' Association have the right to fix such table as they think proper, but they are permitted the use of instruments to test the wheat, and upon these tests the table is based. It seems to me the Government should step in and fix the proper gradings and the reductions to be made on wheat going below 60 pounds or

the standard. I call attention to what is an irritating question. The hon. gentleman will find that the dissatisfaction is widespread, and that some means should be adopted by which the matter would be governed by some law, rather than mere usage, either on the part of the producer or the purchaser.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad the hon. member for Bothwell has brought the matter up. It is one out of which he has tried to make a good deal of capital in the recent election. I may say, there is not a man in Canada who can go into the hon. gentleman's county and buy wheat on any other terms than are at present adopted. It is not unsatisfactory to the farmers; in fact, no wheat is bought there without using the tester he speaks of, which is one of the best means ever adopted for settling the matter between the buyer and seller. It is not compulsory. It was fixed first by Order in Council by the late Government. Several Orders in Council were passed, from year to year, and the system was perfected as far as possible. And, as I said before, there is no means of buying grain that is so fair to the farmers as well as to the purchasers as that in vogue in Ontario. The hon. gentleman stated that, of course, as grain declined in weight, the price declined. Where wheat goes down to 53 pounds, as stated by the hon. gentleman, it is not fit for flour; it is only fit for feed, and should be paid for on that basis. But the hon. gentleman forgot to say that as it goes up in weight the price goes up. For instance for wheat weighing 61 pounds there is 1 cent per bushel added to the price, and so on with every further increase of one pound per bushel. So far as the farmers are concerned, I know, having had some experience, that you cannot go and buy wheat to-day without using what is called the tester. Those having good wheat to sell will not sell unless you use the tester. Those having poor wheat will perhaps do so. But this instrument has been the means of greatly improving the quality of the grain in Ontario. Formerly the buyer hastily glanced at the wheat and allowed so much for it. Now it is bought on its merits and if a man grows good grain and cleans it well he will get more for it. If he brings poor stuff into the market and not well cleaned, it will weigh so much lighter and he will get so much less. Thus there is a strong inducement to the farmer to raise good grain and clean it well, and there is no dissatisfaction with the system of buying among the farmers of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend has taken the trouble to defend a position that was not attacked. I did not object to the use of a tester or to proper reductions being made for lack of weight. No man in his senses, would propose that wheat weighing 53 pounds per bushel should be paid for at the same rate as wheat weighing 60 pounds per bushel.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then why do you object?

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman had paid attention—and he is perhaps better able to pay attention to these matters and understand them than any other gentleman in the House, because he is a miller—my objection was not that the tester is used but that there is no regulation by-law governing how it is to be used.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, that is provided by Order in Council.

Mr. CLANCY. No; the order in Council to which the hon. gentleman refers does not regulate the means by which the tester is to be used. There was an outcry in the province because of the want of uniformity and it was complained that the same different results were obtained in the testing of the same grain by different persons. When this complaint was raised, I think the late Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood) will say I am right, the Government passed an Order in Council not fixing regulations for the use of the tester but providing for inspection so as to secure uniformity of size in the vessels. I wish to call the Minister's attention to the fact that in consequence of want of uniformity there has been a complaint. But there is another difficulty to which I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) would pay some attention, that the Miller's Association arbitrarily fixed a table for additions and reductions in the case of grain weighing more or less than sixty pounds. I am trying to point out that this should be fixed by a tribunal not interested on either side. They give one cent per bushel additional for every pound over sixty pounds per bushel. But let it be remembered that there is more wheat that will weigh under sixty pounds than there is wheat that will weigh over sixty pounds. For one pound less than sixty pounds they take off 1 cent per bushel, for two pounds under sixty pounds, 2 cents per bushel, for three pounds, 5 cents per bushel, for four pounds, 8 cents per bushel, for five pounds, 12 cents per bushel, for six pounds, 16 cents per bushel and for seven pounds, 20 cents per bushel. The farmers are asking that the department may fix a rule by which these reductions should be fixed not arbitrarily and specifically but according to the price. This seems to me to be fair to both sides, and I believe that the rights of both sides should be guarded, the rights of millers as well as the rights of farmers. It is, of course, admitted that the grain buyer must be guided by some rule in buying, because he has to sell by a rule. But to make the reductions specifically is not fair, nor is it fair that the reductions and additions should be fixed by one side alone.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope I misunderstood the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) in his answer to the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that he would be pleased to yield to recommendations for the abandonment of the weights and measures inspection service.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. To the reorganization of the service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the argument of the hon. member for North Oxford was in favour for the abandonment of the service. To my mind, taking the facts as given by the Controller of Inland Revenue—that the service brings in $40,000 a year and cost $70,000 a year showing a deficit of less than $30,000 a year—I am prepared to say that there is no service outside of the post office service that is of more practical use to the people and costs relatively so little money. As the hon. Controller knows, the service is divided into two parts, those engaged in the factories and those travelling and inspecting weights in various parts of the country. We all agree that if the hon. gentleman finds the service inefficient or over-expensive, he is perfectly right in reorganizing in order to secure economy and efficiency. But I hope he will not abolish the service which is popular with all those who buy and with all who wish to sell properly and which, in the interests of the people, should be continued. I believe the officers are good men and that they earn their money.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is quite mistaken in thinking that it does not matter to the farmer what the standard is. The farmers of the North-west Territories and Manitoba consider that it matters a great deal to them. We feel strongly there that the grain buyers in Toronto and Montreal have a great deal too much to do at the present time with fixing the standards. Their interests are not our interests. Their interests are to fix the standards in such a manner as will be detrimental to the farmers, and I hope that the Controller of Inland Revenue will see, that when he comes to deal with this question in the future, that the people of the North-west and Manitoba are allowed to fix their own standards and supply their own measurements for their own wheat, and that, therefore, we shall not be subjected to the injustice we have suffered in the past because of the greed and machinations of the buyers in Montreal and Toronto. There is nothing in the history of business transactions, in my opinion, so insolent as the demands of the grain buyers in this matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As a representative of a rural constituency in Manitoba, I have felt it was desirable that the farmers should have at least an equality on the board in fixing these standards. For years we had complaints from the farmers all over the province and the Territories that these standards have not been fixed in their interest, and they had made strong representations to their representatives and others in regard to this point. Acting with other members from the west, we made representations to the Controller of Inland Revenue, and I am pleased to be able to testify to the manner in which he took the question up. He frankly told us that the interests of the farmer were to be the interests of the department. We pointed out to him that inasmuch as it was the farmers who raised the grain, inasmuch as it was the farmers who bore the burden and the heat of the day, who gave the toil to produce the wheat, they at least should be strongly represented on the board in fixing these standards, and we were able to induce the Controller to recommend that an Order in Council be passed giving one-half the representation on the board to farmers. Since the change has been recommended, I have had representations from people in the west complaining that the proposed change in regard to the composition of the board and with regard to fixing three permanent standards, No. 1 hard, No. 2 hard, and No. 1 Northern, would not be satisfactory. I may say that these representations did not come from farmers but from dealers and others interested in the manipulation of the wheat market; so that I paid no attention to these representations. I am here as a representative of the farmer, and I want to stand up in his behalf on every possible occasion. Personally I am not in a position to say what would be the best in regard to this matter, because I have not studied the question sufficiently to be an expert, but in following the direction of the farmers, I feel that I have done my duty, and if they suffer it will be their own fault. But I may say that I am disposed to think that a change will certainly be in the interest of the farmer in the long run. By securing these permanent standards we will ensure the reputation of our wheat in the European markets. I have always felt, and representations have been made to me to that effect, that the wheat grown in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, which is the best produced in the world, has not had a fair show in the London market, because I believe it has been manipulated by the dealers. The excellent quality of our wheat has been deteriorated by mixing it with scoured, and with wheat of an inferior quality, and in that way the reputation of our wheat has suffered in the British market. I want to pay a tribute to the manner in which the Controller of Inland Revenue has taken up this matter and dealt with it, as he believes, in the interest of the farmer and in the interest of the grain trade also.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would ask the Controller of Inland Revenue what is the present numerical strength of the board?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are eight farmers, five millers, and three men called dealers, those who go between the farmers and the millers.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). How many farmers were on that board before ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Four or five, I think. But I do not think a distinction was ever made before. I remember when we began to consider the question they were not satisfied. There was a mixture, there were two grain inspectors among them, whom we have taken away altogether, because we thought that, being executive officers, they had no right to legislate upon the work they were going to do afterwards. But it did appear at that time as if there had not been a careful classification. There were farmers on the board, but I could not say how many ; I do not think there were one-half.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have heard no complaint in the past that there were not enough farmers on the board. I do not think you will find in the records of the department any complaint since the change was made increasing the number of farmers on the board. I understood from the Controller that he was going to await the decision of the standards board, which will meet soon, if they have not met already, in Winnipeg, to get from them information upon which we could make some change in the law making the standards permanent. Am I right ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. That can be made by Order in Council. But we have given instructions to adopt a permanent standard.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). But can the standard fixed by statute be changed by Order in Council ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The standards can be changed every year by Order in Council. Last year the standard was 60 pounds and two-thirds Red Fife, now we want to put it at 61 pounds and three-fourths Red Fife, at the request of the farmers. It would look at first sight as if that increase would operate against the farmer by making the standard higher, but I was much struck by the way in which the farmers looked at the matter. I wondered why they wished to raise the standard, and they said that it was in order to raise the reputation of their wheat.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There was a change made by the late Government on their accession to power in 1879. I was not a member of this Parliament at the time. I know as a matter of history that there was an Act passed in 1879 amending the Act respecting Weights and Measures, and that this Act was much more economical as regards the number of officers employed than the previous Act, and the expense was considerably reduced. In the event of the department undertaking changes in the direction of economy, I would heartily echo what has been said by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that it would not be a wise move to wipe out this branch of the department, because it is performing a very useful service. If economy is desired, I strongly suggest that additional work in connection with the Weights and Measures Act might be thrown on the Department of Inland Revenue, because while some of the officers are fully employed, there are always officers in every department who are not working at their full strength. That course was pursued to a limited extent by the late Government.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not wish to disturb the friendly feeling which pervades the Committee at the present time by referring to what took place in 1879. But I must say that after the Government had swept out all the staff, they reorganized a new staff a few months afterwards, and I am perfectly satisfied that not one of the officers appointed by the Mackenzie Government were reinstated. That is a statement I can establish, and I could give names. As regards abolishing the system of weights and measures, I may say that it would not require much to induce me at all events to modify it so as to work it with a less number of men, because I consider the staff is at present much too large.

Resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 25th September, 1896.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 38) to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act by dispensing with the preparation of the new voters' lists in certain cases.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

DISMISSALS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals whether he can say anything as to the supplementary correspondence required, under the Order of the House, in connection with the dismissal of the bridge-tenders on the Intercolonial at the port of Pictou, mentioned to him, the correspondence referred to by himself in committee, and also in the papers brought down, but not included in the return; and I called his attention to the language of the Order of the House, which covered all correspondence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not yet received the further correspondence which took place between any of the parties named and the department, but I shall hurry it up.

PROROGATION.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. First Minister if he is able to state on what day prorogation is expected to take place. I ask simply because it will be a great convenience to many members of the House to have some idea of the day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is impossible to fix any day, but, with the concurrence of my hon. friend, I hope by Saturday to be able to prorogue.

J. K. LAMBERT.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether he has considered the case of J. K. Lambert and has rectified the error that has been committed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I must say that I have not yet had the time to look into this matter. I intend going west as soon as the session is over, and then I will have more time to see about it.

TIGNISH, P.E.I., FIRE SUFFERERS.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government whether he is prepared to do something on behalf of the Government for the relief of the sufferers by the fire at Tignish? I brought the matter up some days ago, and the hon. gentleman asked me to bring before him the facts in connection with the case, and he would consider the matter. On reference to a newspaper published in the city of St. John, N.B., I find:

> Some days ago we set forth the claims of the Tignish, Prince Edward Island, fire sufferers for relief, in a circular issued by responsible gentlemen. So far as known as yet little relief has been received. Mr. J. J. Gallagher, the Prince Edward Island representative of Messrs. Manchester, Robertson & Allison, is now in the city. He is just from the scene of the recent fire, and reports that there are many people in absolute want of clothing. In consequence of this the firm published a notice in this morning's issue notifying the citizens that all contributions of clothing, &c., will be collected and forwarded by the firm. No doubt many citizens will take notice and send in clothing.

In the name of the thousands who are suffering in that locality, I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring down a small amount to assist them in their great suffering.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say that this matter has been engaging the attention of the Government, and the reports we have received are of a very conflicting character, so conflicting that the Government has not yet come to a determination. I would be obliged to my hon. friend if he would kindly send me the paper he has read from.

HULL ELECTRIC COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 20) to change the name of the Hull Electric Company to the Hull and Aylmer Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Devlin.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I do not think this clause is at all necessary to give the Federal Parliament authority to deal with the undertaking; but if the clause is allowed to remain in the Bill, it should be amended so as to apply to the whole undertaking. As it now reads, it is not intended to apply to the whole undertaking, but simply to that portion which is to be constructed under the Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN. I really cannot understand the objection of the hon. gentleman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It can be very easily understood.

Mr. DEVLIN. Maybe so, but yet I do not understand it. I wish to say that two years ago this very clause was inserted in another Bill. This Parliament gave a charter to the Ottawa City Electric Railway and incorporated this clause in the Bill, and I cannot for the life of me see why this clause should be refused entrance into this Bill, which certainly, and for a great many and stronger reasons than could apply to the Ottawa company at the time it was chartered, may be considered a work for the general advantage of Canada. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) imagines that we are simply constructing a small piece of road in the province of Ontario. I wish him to understand that that is not the case. This electric road reaches from the town of Aylmer and, at the time of its completion, it will run into the city of Ottawa. Why should this Bill be singled out for the omission of this clause when a similar clause has been inserted in other Bills ? It is true, as my hon. friend says, that we have a charter from the province of Quebec. It is true we have a charter from the city of Hull and from other towns. But this work becomes one general work, consisting of one line from the town of Aylmer into the city of Ottawa, and for that line we ask a Dominion charter. Now, this Parliament two years ago gave a Dominion charter to the Ottawa Electric Company, and declared it a work for the general advantage of Canada. Why not do the same in this case ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) appreciates the point raised by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), a point that is well taken. The question is purely a question of drafting. It cannot be suggested in the spirit of opposition to any clause of the Bill, and is based upon the point that, as the Bill is to give rights to a company for connecting the two provinces, this clause is superfluous and would be very bad drafting from any point of view. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin), if he desires to press the Bill, will find that dropping this clause will in no sense prejudice the rights of this company. The hon. gentleman refers to the case of the Ottawa Electric Company. There may have been good reasons for inserting the clause in that case, for, speaking from memory, the company was not given powers to build between two provinces.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the clause, from any point of view, was quite unnecessary. This Parliament has undoubted jurisdiction—no one has contended to the contrary—over any application for powers to construct a railway between two provinces in Canada. I think my hon. friend should accept the suggestion of the Solicitor General and allow the clause to drop.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no desire to check or block the progress of this Bill. My suggestion to my hon. friend would be that the clause should be allowed to drop. Then I think he will find that every hon. member in the House will say that the remaining clauses will bring it within the scope of the federal power. But if such a clause is to be allowed to remain, I would suggest that we draft it in this way :

The undertaking of the Hull Electric Company, a company incorporated by chapter of the statutes of Quebec and hereinafter called the company, is hereby declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Then we take under the operation of the federal law the enterprise in its entirety, instead of leaving the portion in the province of Quebec under the operation of the local law. That is my desire. I offer the suggestion to my hon. friend in no spirit of hostility, but because, to a certain extent, I suppose, I should be held responsible for the drafting of the Bill if I said nothing about it. I took some trouble to look into the matter, and if you will consult the statutes, you will find that this clause has been incorporated in the Acts to incorporate the Montreal Island Belt Line, the Montreal Park Island Railway, the Shore Line and the South Shore Railway and others.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not say that the hon. gentleman was showing any hostility to my Bill, although I found it exceedingly strange that so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, these difficulties were discovered almost too late, even too late. The Bill might have become law, and would have become law, and none of these difficulties would have been known to the Department of Justice, because at the very sitting at which these clauses were to be considered, the Bill passed and we had no such suggestion. However, I never said that my hon. friend had shown hostility to the Bill. But in my anxiety to have the Bill put through, I will consent to the clause being dropped.

Section disagreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. CHARLTON. The Ottawa Electric Railway Company has certainly vested rights in this matter, in the matter of running tracks upon the streets of Ottawa, which would be infringed upon by the second section of the Bill. This second section, I see, provides that the corporation may, within the city of Ottawa, lay tracks and operate the line. The third section also makes a similar provision. By chap. 53 of 55-56 Victoria, of Canada, I find that the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company,

under the second section of the Act, received the following power :—

The company shall not take possession of, use, nor occupy the Union Bridge nor any of the approaches thereto without the assent of the Governor General in Council, but with such consent, the company may, upon such terms as the Governor in Council prescribes, use and occupy so much of the Union Bridge and of the approaches thereto as may be necessary for the railway of the company.

And further, it is provided in the contract between the city of Ottawa and the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company :

The corporation——

That is the corportation of the city of Ottawa——

—shall not, before the 13th day of August, A.D. 1898, grant authority to any company, private individual or firm to construct and operate a street railway in any other part of Ottawa, and in the event of any company, private individual or firm thereafter proposing to construct street railways on any of the streets of the city of Ottawa, including the streets mentioned in this agreement and not occupied by the companies, and the corporation determining that there shall be street railway service on such streets, the matter and substance of the proposal shall be notified to the companies, and the option of constructing such proposed railways on the conditions contained in this agreement shall be offered to the companies, but, if such option shall not be accepted by the companies within thirty days thereafter, or if the same having been accepted, the companies shall not proceed with the necessary work and complete the same within the time limited by the corporation, the corporation may grant the authority to any company (organized after the above date), and private individual or firm, and the corporation and its grantees shall be entitled to cross the lines of the said companies, &c.

Now, under the provisions of this agreement the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company have the exclusive right of laying down tracks upon the streets of Ottawa up to the 13th August, 1898.

Mr. DEVLIN. Over all the streets ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Over all the streets. But if the city corporation require further railway passenger facilities in the city by laying tracks over roads where tracks do not exist, the company, under the provisions of this agreement, shall have the privilege of the first chance of laying down those tracks. The company, under the provisions of this agreement, shall have the first chance of laying down those tracks, and if they fail, under certain provisions, to lay down such tracks, and to give the additional facilities which the city corporation requires, then their rights to lay such tracks shall be forfeited, and may be granted by the city to other railway companies under such conditions as may be decided upon.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that provided the present company build such lines in such streets as the city council proposes, the city is bound for thirty years to give it to this company, and to no other ?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the provision under the contract with the city of Ottawa. This Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company has exclusive rights until the 13th August, 1898. After that, the conditions are fixed by the 17th clause. Now we are proceeding under this Bill to infringe upon the rights that the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company exercise and possess under this contract with the city of Ottawa, and under the provisions of chapter 53, 55 and 56 Victoria.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Have you the provisions relating to that exclusive right ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. Now, I hold that in the matter of this electric street railway, while I have not the slightest desire to impede the operations of this company, I hold this House is dealing with a matter which pertains properly to the provincial legislatures of Quebec and Ontario ; and if we give this charter, we grant powers and exercise authority that come into conflict with the provisions already made and authority already exercised by the parties entitled to exercise them. We are interfering with the contract made by the city of Ottawa with the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company, we are interfering with the vested rights of the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company granted and guaranteed by virtue of this contract between the city of Ottawa and the Ottawa Electric Street Railway Company. The provisions I have read give to that railway company exclusive rights in streets of the city of Ottawa until the 13th August, 1898, and then gives them vested rights, if they comply with the conditions demanded by the city in giving such railway extension as is required. If the city says, Here is a street upon which we wish a railway track laid, and if the company complies with that request, then the company has the exclusive right to proceed with the work ; but in the event of their failing to exercise that right and failing to meet the wishes of the Ottawa city corporation, then the corporation may make arrangements with some other company for supplying the city with this service which the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company failed to give. Under these circumstances I do not believe this House is entitled to grant to this company further powers than to come to the Union Bridge or to cross the Union Bridge and touch the bounds of the city of Ottawa. Beyond the power of crossing the Union Bridge and reaching the confines of the city, we have no right, in my opinion, to go ; we have no right to grant this company power to lay down roads within the city. For these reasons I shall oppose this Bill unless its provisions are limit-

ed to the privilege of reaching the Union Bridge, and if it is desired, of crossing the Union Bridge to the city limits.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough) I do not think there is much in that, because the Bill provides that no work can be carried on by this company except with the consent of the city council, and approved by the Governor in Council. I can see many reasons why the passage of this Bill might be in the best interests of the city and of the company. If there was an infringement, the company could take action against the city. But I do not know that we should recognize in our legislation the fact that there is any agreement that will interfere with any other company competing with the Ottawa City Railway Company. I am sure any man who has passed over the Ottawa City Railway Company will say that there is no better service in Canada. But to argue that we should not pass an Act because there is a contract with another company, and that no other company can do the work in the city of Ottawa, is rather a strange thing to come from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I believe the provision that before anything is done it will have to be agreed to by both the city council and the Governor in Council, makes this a perfectly safe Bill. It is in the hands of the city themselves, and it is not likely the city are going to grant any privileges to the new company when they may be mulcted at any time in an action for damages for interfering with the other company. Suppose the present city railway ceases running altogether; then it would be well that there should be a charter with some other company who could come in. I can understand how both these companies might operate in the city to each other's advantage. There may be places where the Ottawa Street Railway Company may not want to build a line; then why not permit this other company to build a line there? It may be found that these two companies can operate together, one being the feeder of the other, having a system by which those who travel upon the new company's road may also have the privilege of travelling upon the other. But it would be dangerous to say that because there is a contract, no other company shall be allowed to operate, because I think such contract would be clearly in restraint of trade, and consequently illegal.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that if any council of the city of Ottawa was foolish enough to enter into an agreement giving a company a monopoly of the streets of Ottawa, and if a succeeding council should see it desirable to do way with such a monopoly, we should give them a right to do so. I am surprised to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) advocating this, because he, above all other men in this House, has always been opposed to monopolies, and this is clearly a monopoly of the right to the streets of Ottawa. Here is a railway that is pouring in trade from a section of country extending back seventy-five miles, and when it reaches the river it has no place to do its business. When it comes to the edge of the corporation, it cannot get into the city through the hoggishness of this other company; it cannot put freight down in the city, it cannot land its passengers in the city, and they have to be dropped down in the mud opposite the city; and the Ottawa City Railway Company controls the corporation of the city so far that they have not made an effort to reach a point where they could take charge of that traffic. The Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway is the only feeder of this line, in a commercial sense, and they want to put down freight and passengers near the centre of the city, and why should they not have the right to come in? Why should we maintain a monopoly that gives to a railway company control of the streets of this city, which company is not willing to provide accommodation for the public? It seems to me unreasonable that any council of the city of Ottawa should enter into an agreement with a corporation of that nature, and give them a practical monopoly for the length of time that is indicated in this Act. I think the sooner that monopoly is done away with, the better for the travelling public.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) speaks of the hoggishness of this company in desiring to retain the franchise and the privileges which pertain to it by contract, stipulation and agreement. The Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company gave up to the city a perpetual franchise over a portion of its line, in consideration of the privileges granted under this contract. To talk about monopoly in this case is absurd, because there is no city in this Dominion, I venture to say, that is served so efficiently by an electric railway as is the city of Ottawa. The Ottawa City Railway Company is a wide-awake corporation prepared to afford to the public all the advantages that can be reasonably asked for. It has secured from the city of Ottawa a contract, and it surrendered for that contract a perpetual franchise. It gave for that contract this franchise, and received the privilege which that contract contains, that it should have exclusive rights in this city until the 13th August, 1898. Then the city corporation of Ottawa provided and safeguarded its interests by the provision that if it indicated to this company that it wanted additional railway lines laid upon any street, the company should proceed at once to lay those lines according to the requisition.

If within a certain length of time, I think it is thirty days, the company did not proceed to lay down the lines as required by the city corporation, then the corporation had liberty to make arrangements with other companies, and to leave this company out of

consideration. We are dealing with a matter now that is not a question of monopoly. It is a question of carrying out with this Ottawa City Street Railway Company, the stipulations and agreements that were entered into, and giving to them that which they received as a quid pro quo for the concessions they made, for the franchises they abandoned, and for the measures they took to meet the wishes of the Ottawa city council. I hold that under all these circumstances, it would be an act of bad faith and an act of injustice on the part of this House to set aside the provisions of the contract, and to leave the Ottawa Street Railway unprotected in the rights they had purchased from the city, by surrendering franchises and other privileges. If the Hull Electric Railway Company is permitted to enter the confines of the city of Ottawa and to make connection with the Ottawa Street Railway, I venture to say that the public will be served just as well as if the Hull company were permitted to lay down its parallel lines in the streets, in competition with the Street Railway Company of this city. That condition of things might be injurious to both lines. It is the right of the Ottawa City Street Railway to enjoy the stipulations that are granted to it under its contract. I hold that if the Hull Electric Railway Company is permitted to cross the Union Bridge, and is permitted to make connection with the Ottawa Street Railway Company, we may rest satisfied, until we see whether the Ottawa Street Railway can afford necessary facilities for the traffic which the Hull Electric Company brings to it. These companies should be allies, and what would be for the benefit of the one would be for the benefit of the other. It will be in the interest of the Ottawa Street Railway Company to afford the Hull company all needed facilities for transacting its business, and it would unquestionably do so. We would not be doing anything to benefit the public interest by abrogating the provisions of this contract, and by taking from the Ottawa City Company that which belongs to it as a matter of right and a matter of law.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that the people of the city of Ottawa do not deem their street railway a monopoly, for I understand that the two representatives of the city in this House are opposed to the passage of this clause. More than that, I believe that the local member is strongly opposed to it, and the opinion of these three gentlemen who are representatives of the feeling of the city ought go a long way to show that the citizens of Ottaawa do not consider that the street railway is a monopoly. This company entered into a bargain some few years ago, with the city in good faith, and they would deem it a violation of that agreement if we,—without having any particular interest because it is a local matter—should take from them their power to govern their own city and to provide as they think proper the means of travel within their municipal limits. It is necessary to understand a few things about this question before we go further. It is argued by those in favour of the present Bill that there is a gap between one railway and the other. Well, Sir, that gap arises not by any action of the Ottawa Street Railway Company, but by the action of the Hull company. They leased from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that section of road between Hull and Aylmer, and under the lease they have actually cut out that section which is now called a gap. The traffic from Pontiac and the various centres of the county has been actually taken away from the patronage of the Ottawa Street Railway Company. The Ottawa company on the other hand are prepared to fill in that gap, and in fact they have already let a contract to that effect, so that they may meet all the demands of the travelling public. These two companies interviewed the late Government on the 18th of May last, asking permission to extend their road, one from the Hull side and the other from the Ottawa side, and after the Governor in Council considered the matter carefully, they passed an Order in Council in favour of the Ottawa company extending their line to a point adjacent to the other. All that was required was a plan of the new construction to be placed before the Minister of Public Works, and that plan was placed before and accepted by the Minister, and permission given to let the contract. The contract was let three days after permission was given, and on the 15th of November next, that gap will be closed and all the facilities formerly enjoyed by the people of Pontiac will be restored to them. There is another point in the matter. It is argued by those who know, probably better than I do, that there is no room on the Interprovincial bridge for the two railways, and that even if this legislation were passed influence would be brought to bear on the Government, from those on either side of the bridge, as to prevent the construction of this road. If you read the latter part of clause 2 you will find under it the Hull road will be permitted to come in and distribute its branch lines through the streets of the city. It reads :

> And may also extend its railway into the city of Ottawa and on, over and along the streets thereof, subject to the following proviso : that as regards so much of its line of railway as is or may be within the city of Ottawa, the company shall only exercise the powers conferred by this Act as to the location, construction and operation of its railway upon such streets, and upon such terms and conditions and for such periods as the council of the said city may approve by by-law.

Now, if that clause passed, and if I had my way, I would have inserted this proviso, which would protect the city company to a greater extent than it is protected now :

Approved of by by-law, ratified by the ratepayers of the city.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that sometimes strong influences are brought to bear upon councilmen to pass a by-law, and that large privileges and franchises might be given to a company by certain ulterior influences which might probably be brought to bear upon the members of the council. But if you broaden the franchise, that is rendered less likely to be accomplished at all, and, therefore, if the clause is passed, I think that the by-law approved by council, should be ratified by the ratepayers of the city before it would take effect. In that way it would be in the hands of the city ratepayers themselves. It must be remembered that the people of Ottawa are perfectly satisfied with the service given by their street railway company, and I must say that so far as my observation goes, this company gives a better service than any other in the province of Ontario. You will notice by their charter, that on the 13th of August, 1898, any extensions that may be required by the city council so as to provide for the convenience of the people must be carried out by the company, at rates agreed to between the company and the citizens. In past years the ratepayers of Ottawa have been perfectly satisfied with the arrangements and conditions existing. We must bear in mind that the question is not the same as if the representatives of this city had asked us, or if the ratepayers of the city had petitioned us to pass a law so as to prevent a monopoly which is in existence. If that were the case then it would be our duty to look into the matter very carefully But, as these things are not brought to bear upon Parliament by the city or by the representative men of the city, it is clear that there is perfectly good satisfaction given to the people of the city; and, therefore, I think Parliament should not interfere and allow another company to come in. In view of these facts—that the gap is to be closed up within a month and a half, that service is to be given equal to what was given by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that there is no application from the people of Ottawa for any improved facilities—I think we would be interfering prematurely to pass this provision. If, after a year or two, the people of Ottawa believe that the electric railway is not serving them properly, or doing justice to them, and they or their representatives come to Parliament and ask for the admittance of this new company, and the breaking down of the present monopoly, then, I think I would be perfectly justified in interfering: but until that time, I do not think we should pass this clause of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that the ratepayers of Ottawa are perfectly satisfied with the present arrangement. That is not my information. I have heard individual complaints from a number of people who are not satisfied, but are very anxious that this company should get the power asked for in this Bill. But even if the ratepayers were satisfied, are we to overlook the interests of the great travelling public?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). They have the same connection as before.

Mr. SPROULE. The connection they had before may have been unsatisfactory, but it was used in lieu of something better. Now we have the opportunity of providing better facilities, and we should not overlook the rights of the great travelling public who are accommodated by this railway for 75 miles back, in bringing their produce into the city of Ottawa. When the interests of the travelling public demand it, a monopoly should not longer exist. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that this is not a monopoly. I would like to know what a monopoly is. He argues that the Ottawa company should have the exclusive right to build railway lines on the streets of Ottawa. If an exclusive right is not a monopoly, I do not know what a monopoly is. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald) says the Ottawa company is prepared to fill in the gap. If they do, the public would still have to transfer from one railway to the other, and pay two railway fares.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Ottawa Electric Railway Company are perfectly willing that the other company should have the privilege of coming to the boundary, where it goes already. Certainly, there would be a transfer, just as there was from the Canadian Pacific Railway before. Goods coming from Aylmer, Pontiac, Shawville and other places, had to be transferred at the Canadian Pacific Railway station and delivered in the city; and that is what would occur at the bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. That is just the trouble. The Ottawa company will allow passengers and freight to be dumped down at the boundary, instead of coming into the centre of the city. Why has the Ottawa, Parry Sound and Arnprior Railway Company, at great expense, brought its station into the midst of the city of Ottawa? For the convenience of the travelling public. And for the same reason this railway wants to get an entrance into the city, where it may discharge its passengers and carry its freight to the market where it is sold. It is no argument to say that the public have the same convenience as they had before. Perhaps the public had not sufficient convenience before. It is plain they had not. But, if this company get the right they ask for, they are prepared to give to the public better convenience, and they should be given that right. The hon. gentleman says the members for Ottawa are against the giving of this right. Well, it sometimes happens that members for a city do not represent

the views of the people of the city, and I question very much in this instance, from what I am told privately, whether the members for Ottawa do represent the views of the people of Ottawa, if they deny the rights of this company to come into the city. It is very important to the trade of the city that that right should be given, and it is very important to the travelling public to be able to come in over one railway, instead of over two. It think it is necessary that we should give that convenience, because the interests of the great travelling public demand it; and, when that is the case, public sentiment will reach the stage at some time when the power will be taken from any company that controls any place, so far as to become a monopoly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman advocate that, if the Ottawa Railway Company has, by contract and for good consideration, obtained from the city of Ottawa the exclusive right to the use of the streets, we should take it away from them?

Mr. SPROULE. I advocate this, on the same principle that we took away the monopoly right from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, because public sentiment got so strong that we had to do it.

Mr. McCARTHY. We had to pay for it.

Mr. SPROULE. In a measure. We gave them a consideration. But I say that, if we were foolish enough to give a monopoly to any company, and it was found afterwards to work to the detriment of the public to a great extent, we would be justified in abolishing it. But I object to any city council which is elected for only one year, entering into an agreement with a company to give away the rights of the people for thirty-three years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask if the Minister of Railways has gone over this Bill. As one member of the committee, I would like to know his opinion in regard to the merits of the dispute between these two corporations, and what his suggestion would be to the committee, as Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I had not the opportunity of hearing the discussion which took place on this Bill at the Railway Committee, as I was attending a meeting of the Privy Council at the time. All I have heard on the subject has been what I have been able to catch since this discussion has been going on. Some new light, I think, has been thrown on the matter, but I have not yet formed an opinion to suggest to the committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The reason I ask is, that I suppose the usual course has been taken of having a report made to the hon. gentleman by his officers. That was the practice heretofore with regard to railway Bills, private and public; but, I suppose, in this case that has been overlooked.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have taken note of some of the objections offered to this Bill, and I may say at once frankly that most of these objections were put before the Railway Committee, and answered there; and the Bill as it now stands, with the exception of this clause which the committee has just dropped, came before this House, as we supposed, ready to receive its sanction. I am asked why we should come to this Parliament and ask for a Dominion charter. That objection was put by the hon. gentleman who resumed his seat a few moments ago, although he knows perfectly well that there is no other Parliament in this country to which we can properly apply for a charter except the Dominion Parliament. The charter given the Canadian Pacific Railway was given by this Parliament. A part of the road belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway has been handed over to the Hull Electric Railway, a lease has been passed, and they have to come to this Parliament and ask for a confirmation of that lease, as otherwise it is of no value. That is one of the reasons which induced us to come to this House. Again, it is a railway connecting both provinces, and it is quite reasonable that we should apply to the Dominion Parliament for a charter. Now, this road is spoken of as a small street railway. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) knows well that it is not an ordinary street railway. It is perhaps the finest railway of its kind on the continent, and a large amount of money has been invested in it. It connects the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway with the city of Ottawa, and with the Canadian Pacific Railway, Canada Atlantic and other lines. So that instead of this being a small street railway, it is the starting point and principal portion of a road some ninety miles long. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, starting from a northern point in the county of Pontiac, brings its passengers and freight and supplies into the town of Aylmer, where they are transferred to this Hull Electric Railway, and by it brought into the city of Ottawa—at least not into the city of Ottawa, for it stops in the city of Hull at a corner. It has no station there, and its passengers are obliged to get off and walk across to suit the convenience of the Ottawa Electric Railway. Why is it that a railway of this importance, having a large amount of capital invested in it, with all the characters of a large steam railway, except that it is moved by electrical power, should be the only one to be refused an entrance into the Capital, and that simply to please the Ottawa Electric Railway. There is not a man in this House who will say that the business community of Ottawa want the entrance to the city refused to this line. It is in the interest of every business man

in this city that this road, laden with freight and passengers, from the large county of Pontiac, should be allowed into this city. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said that the Ottawa Electric Railway has exclusive right to the streets of Ottawa.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I said if it has. I do not know what it has—I do not know anything about it.

Mr. DEVLIN. I venture the statement that it has not. It has the exclusive right only to those streets through which it runs. We are quite willing to leave it to the streets on which it runs, and find some back way, if possible, on which it does not run, by which we can get to a point where we can land our passengers and freight and build our station. Bear in mind, Sir, that this is a road which carries an immense quantity of passengers and freight. Millions of feet of lumber are carried over it. It is a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of which it was said that it was the most paying branch of the entire system, on account of the passengers and the freight it carried; yet to-day we must be told, to please the Ottawa Electric Railway Company and nobody else, that we must stop over there at that little corner in Hull and not come into the Capital of Canada, our entrance into which would be of great advantage to all the business interests in this city. I answered all these objections in the committee. To please the members of that committee, I dropped sixteen clauses of the Bill. The lawyers representing the various interests met together and came to an understanding to agree to this Bill as it was this afternoon, when we opened the proceedings of the House. It was agreed upon and reported to the House, and now fresh objections are made. I consented, a moment ago, to a proposal made by the hon. Solicitor General that a certain clause should be left out, and the House was under the impression that the Bill would then safely go through. Hardly, however, was that amendment settled than a serious objection was formulated to clause 2, and I venture to say that if I were to drop this clause also, we would have objections to every other line in every other clause. In the interests of the county I represent, a county which is largely served by this Bill, and which demands entrance into this Capital, I ask that the doors of the Capital shall not be declared closed against us by the Dominion Parliament. We want to invade no rights of the Ottawa Street Railway. These rights are protected, in the strongest possible way, by this very clause 2. I have personally no interest in the road. Far from it, it is a road that used all its influence against me day and night, and influences of the strongest character, but out of regard for the interests of the county of Pontiac, I ask that this clause be adopted and shall insist on a vote.

Mr. LOUNT. There is a strong objection urged by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) against this Bill, namely, that an exclusive privilege was given by the Ontario legislature to the Ottawa Electric Railway Company. It is contended by the promoter of this Bill that there is no such exclusive privilege. I have not been able to read the Act with care, but the best consideration I can give it leads me to the belief that probably an exclusive right has been granted by the Ontario legislature. However, that is a question perhaps for the determination of the courts, but still we should avoid a reference to the courts if possible. It occurs to me that we should endeavour, as far as possible, to escape what is claimed to be a monopoly which has been granted to the Ottawa Street Railway. All monopolies are objectionable, and I consider that the Ontario legislature, in giving this exclusive right—if such right has been granted—went in the wrong direction, and, as far as I am personally concerned, as a member of the committee, I would endeavour to find a way out of the difficulty. It occurs to me that there is a way to grant the passage of this clause, without infringing upon the exclusive privilege given by the Ontario Act to the Ottawa Street Railway Company, if such exclusive privilege was given. This second clause, which is now objected to, has this provision:

> The company shall only exercise the power conferred by this Act as to location, construction and operation of the railway upon such streets and such terms and conditions and for such period as the council of the city may approve of by by-law.

The Act, which was read by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), declares that this exclusive privilege is granted to the Ottawa Street Railway until August, 1898.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the Ottawa Electric Railwas is run under an Ontario charter?

Mr. LOUNT. So I understood.

Mr. DEVLIN. A Dominion charter, too.

Mr. HAGGART. Has it a double charter the same as this proposed one?

Mr. DEVLIN. It has its local charter, and then it came to this Parliament and got a charter.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I understand it in this way—that the old horse cars company had a charter from the late provinces of Canada, having obtained the charter in 1866. When they took over that company, the electric company had to get a change in that charter in order to enable them to apply electric power instead of horse power; and it was decided by their solicitor that the local legislature had not power to amend that charter of 1866, and therefore they came to the Dominion Parliament to have it

amended to enable them to use electricity as a motive power instead of horses. That is what my hon. friend refers to as a Dominion charter.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend knows that it has a Dominion charter, and the very second clause of that charter declares that this company's railway is a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. LOUNT. However the charter may be, the proposition we are now considering is the advisability of passing this clause. The question appears to be one arising out of the fact that one side contends that a franchise has been granted to the Ottawa Electric Company governing all the streets of Ottawa, and the other side contends that it is not so. I am adverse to all monopolies that would grant to any company exclusive rights in any city. I am further in favour of opening, as far as possible, the right to other companies to enter the city of Ottawa. I think it is largely against the interests of the people of Ottawa, especially against the interest of a railway of the character described that it should not have the opportunity to enter this city and give to the people the advantages that must necessarily attend such an enterprise. If the clause read by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has the construction placed upon it that it is exclusively the right of the Ottawa Electric Railway Company to cover the whole streets of the city, then this clause becomes inoperative; it cannot be put into force, because in my humble judgment, the corporation of the city of Ottawa cannot be compelled to permit any railway enterprise to go upon their streets other than the Ottawa Electric Company. But, while the corporation may not be compelled to do that, if this charter is granted to this railway company exclusively, right is not given to them, but they get the advantage they seek for by this Bill. They have not the right to enter, as the corporation can reject, still it is granting a privilege which will be of very great use to this company in this direction:—Assume the possibility, and it is a reasonable possibility, because railway companies anticipate the Act of a legislature, that the Ottawa Electric Company will be perfectly willing if the charter is granted, to make arrangements with the company by which they can operate upon certain of the streets of Ottawa, then when you grant the charter that arrangement can be carried out, and no harm is done to the electric company by granting what is asked and a great deal of benefit may be given to the people of the city. Therefore I am in favour of granting it.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one point I would like to understand before being called upon to vote for or against this clause. I am not opposed to the Bill. It appears that under the charter of the Street Railway Company, the city of Ottawa has the right, at the end of thirty years from the passage of that charter, to become the absolute owner of all plant and franchise of the company. About four years of its time has expired, so that this charter has still about twenty-five or twenty-six years to run. If we pass the charter now asked for and this company, by influences exercised upon the aldermen of the city, secure the right to build lines along certain streets, you will then place the city of Ottawa in the position that it will be deprived of the opportunity to take advantage of the right given it in other cases to take over street railways operated in the city. The city would thus be prevented from making an arrangement such as that which has been made in Toronto, under which the street railway contributes to the revenues of the city a proportion of its daily receipts. Now, when Ottawa becomes an important city, as I have no doubt it will, they will expect to receive a contribution from their street railway just as they do in Toronto. The question is, if you grant this privilege that is now asked by this company, and the company, by the exercise of proper or improper influences upon city aldermen, secure by-laws authorizing them to make roads which would not come within the agreement between the city and the Ottawa company, the advantage of that agreement will be practically destroyed. I do not think we should legislate in that direction.

Mr. CAMERON. That is already provided for. It says: "On such terms and conditions as the city may impose."

Mr. McMULLEN. It does not cover the point I referred to. Suppose that the by-laws are secured by means of influences brought to bear upon the aldermen?

Mr. DEVLIN. That is the city's business.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think a suggestion might be made which would overcome some, if not all, the difficulties which have been urged by gentlemen who are opposed to this section and which I think would offer all the protection that could be asked by those who are interested in the Ottawa Street Railway. I would propose that all the words after the word "thereof" in section 2 of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:—

To the city of Ottawa and to such point therein as the council of the said city may declare reasonably necessary and suitable for the location of the terminus of the company's line of railway in the said city, and making such regulations and doing all such things as are necessary for such purpose.

Now, I think there could be no question at all on the part of members of the committee who are opposing this Bill, to entrusting to the council of the city the exercise of the power and of the discretion which is contemplated by this amendment.

On the other hand, the company could claim no greater right than the right to enter the city and find a suitable terminus. That, I think, ought to be conceded to the applicants. I do not know any reason why you should confine their entrance to the city just at that point where they may enter the city after crossing the bridge. We should allow them to seek the most fitting place they can find for the purpose of a terminus. Now, as to whether such place is found, or as to whether they propose a suitable locality, that must rest in the discretion of somebody, and I think the city council would be the safest parties to whom to entrust the responsibility of deciding that question. I would propose, therefore, an amendment to clause 2, adding after the word "thereof," in the sixth line. the following words :—

Into the city of Ottawa, and to such point therein as the council of the said city may by by-law declare necessary and suitable for the location of the terminus of the company's line of railway in the said city, and may make whatever connection and do all such things as are necessary for such purpose.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will accept that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I infer from the remarks made by the promoter of the Bill that his road proposes to go over the Union Bridge. Now I want to know if it is intended to give permission to this road to go over the same track which is used by the Ottawa Electric Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Governor in Council will determine that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assume that is the intention, and I would like to know whether there is room for the two tracks. If that is the case, it strikes me it would be a serious objection to this portion of the Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN. I understand my hon. friend wants to know if we would have running powers over this bridge, and also whether there is room for a double track. At the present time, over the large bridge, there is a double track used by the Ottawa Electric Railway, that double track terminates the moment the bridge is crossed. I do not think a double track, or even a single track, would be permitted over the stone bridge; I myself would be sorry to see even a single track over the stone bridge. At present there is simply room for the ordinary traffic, and scarcely room for that. I am in hopes some day that the Dominion Government will construct a decent bridge there, and I am going to press for that. But as matters stand at present, the bridge is so imperfect that I would not be willing to have even a single track constructed over it.

Mr. FOSTER. In addition to that, if I understand the Order in Council aright which now governs the present Ottawa Passenger Railway, it has recently received from the Government, under Order in Council, as authorized by the Act of 1892, the right to put a track across to the city of Hull, and under that proposal the present Minister of Public Works has already approved of the plans.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But who owns the track ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that—on which they have given a contract, which contract is now in process of fulfilment ; so that by the middle of November, as I am informed, the Ottawa Passenger Railway will have its structure completed, and will make its entrance into Hull, and make a connection. But that is not over the stone bridge.

Mr. McCARTHY. Where is the stone bridge ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is on the Hull side ? I quite agree with my hon. friend, and the Government was of the same opinion when they passed the Order in Council, that the track of the Passenger Railway was not to pass over the bridge, but they were to build a side structure, and build it so that if the Government wishes to utilize it to widen the roadway across the bridge, it should be capable of being used for that purpose. So that under this if the Government were of the same opinion, they could only allow this company to come in in one of two ways : either by making an arrangement with this Ottawa Passenger Railway Company, which builds the structure itself, and which, as I understand it, owns it only so far that the Government has the right to use it in making the general roadway wider. It would have to do it under an arrangement with that company, or authorize another side track, either on the other side of the bridge or on this side of the bridge, over which the rails could be laid. The amendment of the Minister of Railways meets exactly the view I stated here on Friday night. I said : I thought the Hull Electric road ought to be allowed to unload its passengers and its freight in the city of Ottawa, and to that end ought to be given an entrance to the city ; but I did not think, under the contract which has been made with, and the franchises which have been paid for, by the Ottawa Passenger Railway, that we ought now to interject an element of contention and rivalry, by investing another road with powers to go over the streets of Ottawa. I objected to that, but I was entirely in favour of having this company get the right to unload its passengers and freight at a terminus in the city of Ottawa. This amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) meets with my view ; I am entirely in favour of it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I merely rise to ask the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) for some information. I understand that about a month ago the representatives of both companies met, and mutually agreed that the Ottawa Electric Company should extend its line to the square at Hull adjoining the Hull Company's tracks, and that a union station should then be erected for the accommodation and exchange of passengers and of traffic. I fully agree with hon. gentlemen who have advocated the necessity of giving the travelling public every facility, and, if such an agreement as I refer to has been entered into, it was for the purpose of realizing that very laudable object. Now, as I am also informed, under that agreement, the Ottawa Electric Railway Company gave a contract to the Bridge Company for the purpose of building the necessary works.

Mr. DEVLIN. May I ask my hon. friend when that contract was given?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am told that the Ottawa Company gave a contract to the Dominion Bridge Company three days after this agreement was entered into. Of course, I am merely giving the information which was conveyed to me, and I am asking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) for information. To my mind, Sir, this is a Bill upon which a policy should be declared by the Government, and for this reason. On the 13th of May, 1896, an Order in Council was passed and approved of, which contains the following :—

That the company having received the permission to use the Union Bridge, they laid tracks on it, and that the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company having obtained a federal charter, wherein is explicitly granted the privilege they now ask, under certain conditions ; there can be no doubt that they are entitled to be granted the privilege in preference to the Hull Electric Railway Company, under whatever conditions the Government may prescribe.

Now, if the Order in Council states that the Ottawa Electric Company ought, in preference to the other company, obtain the privileges which they ask, it seems to me that the Bill, as introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin), is a contradiction to the policy enunciated in that Order in Council, and hence, if there is to be a change in that Order in Council, which had the authority of the Governor General, then, the Government should declare their policy as to what the change is to be. As far as I can judge of the privileges accorded to the Ottawa Electric Street Railway Company, they have, during the term of their agreement with the corporation, the privilege of running their lines in the streets which have been assigned, and, moreover, if the Ottawa city corporation in their wisdom consider that the system should be extended to other streets, then the Ottawa Electric Railway are bound to build their lines on these streets. Ample provisions have been made in the agreement between the city corporation and the Ottawa Electric Railway Company to meet all the requirements of the public. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has spoken of a monopoly. Well, Sir, monopolies are certainly very bad things to introduce into any city or any country ; but hon. gentlemen must recollect that, previous to the enterprise of the Ottawa Company, the city was served by a horse-car railway, and the promoters of the Electric Street Railway Company had to invest considerable capital and to take certain risks on their investment. They have given to this city a service which, so far as my experience goes, is unequalled by any other in the Dominion. To-day, after this agreement has been signed and sealed by the municipal corporation on one side, and by the Electric Street Railway Company on the other, it is all very well to say that this company have got too extensive privileges, and that they should be curtailed. In my opinion, the time to discuss what kind of privileges should be granted to the company, was before that contract was entered into between the company and the city council. You have in question here, vested rights, which, under every possible system of law, are and should be protected. If you take these rights away by legislation, you can only do so by indemnifying the company which loses by the action of the legislature. The fact of the Ottawa Company undertaking to connect their lines with the Hull Electric Company and agreeing to build a union station for the interchange of traffic, goes far enough to protect the interests of the public and the requirements of traffic between the city of Hull and the city of Ottawa, as well as the counties and districts which my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) claims to be served by the Hull Electric Railway Company.

Mr. LANGELIER. I was not in the Railway Committee when this Bill was considered, and I may be mistaken as to the meaning of clause 2, but, if it has the meaning which I deduce from it, it constitutes a very serious departure from the practice which has always been followed by the Railway Committee and by this House in connection with Bills of this kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) see the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways ?

Mr. LANGELIER. That does not bear on the point I wish to allude to. I will not enter into the squabbles between these railway companies ; I am speaking simply in the interest of the public, and, if I am not mistaken, this would be a serious departure from the practice which has always been followed by the Railway Committee and by this House. It has been the uniform practice of that committee, since I have been a member of the same,

that is to say, for a good number of years, never to grant to a street railway company the power to enter into a city and pass over its streets, without the approval and consent of the city council of that city. There was a very great fight on that point before the Railway Committee two years ago in connection with the Bill to give a Dominion charter to the Montreal Belt Line Railway. That company had been incorporated by the legislature of Quebec, from which they obtained power to go into the city of Montreal, with the consent of the city council of Montreal. They had obtained such consent from the city council. They then, for some reason, came to this Parliament to obtain a Dominion charter. They wanted to get the sanction of the Dominion to their local charter, and to retain the power they had already obtained from the city council of Montreal to go into the city. Their Bill was drafted in such a way that, if it was passed in its then shape, it would have given the company power to go into the city of Montreal, whether the city council of Montreal wanted it or not. All the discretion which was left to the city council of Montreal was to locate the streets upon which the railway might pass; but it was not at liberty to prevent the railway coming into the city. That was struck out by the Railway Committee. The committee decided, I think unanimously, that the company should obtain the consent of the city council of Montreal, although they already had it under their local charter. This shows how careful the Railway Committee has always been never to grant power to a street railway company to pass over the streets of a city without the consent of the council of that city. Well, as I read section 2 of this Bill—I would like to have the point explained to me by my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) if I am mistaken—the city council of Ottawa would have no power at all to refuse this company the right to come into the city. The Hull Street Railway Company would have power to come into the city of Ottawa whether the city council of Ottawa wanted it or not. The only power reserved to the city council of Ottawa would be to determine the particular streets over which it might pass. If that is the intention of the promoters of the Bill, to carry their railway over the streets of Ottawa without the consent of the city council, I would be compelled to vote against that, in pursuance of the course we have always followed in every case in which that question has come before the Railway Committee or before this House.

Mr. DEVLIN. In answer to my hon. friend, I may say at once, that we do ask full power to come into the city of Ottawa, just as any other railway company has the right to ask power to come into the city.

Mr. LANGELIER. Without the consent of the city council of Ottawa?

Mr. DEVLIN. We would be very sorry indeed to put ourselves in such a position that the city council could refuse us its assent to come into the city. We think we have a right to ask for power to come into the city of Ottawa, and the proper body to grant us that power is the Dominion Parliament. With regard to the objection of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), I can say that there never was such an agreement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I yield to no member in this House in my desire to see the section represented by my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) served, and properly served, by railway facilities; and I realize the great advantages to the city of Ottawa to be derived from connection with that section of country north of the city. But I am not able to reconcile the desire I have to see my hon. friend's constituents served in this matter, with my sense of justice as to the carrying out of contracts which are existing and binding. I shall not vote in this committee for the passing of a measure which shall override the rights of any corporation which has rights guaranteed to it by a contract which is still valid and binding. This Ottawa Passenger Railway Company was incorporated first in the year 1868, by the legislature of Ontario. It was again incorporated by the legislature of Ontario in 1892. It was incorporated by the Dominion Parliament in the same year. As I said before, this railway company surrendered a perpetual charter, in consideration of which it received certain privileges from the city of Ottawa. We want to consider what those privileges were; this is the keynote of the whole situation. What contract exists between the city of Ottawa and the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company? Under what circumstances was this contract made? Did the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company surrender franchises and give a quid pro quo for this contract? Is this contract still in existence? These are matters which I am bound to consider; and my vote on this measure will be governed by the state of these questions between this railway company and the city corporation. Mark you, the city of Ottawa has not asked for this measure; it is no party to it. The representatives of the city of Ottawa are opposed to this measure. The representative of the city of Ottawa in the legislative assembly of Ontario is opposed to it. So far as we know, this measure is very seriously opposed in this city. These are considerations which have very great weight with me. Now, what are the conditions of this contract between the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company and the city of Ottawa? I again refer to the provision. Section 17 of that contract provides as follows:—

The corporation shall not, before the 13th day of August, A.D. 1898, grant authority to any company, private individual or firm to construct

and operate a street railway in any part of Ottawa, and in the event of any company, private individual or firm thereafter proposing to construct street railways on any of the streets of the city of Ottawa, including the streets mentioned in this agreement and not occupied by the companies, and the corporation determining that there should be street railway service on such streets, the matter and substance of the proposal shall be notified to the compaines and the option of constructing such proposed railway on the conditions contained in this agreement shall be offered to the companies, but, if such option shall not be accepted by the companies within thirty days thereafter, or if the same having been accepted, the companies shall not proceed with the necessary works and complete the same within the time limited by the corporation, the corporation may grant the authority to any company (organized after the above date), private individual or firm, and the corporation and its grantees shall be entitled to cross the lines of the said railway companies with such railways as are authorized by this clause.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). How does the amendment of the Minister of Railways conflict with these powers ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall proceed to show you in a few minutes. By this agreement, the Ottawa Street Railway Company has the exclusive right to build railway lines within the corporate limits of the city of Ottawa until the 13th August, 1898, and any provision that allows the Hull Electric Company to enter the city of Ottawa and to use any street in that city conflicts with this provision.

Mr. HAGGART. What reference is there in the Act to that agreement ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that there is any. I do not know that it is necessary there should be any. All that is necessary for me to know is that the Ottawa Street Railway Company surrendered a perpetual charter, and one of the conditions of the surrender of that franchise was the agreement entered into between the city of Ottawa and that railway company, and I hold that this Parliament is bound to protect the interests of the Ottawa Street Railway Company in that matter because it has paid valuable consideration for the rights that are granted in this agreement. The city of Ottawa is as much interested in this matter as the counties of Ottawa or Pontiac or Wright. The city of Ottawa has made no request that the powers asked for in this charter be granted. It apparently is perfectly well satisfied with the service given it by the Ottawa Street Railway, and it has every reason to be satisfied with that service. The city of Ottawa opposes this measure through its representatives in this House and in the local legislature. It has been stated by my hon. friend that this road will be compelled to bring its passengers down and dump them in the road in Hull. Well, the Ottawa Street Railway Company are building a line to connect with this Hull railway and are to build a passenger depot for the purpose of exchanging traffic with that line. There can be no question but that the Ottawa Railway Company is willing to make any reasonable arrangements with this Hull line for the forwarding of its freight and passengers to Ottawa. Representations have been held out that no such agreement is contemplated. But whether there be an agreement or not—my hon. friend says there is not—the Ottawa Street Railway Company are evidently proceeding on the assumption that there is one, and are building an extension and propose to build a union station, which will afford all the facilities necessary for the transfer of passengers and freight from the Hull Street Railway to the city of Ottawa.

Mr. LOUNT. What invasion of the rights of the Ottawa Electric Railway is done by simply giving the Hull company the right to cross the river and the terminal point ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Ottawa City Railway Passenger Company, under the provisions of the Act of 1892, have the following powers and privileges with reference to the crossing of the bridge :—

> The company shall not take possession of, use or occupy the Union Bridge, or any of the approaches thereto, without the consent of the Governor in Council, but with such consent the company may, on such terms as the Governor in Council prescribes, use and occupy so much of the Union Bridge and the approaches thereto as may be necessary for the railway company.

Under the provisions of that section the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company have, by Order in Council, the possession of that Union Bridge.

Mr. LOUNT. Nobody takes it from them.

Mr. CHARLTON. If this charter becomes law, the Hull Electric Railway Company will take it from them. There is no room on that bridge for both corporations.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They may have running powers.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not necessary to give them running powers so long as the Ottawa Street Railway Company, under its charter, crosses that bridge and furnished all the facilities necessary for the interchange of traffic.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman promised to answer how, in the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways, the exclusive rights of the Ottawa Railway Company to run its trains through the streets of Ottawa are affected.

Mr. CHARLTON. City councils sometimes do rather curious things, and arrangements may be secured from the city council which were not contemplated at the outset. Under the amendment of the hon. Minister of Railways, it might be possible that this road

would get power to get a long way into the city. It might get powers very important to itself and detrimental to the Ottawa Street Railway Company. If the amendment is to be accepted, I would ask to append to it a few additional words, providing that the Hull Electric Railway should not be permitted to collect any fares within the city of Ottawa.

Mr. LOUNT. What fares can be collected? The railway terminates at the boundary of the city of Ottawa, on the Ottawa side of the river. There can be no fares collected at the terminal point.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not proposed to make it terminate at the boundary of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. LOUNT. A reasonable construction must be put on the amendment of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say, at all events, admit the connection between these two roads at the Union Station in the city of Hull, with an extension made by the Ottawa Street Railway Company to that station and the offering of necessary facilities at that point for the interchange of traffic, and that will remove all the qualms I feel over the stipulations between the city of Ottawa and the Ottawa Street Railway Company. If that view of the case is not accepted by the committee, I shall urge the adoption of a safeguard, that the Hull Electric Railway shall not be empowered to collect fares for service in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I understand from this amendment that the point for the erection of the company's station will depend wholly and entirely on the city council, and I think that that is fair. The council will determine the point, and of course a practical and sensible man will know that a certain amount of land is requisite, and if they cross the bridge at all they have to proceed until they get the requisite amount of land on which to build, and, therefore, the security of the city and the railway is placed in the hands of the city council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would propose the addition of some further words at the end of the section, and I do so because I think the point made by my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Morrison) has been very well taken. I would call attention to the fact that there is no provision whereby the company would be entitled to cross this bridge. I think that is clear, and I suggest that these words be added:

And the said company, in crossing over the said bridge, subject to the approval and upon such terms as the Governor in Council prescribes, has the right to connect with and may exercise running powers over the line or lines of railways upon said bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know exactly what that means. It surely does not mean that we arbitrarily give them the right to run over the tracks of the City Passenger Railway, but that they have the right to do so subject to agreement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. If that is not the idea, I think quite a new element is introduced. I was quite willing to accept the first amendment, but I would like to have the sense of the committee on the amendment first, as this materially varies the effect of it. A member may quite fairly say that he is in favour of the first but not in favour of this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman is in favour of the first and if the facts as stated to us are correct, he must necessarily favour the second.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because there is no room for another line across the bridge. When you give a theoretical power to cross which cannot practically be exercised, you merely play with the question. If you give the power to run over the bridge, you must give that power over the existing line of road, because there is no room for another.

Mr. McCARTHY. But I do not see why they should not pay some reasonable compensation for that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This provides that the crossing shall be upon such terms as the Governor in Council may prescribe.

Mr. McCARTHY. That, then, leaves the whole question with the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. There ought to be reasonable compensation provided.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I presume that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council could settle that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would come within the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. In any case, they have the right to allow running powers over railway lines on such terms as to them seem reasonable.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is already provided under the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have to confer upon the Governor General in Council, or upon the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, the power to determine the terms upon which it is to be exercised.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, if it is understood that there is to be a compensation.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the compensation hardly amounts to anything. They have the power to lay rails on what is public property. If the other company acquire the right to use the rails the compensation would, surely, be merely nominal.

Mr. FOSTER. But in order to get their rails down, this company is building a very expensive bridge at their own cost. And after they have spent thousands of dollars to build that bridge, you give another company the right to run over it and say nothing about compensation.

Mr. DEVLIN. Where is that bridge ?

Mr. FOSTER. That bridge is going to be partly in the air——

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend knows there is no such thing in existence.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's hon. friend does not know any such thing. He knows that he has been told by responsible parties that the contract is let for the work, to be finished on the 15th November, and that the material is nearly all bought and paid for.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend is speaking of a private bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. And this bridge the railway must cross in order to reach the Union Bridge.

Mr. DEVLIN. Of course, the Government have the best knowledge of this matter. I do not know whether the Government have given the Ottawa Electric Company the rights to construct such a bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. It is already provided for by Order in Council, and the plans have been approved by the present Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. This speaks of the Union Bridge and speaks of it always as "the" bridge.

Mr. BELCOURT. I rise to say a few words in support of the amendment suggested by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). But before doing so, I wish to say that while this Bill was before the committee of the House I was charged outside and inside the House with obstructing arbitrarily the passage of this Bill. Personally I have no objection to the Bill, and I quite agree with the expressions of opinion I have heard that the Hull Electric Railway Company should have some means of depositing its passengers in the city of Ottawa, and, so far as I am concerned, I am in favour of allowing them such powers as will enable them to deposit their passengers in the city of Ottawa, and not in the mud, as the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) has told us. In taking the part I have taken in discussing the Bill, I have sought to protect the interests of a large number of my constituents in the city of Ottawa, who, I consider, have acquired vested rights sanctioned by the city council of Ottawa, by the legislature of Ontario and by this Parliament. I have tried simply to protect the rights for which they have given consideration and large concessions. I think that, with reference to a particular amendment now before the Chair, the words "with compensation to the Ottawa Electric Railway Company," or some such words, should be added ; because these people have gone to great expense in laying tracks on this bridge, and in providing for tracks to be laid from the bridge to join the other company in Hull. Now, I will read to the committee the Order in Council in question under which the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company has had plans made, and has given out a contract for the erection of the work required. The Order in Council is dated 13th May, 1896, and reads as follows:—

On a report dated 30th April, 1896, from the Minister of Public Works, stating that the Ottawa Electric Railway Company have asked the Department of Public Works for permission to extend their track from the bridge over the Ottawa River at the Chaudière into the city of Hull, either by using the present roadway or by using the right of way over the reserves and waterways adjoining said roadway.

That the Chief Engineer, to whom this matter was referred, states it is out of the question to grant the company permission to use the present roadway owing to its narrowness, but that there cannot be any objection to permitting them to lay their tracks in the position shown by a dotted line on the plan hereto attached, on the condition that they will agree to lay at points "B" and "B" where the tracks will cross the roadway, a permanent pavement between the tracks and at least two feet outside of the outer rails in such a way that the surface of their rails shall not project more than a half inch above the pavement, the pavement itself being always kept at the level of the roadway. The Chief Engineer further states that the company also ask for permission to lay a track on the ten foot reserve on the north side of the slide channel, and as this reserve is not used in connection with the working of the slide, there cannot be any objection to granting the company the permission they ask for.

The Minister further stated that the Department of Public Works is of opinion that it would be advisable that the ten foot reserve referred to, be only leased to the said company for a yearly nominal sum, as it is not known for a certainty whether in the near or distant future, the said reserve may be required, and that in return for the privilege to be granted to the company to extend their line as aforesaid, the company should agree that the erection which will carry their railway on the side of the causeway which the Department of Public Works may have to do in the future.

And I invite the attention of the committee to that.

The Minister further states that an application has also been made by the Hull Electric Company for a right of way upon the Government road in that city, from the Suspension

bridge, northward to Main Street, and failing that, they ask for the privilege of constructing a bridge on the east side of the road, the company stating at the time that they hold from the city of Hull an exclusive franchise to run an electric road over all its streets.

The Minister further states that the Hull Electric Company was incorporated by an Act passed by the legislature of the province of Quebec, under chapter 59 of 58 Vic., 1895, the company being granted the power to construct tramways in any point or points of the city of Hull, town of Aylmer, and village of Gatineau Point, in and between such city, town or village.

The Minister further states that the Ottawa Electric Railway Company, as the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company, obtained a statute from the Parliament of Canada in the year 1892, being chapter 53 of 55-56 Victoria. In the first clause of the Act it is enacted that the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company may extend, construct, maintain and complete an iron railway from and communicating with the end of its present line of railway, at or near the Union bridge, thence subject to the provision hereinafter set forth, across the said Union bridge and over, along and upon such streets in the city of Hull as may be authorized. Clause second provides that the company shall not take possession of any of the approaches to the Union bridge without the consent of the Governor in Council, but with such consent, the company may, upon such terms as the Governor in Council shall prescribe, use and occupy so much of the Union bridge, and of the approaches thereto, as may be necessary for the railway of the company.

The Minister further states that the company have received permission to use the Union bridge, and have laid tracks on it ; and that the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company, having obtained a federal charter wherein is explicitly granted the privilege now asked under certain conditions, there can be no doubt that they are entitled to be granted the privilege in question in preference——

And I invite the special attention of the committee to that.

—to the Hull Electric Company under whatever conditions the Government may prescribe.

The Minister, in view of the foregoing facts, recommends that the Ottawa Electric Railway Company be granted permission to extend their track from the bridge over the Ottawa River at the Chaudière into the city of Hull, on the following conditions : 1st. That the said track be laid in the position shown by blue dotted lines on the plan hereto attached. 2nd. That at the point marked "B" and "B" on the said plan where the tracks will cross the roadway, a permanent pavement between their tracks and at least two feet outside of the outer rails, to be laid in such a way that the surface of the rails shall not project more than one-half inch above the pavement.

The conditions are too long, and I will not read the rest now. This is the last clause of the Order in Council :

The Minister further recommends that before any work is proceeded with by the company, they shall submit for the approval of the Minister of Public Works, plans showing the exact location of the tracks with relation to the roadway, as well as details of construction.

Acting under this proposal, the Ottawa Electric Railway Company proceeded to call for plans of the proposed structures in order to complete the gap between the bridge and Main street in the city of Hull, and had these plans prepared. The work is already under contract, and the Ottawa Railway Company has gone to considerable expense in the matter. Now, the Hull people not only ask that they may be permitted to come into the city of Ottawa—to which I, for one, have no objection—but they also ask to be allowed to use the tracks of the Ottawa Electric Railway. I submit that that amendment should be made subject, not only to such conditions as the Governor in Council may impose, but also to an agreement between the Ottawa Railway Company and the Hull Electric Railway Company, or upon such compensation as this committee may deem right to impose.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to propose as a new amendment to this section, that the following words be added :—

And the said company shall not have power to collect fares or rates for service within the limits of the city of Ottawa.

I think this has been assented to by the promoter of the Bill, and this removes the objection as to infringement of the rights secured by the Ottawa City Railway Company by contract with the city.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend must have misunderstood me, I never agreed to such a proposition. It would be utterly impossible. In fact there are some days when half the fare would not be collected, and such a clause would not work. First of all, I must explain that the cars are crowded. There are days when we carry as many as four or five thousand passengers, and the conductor must begin to collect the fare from the very start.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not mean that they shall not be allowed to collect fares within the limits of the city of Ottawa, but that they shall not collect fares for service within the city.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then I will point out that the Ottawa Electric Railway will not even allow us to cross a quarter of an acre of their track without forcing us to pay fare ; and they want the Hull Electric Company to run over a large portion of its own track without collecting a cent. I cannot accept that amendment.

On section 4,

Mr. CHARLTON. It appears, from the provisions of this section, that the Hull Electric Company contemplate entering the city of Ottawa by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge. The words are :

And of running and operating said trams and cars upon the railway tracks of Canadian Pacific Railway Company within the city of Ottawa.

This provision gives the company entrance into the city of Ottawa, and all the entrance

it needs to acquire. It gives them that entrance without the necessity of infringing upon the rights of the Ottawa Street Railway Company by setting aside, by an Act of this Parliament, the conditions of the contract entered into between that company and Ottawa city council. We are, therefore, doing an injustice to the Ottawa Street Railway Company by the passage of the second section, and it is now revealed by the fourth section that we are doing this injustice without there being any necessity whatever for it; because the Hull Company will secure entrance to the city of Ottawa by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway and their bridge.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There is another point to which I direct the attention of the committee. At page 2 of the Bill, from line 5 to line 11, it says:

> And the possession by the company of the said railway under the lease to be given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in pursuance of the said agreement shall be held to be a fulfilment by the company of the obligation under its charter to construct a railway or tramway to Aylmer aforesaid, and other places referred to in its charter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the charter is a Quebec charter, and it contains a by-law passed by the city of Hull. That provides that the Hull company shall connect Hull with Aylmer, Gatineau Point and Ironsides. The Bill, therefore, asks Parliament to declare that the lease of the line between Hull and Aylmer shall not only be held to be a fulfilment of the company's obligation to construct a line between these two points, but that it shall be held to be also a fulfilment of its obligations to construct a line to Gatineau Point and Ironsides. I think that is a point the lawyers of the committee should look into, and see if this agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company prevents the construction of the other two lines.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) states that, by endorsing this provision of clause 4, we shall pronounce the line already constructed. I may say at once that it is already constructed. I have explained to the House a dozen times over that, instead of building a new line, the Hull Electric Company simply leased from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway extending from Hull to Aylmer. They immediately placed a trolley wire above it, and ran their electric cars over the track. I would like to know wherein is the difference, whether you construct a line independently, or whether you take a line already constructed and perfect it in such a way as to meet all the requirements of the Act? The road is now constructed. It was taken over from the Canadian Pacific Railway, not forcibly, but with the consent and good-will of the company. It was converted from a steam railway into an electric railway, so that every provision of that very charter is met here, and every one is satisfied. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) objects to the cars of the Hull Electric Railway passing the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not object. I simply say that this gives you an entrance into the city of Ottawa.

Mr. DEVLIN. Certainly, I admit that at once. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) knows that, by the previous provisions of the Bill, we cannot go one inch into the city of Ottawa, except so far as we are allowed by the city council. We ask to cross this Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, so that we may draw our freight trains straight to the Union station, and so that we may bring these passengers who wish to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway trains going west, to to the station. My hon. friend must know, and no one in the House knows better, the object for which the Pontiac Pacific Railway was constructed. He has travelled over the road, has visited the county of Pontiac, and knows the traffic that is done over this road. He knows well, that the passengers coming from Pontiac must get into the city of Ottawa, if they are to take a train to Toronto or the west. For that reason, it is asked that this lease shall be granted, and that the Hull Electric Company shall have the power of crossing this bridge, provided, of course, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are the party most interested, shall give them that permission.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) said that the railway has already been constructed. That portion of it from Aylmer to Hull has been constructed, but that portion of it from Hull to Gatineau and Ironsides has not been constructed.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will at once meet the objection of the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald), if he allows me. I will drop out every word in the lines from 5 to 10 of the Bill, and that will cover more ground than my hon. friend wants.

Mr. CHARLTON. Undoubtedly, the company have reason to suppose that they will be able to effect an entrance to the city of Ottawa over the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge. My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) points out the necessity to the company of having access to the Canadian Pacific Railway depot for its freight and its passengers going west. That is a commendable part of the scheme, but, if that power is obtained by the Hull Electric Company, I am unable to see that the passenger traffic would not be served just as well by a union depot on the Hull side as by a union depot on the Ottawa side. The Hull Company would have all the facilities it requires so far as its access to Ottawa is concerned, by making a

connection at the Union station in Hull, which the Ottawa Street Railway Company intends to reach by the 15th of November. Why, therefore, should we take away a portion of the franchises of the Ottawa Street Railway Company and allow the Hull Company to cover the tracks they have laid down? I cannot divest my mind from the impression that this House is doing an injustice to the Ottawa Street Railway Company, and is not in any material degree benefiting the other enterprise, by insisting that the Hull Electric Company shall have the privilege of assuming partial control of a portion of the franchise and track of the Ottawa Street Railway Company, by coming across the Union bridge to make connection, instead of making connection on the other side of the bridge. It seems to me we are trespassing on the vested rights of a company, and are doing it unnecessarily.

Mr. MORRISON. I submit that the words from line 12 to the end of the clause ought to be included in the amendment, as they are inconsistent with the amendment of the hon. Minister of Railways. The clause as it reads gives the Hull Electric Railway power to run over the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks to the city of Ottawa, that is, to apply electric power to a road which is now used for steam power; and I submit that this cannot or ought not to be done without the matter going first before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. BELCOURT. Would the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) say whether it is intended to operate electric cars over the railway bridge for anything but freight, or is it intended also to run passenger electric cars?

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend puts a question which it is of course impossible for me to answer. I do not know what the administration of this road may decide upon. My business here is simply to submit what the Bill is. I have explained to my hon. friend that one of the reasons why we ask for permission to cross this bridge is that western-bound passengers may be transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BELCOURT. I take for granted, then, that it is intended to operate electric passenger cars over this bridge. It is well known to most of the members of this House that on this bridge there is only one line of track, and that there is not room to lay another line. I do not think it is quite prudent to allow the operation of an electric railway over a bridge of this kind, with only one track, and that for a railway operated by steam. There is no provision in the Railway Act for anything of this kind, and I think it is a very serious matter. On behalf of the citizens of Ottawa, I must ask this committee to afford some measure of protection to the people who are going to use this railway. It must be quite evident to every member of this House that electric trains passing over this bridge every ten or fifteen minutes, or possibly at shorter intervals, will constitute a very serious danger to people using that railway. There are no safeguards provided in this clause to insure any reasonable safety. I move that all the words after the word "thereof" in the 11th line of section 4 be struck out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). As I understand this part of the section, it means that a railway in existence, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is subject to the provisions of the general Railway Act, has the right to give this electric railway company the right to run on its line across a bridge within the limits of the city of Ottawa. How are you going to treat an electric railway, which is not subject to the provisions of the general Railway Act, on the lines of an ordinary railway? How is it going to be treated, for the protection of the people who will use it? That seems to be an objection that is worthy of the attention of the committee.

Mr. DAVIN. I will support the amendment. I think the objection stated by the hon. and learned gentleman is a very important one. Here you have one line, and you are going to allow two companies to have the right to operate their railway upon it. I think there is great danger to the public here, and Parliament ought to pause, especially as there seems to be running through this Act an element of injustice to the Ottawa company. The Ottawa company has arranged under an Order in Council to go across the bridge to get into Hull, and to remove the objection, from the point of view of public usefulness, which has been urged at a prior part of the discussion of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that the old Ottawa Passenger Railway Company have the same right to run on the tracks of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Railway. So that it does not seem that we are giving any more power here than was given originally to the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In reference to the observation of the hon. Solicitor General, there must be power in existing legislation to enable the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to deal with electric railways as well as other railways, because numerous applications are now dealt with by that committee in regard to these railways crossing each other.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then, would it not be wise in this case to provide that this shall be subject to such regulations as shall be made by the Governor in Council?

Mr. HAGGART. Under the Railway Act every railway has a right to run either by

steam or electricity. I do not see any difficulty in running one road by steam and the other by electricity on the same tracks, any more than running two steam railways.

Mr. MORRISON. My point is that this Hull Electric Railway Company may run their cars over the Canadian Pacific Railway in the city of Ottawa and ignore the objections of the city, which, I think, is contrary to the spirit of the Act. By leaving in these words, from the twelfth line to the end, you cause a conflict in the Act itself. You will ignore the right of the city of Ottawa to decide as to whether and to what extent the electric road may run on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DEVLIN. I cannot see the necessity of taking out those few lines to please my hon. friend.

Mr. BELCOURT. To please my constituents.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend's constituents did not ask him to oppose this Bill. The views of those who sent him to Parliament were pretty well represented in an article in the "Free Press," which said that the citizens of Ottawa had no objection to the passing of this Bill, but, on the contrary, were most anxious to see this road get into the city of Ottawa. So far as my hon. friend's constituents are concerned, their interests will best be served and their pockets better lined, in every possible sense, if this road comes into the city of Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean?

Mr. DEVLIN. That a lot of money will be brought from the county of Pontiac to Ottawa. It means that the products of Pontiac and Wright counties will be brought into Ottawa, and that the money obtained for these products will be spent in Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a pretty sharp turn.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend must not put any construction on what I said which is not borne out by my words.

Mr. DAVIN. According to this clause, you would be able to carry your road over the Canadian Pacific Railway line through the streets of Ottawa. Your line runs on Sundays, do you propose to run through Ottawa on Sunday?

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend must have travelled over the line on Sunday.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I have never been over the line.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is impossible for me to consent that this clause should be struck out, because that would defeat the end of the Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. It ought to be defeated.

Mr. DEVLIN. No doubt my hon. friend has worked hard enough to defeat it. I wish to bring our freight and passengers destined for western points over the Canadian Pacific Railway, which object, the hon. gentleman must see, is a most laudable one, and altogether in the interests of the community. I am perfectly willing to move that, as a further amendment be added to the clause:

That all contracts hereafter made between the said company, relating to the above matters, shall be subject to the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in the assertion he has repeated so often, that I have received no instructions from my constituents to take the part I have taken, and to show my hon. friend and this hon. committee that I have no intention or desire of opposing the passage of this Bill, I declare that with the amendment he has proposed I am satisfied. I am not arbitrarily opposing the passage of this Bill. I may say that I have had instructions from the City Solicitor himself, who requested me, in the interests of the citizens of Ottawa, to see that every protection should be afforded the public of the capital in the use of this railway bridge. I deny that the hon. member is competent to express the sentiments of the electors of the city of Ottawa. My colleague (Mr. Hutchison) and myself have been elected to represent their views, and I deny any right or authority on the part of the hon. gentleman to state what the views of the citizens of Ottawa are. What I have done here in opposing the Bill and in seeking to introduce into it the measure of protection to which the citizens of Ottawa are entitled, I have only done in the exercise of my duty. I withdraw the amendment I submitted because that proposed by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) meets my views.

On section 5,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I desire to say that I object to this clause on the ground that we are called upon to ratify by it a by-law of the city of Hull and an agreement which we have not before us and with the contents of which we are not made acquainted.

Mr. DEVLIN. This clause was put in at the desire of the city of Hull. Here are the facts connected with this clause. The city of Hull thought the Act an infringement upon its rights and privileges, and it was so represented before the Committee on Railways and Canals, and in order to meet the wishes of the city and of several representatives of the city present, this clause was framed and inserted, and was passed with the approval of the whole Railway Committee.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I object on the ground I have stated. Are we going to give effect to a document which is not before us and with the provisions of which we are not acquainted? I do not make objection on account of the city of Hull.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is quite evident that this point is a very important one. As was pointed out on a previous occasion also there are many points in this Bill affecting principles that are not only important but new, involving questions between the provinces and the Dominion. Therefore, the committee ought carefully to consider the details of such legislation. It was stated on behalf of the Minister of Justice, when the Bill was before the committee, that these were the views he held. But he had not had time fully to investigate the matter. The lawyers in this House will understand that these are most complicated questions, questions that the Minister of Justice, whoever he might be, would require time to look into. I would call attention to the fact that the Railway Act would not apply to this Bill, and I do not see how the Railway Committee are going to exercise their power in respect of it. As this clause was put in simply to please somebody representing the city of Hull, and on grounds that I think good reasons could not be given for, and, as in the judgment of gentlemen who understand these matters, this is a new principle, it is of no particular advantage to the city, nor can it be to parties interested in this Bill. Therefore, I think it ought to be struck out.

It being Six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before you left the Chair at Six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, objection was made to this clause 5 by the Solicitor General. I stated that the clause had been inserted at the request of the representatives of the city of Hull, who came before the Committee of the House on Railways and Canals. I myself was most anxious to have it inserted as it seems to me to give considerable protection to the city of Hull in so far as any rights and privileges belonging to the city are concerned. I am most anxious to get this Bill through, and since this clause is objected to by the Solicitor General, and as objections have been formulated against it by the Department of Justice, all I have to say is that I will have to withdraw the clause.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not quite agree with the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). I do not think the whole clause should be struck out. I think that the objection raised by the Solicitor General would be quite sufficiently met by striking out all after the word "Act" in the 5th line of the clause. This would leave the clause reading as follows:—

Nothing in this Act contained shall confer on the company any additional powers, franchises, rights or privileges in the city of Hull beyond those held, acquired or possessed by the Hull Electric Company at the time of the passing of this Act.

Mr. LOUNT. I do not see that any purpose would be served by leaving the clause as suggested. It would simply be a declaration that the law should remain as it is and that this Act shall not convey any additional power. Well, as the Act does not profess to convey additional power other than has been conceded by the committee so far, it seems to me that the clause suggested conveys no meaning.

Mr. BELCOURT. The Act authorizes this company to construct certain lines of railway in addition to those already constructed and for which no provision is made under the agreement sought to be ratified by section 5. I think that the company, if this is passed, will be in a position to construct a branch line in the city for which no provision has been entered into between this company and the corporation of the city of Hull. The object I have in view in proposing the clause I do is to make it clear that before constructing on the streets to which I have referred it will be necessary for the company to go to the Hull city council and make an arrangement for this particular branch. There could surely be nothing to object to in that. I can well conceive the objection hon. members would entertain to ratifying an agreement of which they know nothing and which is not now before the House. But this does not apply to ratifying the first four lines of section 5.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this clause be struck out? Carried.

Mr. BELCOURT. I should like to have the opinion of the committee on my amendment. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) proposes that the clause should be struck out. I move that it be not struck out, but that all after the word "Act" in the 5th line be struck out.

Mr. DEVLIN. My hon. friend must understand that I only yield to the desire of the Solicitor General.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not now finding fault with my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin), but I think the amendment I propose is not open to the objection raised by the hon. Solicitor General.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I understand the hon. member for Ottawa City (Mr. Belcourt) correctly, his position is that this Bill, standing as it does now, confers upon the Hull Electric Company the right to lay down tracks and construct works within the city of Hull, which

it has not the right to do under its existing charter. Well, that is a matter which I think ought to be very readily settled. I suppose what the hon. member has in his mind is that such additional powers are conferred under the second clause of the Bill and is to be found in these words: "That the Electric Company may construct and extend its railway to and over the Union Bridge and the approaches." In other words, it is held by my hon. friend that under the existing charter the Hull Electric Company has no power to extend its present railway to the Union Bridge and its approaches, or to and over such portion of the bridge and its approaches as may be within the limits of the city of Hull. Now, if he is right, I think he is making a point which is worthy of the consideration of the committee; and the effect of leaving the proposed portion of section 5 in the Bill would be practically to denude the company of the powers which are conferred upon it by the first clause of section 2 of this Bill. If, as a matter of fact, he is right, then the present Bill does give additional rights to the Hull Electric Company in the extension of its railway over these approaches and through this bridge. Now, I think section 5 which declares that nothing in this Act shall confer upon the company any additionatl powers beyond those already possessed by it under its special charter, clearly destroys the effect of the first clause of section 2. Therefore I take it that if we intend to give the company rights which we have already declared it is our purpose to confer upon them by the 2nd section, that whole 5th clause should go out.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to point out to the Minister of Railways that after giving the legislation provided for in clause 2, clause 3 provides that the operation of so much of the company's line of railway made within the province of Ontario shall be subject to the statutes of Ontario. Then we go on and grant certain powers to this company which he says it can exercise in the province of Quebec, and there is no provision to bring this company under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Railway Act, neither is there anything to show that you have taken it out of the jurisdiction of the provincial legislation of the province of Quebec. As I pointed out to the committee in the first place, it seems to me that the Bill is very badly drawn. I am not taking any part at all in the contention between the two companies. It has been pointed out by several members who take an active part in railway legislation that this is somewhat inconsistent and different from any legislation we have had heretofore, and that there are some very important points of principle involved in this legislation. It seems to me that one clause is inconsistent with the other, and where the company will be when this Bill is through, I cannot understand.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the courts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know where the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would come in, unless there was some declaration to bring this under the Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think we are raising difficulties here. I see nothing in the Bill as the hon. gentleman proposes to leave it, which is very objectionable. He proposes to strike out section 5 altogether, for the plain reason expressed by the Minister of Railways that we have under section 2 conferred powers upon them which they are not given by the local charter. If section 5 is left in, it simply contradicts and annuls the powers that were conferred by section 2. Therefore the hon. gentleman is well advised in withdrawing it, and when section 5 is withdrawn, the Bill is plainly understood. The other section to which my hon. friend refers, relates entirely to that portion of the work in the city of Ottawa to reach the station which they are going to build, and that 3rd section simply prescribes that that particular branch of the road shall be subject to the statutes of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the promoter of the Bill if, as a matter of fact, the city of Hull has given any authority at all to this company to build from the present terminus to the stone bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the question to which the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) directed our attention, does not arise in connection with the 5th clause. We have either passed beyond that point, or else we have not come to it. At all events, it is really not germane to the discussion we are now carrying on. I think my hon. friend has properly called the attention of the committee to the question as to the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee, and it is a matter that we might very well consider. But at the moment we have before us the 5th clause of the Bill, and the question before the committee is whether that should be left in whole or in part, or whether it should be struck out. My judgment is that the 5th section should not remain in the Bill, as I think it is really contradictory of one of the three preceding provisions. I think the point which the hon. member who raised this question had in his mind, was that we have, under the second clause and with the amendments which have been added, taken the precaution of requiring that the consent or approval of the city authorities at Ottawa shall first be had before this company extends its line of railway within the corporate limits of the city. But the hon. member would have us bear in mind that we have not done that in respect of the extension within the city of Hull, and what he desires is that there shall be a similar clause

inserted in this Bill, or in some independent section of it, which will make it necessary that the consent or approval of the corporation of the city of Hull should be had before the extension takes place which is authorized by the 2nd section of the Bill. That is a very fair request to make, and the hon. gentleman need only propose an additional section which will contain something to that effect, to cover all the ground. The 5th clause may drop out not only without any disadvantage to the Bill, but with positive advantage to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) tell me if the city of Hull has given authority to the Hull Electric Company to build from its present terminus up to the bridge approaches ?

Mr. DEVLIN. The company is operating under a charter already received from the city of Hull.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, as far as the present terminus is concerned. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know whether the city of Hull has given them power to extend their line to the bridge approaches.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The members of the Hull City Council, through their solicitor, appeared before the committee and said that the company did not have this power, and they wanted a clause to protect them. If this clause is struck out, some other provision ought to be made to meet the request of the Hull City Council. They desired, as suggested by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) and the Minister of Railways, that they should be protected against the company proceeding with the work without the consent of the council under the municipal and provincial laws.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, we should legislate in this matter. We have legislated so with reference to Ottawa and the province of Ontario, and we would be acting unfairly, if we gave this company the right to build any line in the streets of Hull without the consent of the council.

Mr. BELCOURT. The suggestion made by the Minister of Railways would, I think, meet with the desire of the city council of Hull. I am quite willing, on their behalf, to adopt the suggestion and to allow clause 5 to be struck out, and another clause substituted. I would suggest that the substituted clause should read in the following words, and I am following almost verbatim the last part of section 2, which affords protection to the city of Ottawa. I would move that clause 5 be struck out and the following be substituted as clause 5 :—

That as regards so much of its line of railway as may hereafter be constructed in the city of Hull, the company shall only exercise the powers conferred by this Act as to the location, construction and operation of its railway, upon such streets and upon such terms and conditions and for such periods as the council of the said city of Hull has approved or may hereafter approve by by-law.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is all very good, but I cannot agree to it. First of all, my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) cannot come here and say that he represents the city of Hull.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say that I represented the city of Hull.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) to say : On behalf of the city of Hull, I propose to do so and so.

Mr. BELCOURT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; I did not say, on behalf of the city of Hull.

Mr. DEVLIN. The objection of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is a fair one, and I shall meet it at once. My hon. friend will remember that, when this Bill was first before the House, the by-law which had been passed by the city of Hull with reference to the electric railway, was put into the hands of every member of this House. It is not included in the Bill in its present form, and I do not know why. Clause 5 refers to this by-law 61, which was published in the Bill, and that is the reason clause 5 is here. Clause 2 of the by-law 61 reads as follows :—

The said street railway may pass along one or more or all the streets of the city of Hull, provided always that the circulation of foot passengers shall in no manner be diminished, prevented, or endangered by the said railway.

The power of passing along this very street referred to by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), is enjoyed by the company. Why take it away from them ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The best way to remedy this difficulty, which is a serious one, would be to take clause 17 of the Bill as first printed, insert it as clause 5 of the present Bill, and print the by-law as a schedule.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we strike out clause 5 altogether, this company could go on without any hindrance. If we leave in the first portion of the clause, we will say that they cannot do anything except what they are allowed to do by the original statute and by the by-law.

Mr. FOSTER. If the city of Hull afterwards come to the conclusion that something else ought to be done in railway construction, that would necessitate them coming here for legislation again.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think so. You could add "or by any other arrangement made with the city of Hull." All that we have to do is to protect the city of Hull. The company is represented here, and is protecting itself.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The objection is not met by the suggestion of the hon.

member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), because it would be thought, if the by-law was referred to and not printed, that it was a mistake in legislation. The promoter of the Bill agrees to accept section 17 of the original Bill, which refers to the by-law, and then the by-law should be printed as part of the schedule to the Act. That will remedy the whole of the difficulty.

Mr. LOUNT. I believe there is no absolute necessity to publish the by-law in the Act. It is only encumbering the Act with an unnecessary by-law. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is pertinent. It removes the difficulty, and protects the city of Hull, so far as it can be protected. As I recollect the proceedings before the Railway Committee, this matter was submitted to the parties, the solicitor for the railway company was present, and they framed this provision and brought it back to the committee, saying that they all agreed to it. The city of Hull and the city of Ottawa having agreed upon it, it does not appear to me that any objection should be urged by the committee against that in which both sides have to a large extent concurred. The clause, as it would read after the first five lines are struck out, would be a perfect protection to the city of Hull, and I do not see the necessity of printing a by-law as part of the Act. It refers to the by-law, and incorporates it in the Act by that reference to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not agree with the Solicitor General, because clause 17 proposes to validate by-law 61. I do not think we should validate that by-law, and we do not propose to do so. What we say is that they shall not do anything that is not provided by the by-law. Otherwise we leave them just as they were before.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My objection is to referring to the by-law as part of the statute without printing it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Clause 17 purports to confirm a by-law. What I say is to leave that part out. We can schedule the by-law if you please. It is always better to do that when we refer to a by-law at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the amendment meets the wishes of the city council of Hull, as I understood them.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. DEVLIN moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this Bill was railroaded through the committee with great speed, and it should not be railroaded through the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a question of urgency before the House as to whether they will have this Bill read a third time now or not, and I shall put it to the House.

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

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 35) for the relief of Albert Nordheimer—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Lount) on division.

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Roche.)

ACHILLE JOBIN.

Mr. MONK asked:

Has the Government dismissed Achille Jobin, of Dorval, P.Q., from the position he held in connection with the dredging now being done on Lake St. Louis? What was the cause of his dismissal? Were any complaints made against him, and by whom? Has his successor been appointed? What is his name, and by whom was he recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The superintending engineer, it appears, dispensed with the services of Achille Jobin, and appointed Arthur Desjardins in his stead, but the removal took place without any direction or authority from my department. I was not apprised of what had taken place until this question was put on the Table, but shall procure full information on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it without the endorsation of the Minister acting at that time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no reason to suppose it was either with his knowledge or endorsation. I am advised it was without any knowledge whatever of the department. I presume that would include all the officers of the department.

NANAIMO, COMOX, UNION, &c., MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McINNES asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to establish a semi-weekly mail service between Nanaimo City, Comox, Union and intermediate points?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The hon. gentleman having pressed on the Government the advisability of establishing a semi-weekly mail service between Nanaimo City, Comox, Union and intermediate points, it is the intention of the Government, at an early day, to invite tenders for such service.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only reason ?

MR. CHARLES R. SMITH.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Gibson) asked :

Was Mr. Charles R. Smith, of the city of Hamilton, recommended by the late Government for a position in the Government service ? If so, what was the nature of the recommendation and the salary attached thereto ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Smith was recommended on the 27th of April last by the then Controller of Customs as a preventive officer in the Customs at a salary of $1,000, and no action appears to have been taken by the late Government.

MINING ENGINEERS' VISIT TO CANADA.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

Is the Government aware that on the invitation of the Federated Canadian Mining Institute, the Iron and Steel Institute of Great Britain, the Federated Institute of Mining Engineers, and the American Institute of Mining Engineers, are to visit Canada in 1897 ? If so, has the Government been asked to provide transportation facilities to enable the visitors to make personal inspection of the mineral resources and mining industries of the Dominion ? If not, will the Government give favourable consideration to a request to provide such facilities ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). This matter has not been brought to the attention of the Government yet.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. McALISTER asked :

Did the Honourable leader of the Government, in speaking at the court-house at Dalhousie, N.B., on Monday, the 28th day of August, A.D. 1895, say :—

" If one of you gentlemen take a load of farm produce to sell in the American market, you are stopped on the road when you come to the American boundary line and made to pay a customs duty which more than takes away any profit you might make. It is the policy of the great Liberal party of Canada, of which I have the honour to be the leader, to make the American markets free to the farmers of Canada, and as soon as we get in power, which will not now be long, we will make such arrangements with the Government of the United States as will cause these markets to be opened to Canadian farmers. The Conservatives tell you that they cannot make any fair arrangements with the American Government for reciprocity, but that is because they never were in earnest about doing so " ?

Mr. McINNES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that that is one of the numerous questions asked of me to answer which my memory is not equal, but the sentiments are quite commendable, however.

BALSAM AND CAMERON LAKES—IMPROVEMENT OF CHANNEL.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. McHugh) asked :

1. What amount has been expended for improvement of the channel between Balsam and Cameron Lakes, at Rosedale, during the last two years ending 30th June, 1896 ?
2. What work has been done for such expenditure ?
3. Was such work done under contract let by public tenders ? If not, then under what authority was such work done ?
4. What amount has been expended or paid on roads, or allowed in respect of roads, in the township of Bexley and Eldon affected, or likely to be affected, by the construction of the Trent Valley Canal ?
5. Under what authority was such last mentioned expenditure or payment made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The amount expended for improvement of the channel between Balsam and Cameron Lakes at Rosedale, during the two years ended 30th June, 1896, is $19,089.71. The work done for such expenditure has been the drilling of 14,000 holes through this channel of an average depth of 4 feet 6 inches, ready for blasting ; the length of channel drilled is 4,000 feet ; the blasting of a portion of the surface drilled is 2,500 feet in length by 90 feet in width, and the dredging out 6,500 cubic yards of the material blasted. Such work was not done under contract let by public tenders. Such work was executed by day's labour, under authority from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The amount expended, or paid on roads, or allowed in respect of roads, in the township of Bexley and Elden, affected or likely to be affected by the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, $12,699.15. By authority of the Government and under a contract with Andrew Onderdonk for construction of Section No. 1 of the Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe Division of the Trent Canal

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE—CONTRACT.

Mr. POULIOT asked :

Whether it is true that, subsequently to the 23rd June last, the late Government sent to Sir Donald Smith, High Commissioner at London England, a cablegram or other document instructing him to sign immediately, in the name of the Government of Canada, the contract with the Allan Company, for the fast line of steamships between Canada and England, on the basis of an annual subsidy of $750,000 for ten years ?

If so, what is the date of the said telegram or other document ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). All the papers in regard to the fast Atlantic service will soon be laid on the Table, and in these my hon. friend will find the answer to his question.

THE "HURVEY" LINE.

Mr. KAULBACH asked :

Is the Government aware that on the proposed line of railway, located from Sand Point, Shelburne County, to New Germany, Lunenburg County, Nova Scotia, known as the "Hurvey Line," upon which construction had commenced, an application was made last year for an extension of said road from New Germany passing through New Ross, connecting Chester Basin, Chester and Hubbert's Cove, making the terminal point at Halifax ? If so, is it the intention of the Government to submit a resolution to Parliament, this session, with the usual provision of $3,200 per mile to complete the same ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I can only repeat the answer given to similar questions, that it is not the intention of the Government to bring down this session any resolutions whatever or to promote any legislation in the way of giving subsidies for railways.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—DISMISSALS.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Honourable Minister of Railways and Canals to make inquiries into the cases of Anthony Duggan, William Stuart, Richard Fitzpatrick, Robert Stuart, Joseph Gallant, Andrew LeClair, Thomas Hughes, Patrick Berrigan, Ewen Stuart, Jas. Currie, Sylvain Wedge, Daniel McAlduff, Alex. Livingston, Alex. McConnell, Mortimer McEwen, Phillip Mooney and other employees, in all about sixty, who were summarily dismissed from the Prince Edward Island Railway, since the 11th July last, without investigation, with a view to the redress of any wrongs which may have been committed, in order to reinstate faithful and efficient servants of the department, according to the declaration made by the Honourable the Minister of Railways to the House in committee on the 18th inst. ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am unable to answer this question fully until further information is obtained from the superintendent of the railway. The assumption in the question that about 60 men have been dismissed since the 11th July, is incorrect. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who acted as Minister of Railways until the 27th August, informs me that all casual or temporary labourers on the road were previously to the 23rd June, employed on the recommendation of politicians supporting the late Government, and that he at once ordered that this should cease, and temporary workmen be employed hereafter on the recommendation of the friends of the present Government. As a consequence of this change, a number of men temporarily employed under the old system, have ceased to be employed, and others have been substituted for them. A return giving the names and dates of dismissal of these men is being prepared, and will be laid before Parliament shortly. No application has been made by, or on behalf of, any of the parties named in question for an investigation into his case. If any such is made, it will receive careful consideration, and, in cases where an investigation is ordered, the parties will be allowed to tender evidence in their own defence.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Has the Government dismissed the following men from the service of the Prince Edward Island Railway, viz. :—James Currie, trackman ; Sylvain Wedge, trackman ; Daniel McAlduff, porter ; at Alberton station ?
2. What charges was preferred against them ?
3. Who investigated the charges, and were the men allowed to defend themselves ?
4. What officials reported on those dismissed, and what reasons, if any, were assigned for making them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I understand, the men named in the question of the hon. member were removed. The fact of the removals has only come to my knowledge since the question was asked, and I am intending to make full inquiry respecting the same.

POSTMASTER AT SAILOR'S HOPE.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked :

Whether Mr. Fidelus Macdonald, postmaster at Sailor's Hope, P.E.I., has been dismissed ? If so, on what charge and by whom was it preferred ? Was an investigation held and the charge proved ? Has a successor been appointed and what is his name ? What was the salary of the late incumbent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Fidelus Macdonald has not been dismissed. A complaint was made against him and notice thereof communicated to him, to which he has made reply, denying the correctness of the charge. His salary is $120 a year.

MR. A. P. LEPINE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Casgrain) asked :

What was the date of the dismissal of Mr. A. P. Lépine, of Quebec, from the public service ? What was the date of the appointment of Mr. Belland in the place of Mr. Lépine ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Lépine was notified on the 5th August last that his services were no longer required. The work in connection with his position had ceased on 30th June last, with the expenditure of the appropriation for 1895-96, there being no money to spend and no work to be done after that date. 2. 5th September instant.

SEIZURE OF THE "WILLIE McGOWAN" AND "ARIEL."

Mr. McDOUGALL asked:

Has the Government addressed any communication to the Imperial Government since May last, further urging early settlement of the claims against the Russian authorities in connection with the seizure of the schooners "Willie McGowan" and "Ariel" in the Behring Sea? If so, on what date?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No such communications have been addressed to the Imperial Government by the Government of Canada since May last, nor would any such representations appear to serve any purpose. The information which this Government has is to the effect that the claims and all the documents in support thereof have been, or are about to be, referred to Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg, for early adjustment with the Russian government; and negotiations, it is understood, are proceeding in that direction. No representations on the part of the Canadian Government could expedite matters at this point.

THE HORN-FLY.

Mr. RINFRET asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to offer a reward to any person who finds the best means of averting or fighting the horn-fly scourge, provided such means be found effectual and practical by the Department of Agriculture of Canada?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The matter has not been under consideration of the Government. The Government has, on the Experimental Farm staff an entomologist, whose duty it is to study all such matters. He has given most careful attention to this subject, and has published for the farmers of Canada a remedy which is satisfactory, when applied properly. Further experiments have been undertaken, to discover whether anything cheaper and better than these remedies can be found. There is, therefore, no necessity for the Government to offer any reward, as suggested above.

TOBACCO REGULATIONS.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to maintain the law which forbids tobacco-growers to manufacture into cut tobacco or cigars the tobacco they require for their personal use?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). I am not in a position to answer at present.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to repeal the law respecting weights and measures, in order to relieve merchants and others from the payment of the fees and costs attending inspection?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). The matter has not yet been considered by the Government.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGERS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Dugas) asked:

What was the number of messengers during the last session under the Mackenzie Government, in 1878?

What were their names?

How many of them did not resume their positions in the first session under the succeeding Administration?

What are the names of those who were left out?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). As my hon. friend knows, this is a matter that is not under the control of the Government.

DISMISSALS FROM THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Casgrain) asked:

Were the following persons dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway, and, if so, for what reason, viz.:—George Talbot and Alfred Dubé, both of the town of Montmagny; Xavier Simoneau and J. Bte. Proulx, both of the parish of St. Pierre, Rivière du Sud; Xavier Poitras and Sifroid Fortier, both of Cap St. Ignace?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Alfred Dubé is one of the three or four persons to whom I referred the other day, as having been discharged from the Intercolonial Railway employ. As to Talbot, Simoneau and Fortier, I have inquired, and learn that they have not been continued in the employ. I had not learned of their discharge until the question of the hon. member brought the matter to my notice, nor was the department communicated with previously thereto, to my knowledge. I shall make inquiry into the circumstances. Proulx and Poitras have not been removed.

JOHN O'NEIL.

Mr. BRODEUR asked:

Is John O'Neil, whose name appears in the Civil Service List for 1895 as collector of canal tolls at Montreal, set down as having been born on 3rd September, 1835, first appointed April, 1858, and in receipt of a salary of $2,000, still in the employment of the Government? If not, when did he leave such employment, and by whom has he been replaced?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). John O'Neil is still in the employment of the Government.

LOCK-KEEPER, CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. MORIN asked :

Whether the Government before appointing Bernard O'Cain in place of Cyrille Patenaude, as lock-keeper on the Chambly Canal, P.Q., made inquiry as to his age and competency ?

On whose recommendation was the said B. O'Cain appointed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Bernard O'Cain has not been appointed in the place of Cyrille Patenaude as lock-keeper on the Chambly Canal.

WILFRID BROSSEAU, POSTMASTER, ST. JOHNS.

Mr. MORIN asked :

Whether Wilfrid Brosseau, appointed postmaster of the town of St. Johns, P.Q., in the place of James Macpherson, is not a manufacturer and merchant of the said town of St. Johns ?

Do the Government allow town postmasters to conduct stores or manufactures ?

Has the said Wilfrid Brousseau furnished any, and, if so, what security as postmaster of the town of St. Johns ?

Who recommended the appointment of Wilfrid Brosseau ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. It is not known to department whether or not Mr. Brosseau is a manufacturer or merchant. 2. No rule has been laid down on this subject, the department merely requiring every postmaster who is paid by commission to give a proper degree of personal oversight to the duties of his office. 3. Mr. Brosseau has been called upon to furnish a guarantee bond in the usual amount. 4. A number of citizens of St. Johns petitioned the department in Mr. Brosseau's favour.

MAIL CONTRACT WITH THE ALLAN SS. COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. When was the last contract with the Allan SS. Company for carrying mails between Canada and Great Britain made, and for what length of time ?

2. Was there any clause in the contract requiring the Government to give notice to the company of the expiry of the same ?

3. In what way have the renewals since been made ?

4. If by Order in Council, what are the dates of the several orders issued since the last contract ?

5. For what period was the renewal made by the last Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. 16th day of December, 1891, until the 24th day of December, 1892, inclusive, with a proviso that the Government should have the right to continue the operation of the contract for a further period not exceeding one year. 2. No, but in view of the fact that the contract had been continued from year to year for many years, the Government were of the opinion that notice to terminate the arrangement should have been given, and that under all the circumstances the company was entitled to the contract for carrying the mails to the close of the season of 1897, and no longer. 3. By Orders in Council. 4. 17th of May, 1893, authorizing renewal for one year from the 24th of December, 1893—12th June, 1894, authorizing a further extension until the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence in 1895—7th of September, 1895. 5. For one year from the close of navigation in 1895, or say, until the 25th day of November, 1896.

MR. H. E. PETIT, AND COAL CONTRACT.

Mr. MORIN (translation) asked :

Whether the Minister of Public Works has taken cognizance of the following letter which concludes an article intituled "Mr. Tarte," published in the journal "La Libre Parole," on 5th September, 1896, at Montreal :—

2nd September, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I have received from the Public Works Department at Ottawa a letter informing me that you have tendered for the furnishing of ———— to the public buildings of————. But as your tender is the same as that of another house, they write to ask me to whom the contract is to be given.

I write you to-day to know what you intend to do for me in this matter. I shall await your answer.

Business is business, as you know.

Respectfully yours (?)

Did the Minister of Public Works write, or cause a letter to be written, in relation to a contract for supplying coal, to Mr. H. E. Petit, the defeated Liberal candidate in the County of Terrebonne at the late Dominion election ? If so, is the Minister of Public Works aware that Mr. H. E. Petit, the defeated Liberal candidate at the said election, is, according to public rumour, the author of the letter quoted in the journal "La Libre Parole" ?

Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to govern himself hereafter by the opinion of the said Mr. Petit, in awarding contracts for certain supplies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I have seen the letter in the journal mentioned. I had received two tenders for the supply of coal to the public building at St. Jérome. The prices were equal. If there had been a difference, the lower tender would have been accepted as a matter of course. But, as they were equal, I was free to accept either. In such cases, the practice of the department, for many years, had been to ask the opinion of the friends of the Government as to which tender should be accepted. Following this practice, the secretary of my department sent the following letter to Mr. Petit, who had been the Liberal candidate at the last election :—

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, August 28th, 1896.

Sir,—In answer to a notice asking tenders for the supply of coal for the Public Buildings of the Dominion, two tenders have been received for the supply of coal necessary for the Public Building of St. Jérome, viz. :—Messrs. Evans Brothers and Labrecque, Cousineau & Co. The

price demanded by those tenderers being equal, I am instructed to ask you to kindly tell me to whom you would like the contract for the supply of coal to be granted.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
E. F. E. ROY
Secretary.

If Mr. Petit wrote such a letter as is given in the question, he did so without my knowledge and the knowledge of the department, and I emphatically disapprove of and condemn it. No action has been taken on the tender.

It is my determination that in every case in which tenders are invited, the lowest tender shall be accepted, if the parties are responsible.

The letter mentioned in the question was part of an article of a libellous character reflecting on the administration of my department and the letter was used for the purpose of supporting unfounded accusations against me. Immediately, on having my attention drawn to the article, I caused steps to be taken to prosecute the author, and the proceedings now pending in court will be prosecuted as vigorously as the law will permit.

CARRYING WOOD ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FLINT asked :

1. Is the Department of Railways informed that the following persons, employees on the Intercolonial at Rivière du Loup, have their wood carried free of charge, from the station at Cap St. Ignace or other places on the Intercolonial Railway, namely : Joseph Chenard, conductor ; Johnny Wilson, chief switchman ; Joseph Dion, fireman ; Grégoire Soucy, baggageman ; Arthur Beaulieu, switchman ; F. O. Fortin, despatcher ; Charles St. Pierre, day labourer ; Louis Michaud, brakesman ?

2. If the Government has no information on this subject, does it intend to inquire into the truth of these matters ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. No ; the Department of Railways is not informed that the following persons, employees on the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup, have their wood carried free of charge, from the station at Cap St. Ignace or other places on the Intercolonial Railway, namely :—Joseph Chenard, conductor ; Johnny Wilson, chief switchman ; Joseph Dion, fireman ; Grégoire Soucy, baggageman ; Arthur Beaulieu, switchman ; F. O. Fortin, despatcher ; Charles St. Pierre, day labourer ; Louis Michaud, brakesman. 2. Yes ; inquiry is being made.

MR. FLODDY, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

1. Is there, in the Department of Inland Revenue, a person named Floddy, who is now going through the counties below Quebec, as an informer ?

2. If so, when was he appointed, and on whose recommendation ?

3. What is his pay ?

4. Besides his pay, how much is he allowed for travelling expenses ?

5. Has he made any report to the department since his appointment, in reference to seizures made ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). 1. Yes, a temporary preventive officer. 2. Appointed on the 27th December, 1895, and was recommended by Hon. John F. Wood. 3. His pay is $50 per month. 4. His actual travelling expenses. 5. A report of every seizure made through his efforts has been forwarded to the collector of the division at Quebec, who has reported the matter to the department.

INSPECTOR OF INLAND REVENUE AT HALIFAX.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked :

(a.) Who is the inspector of inland revenue at Halifax ?

(b.) When was he appointed or promoted to that office ?

(c.) Has he been notified of his appointment or promotion ?

(d.) If not, when will he be so notified ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. H. H. Grant is acting as Inspector of Inland Revenue at Halifax. It is questionable whether any appointment of inspector has been made. Mr. H. H. Grant was recommended for such office by the late Ministry. His nomination formed part of a report which was approved by His Excellency the Governor General, subject to certain qualifications. In making the classification rendered necessary by His Excellency's action it was supposed that Mr. Grant's nomination came within the category of those which were intended to be approved, and it was so placed in the published return, but we have since had reason to doubt the correctness of this.

For this reason and for reasons connected with the reorganization of the office, Mr. Grant will not be notified of appointment.

MAIL CONTRACT CANCELLED—MANITOBA.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked :

Why was the contract made by the Post Office Department, prior to the present Government taking office, with one J. D. Burke for the carrying of mails from the post office in Morris to the Northern Pacific and Canadian Pacific Railway stations, cancelled ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that prior to the contract above referred to, there existed two separate contracts with one J. D. Burke, for carrying the mails from the post office in Morris to the

stations of the Canadian Pacific and Northern Pacific, respectively, at sums amounting together to $227.50 per annum. That these two contracts, in ordinary course, would have expired on the 28th February, 1896, and tenders for new contracts were duly advertised for.

The last day for receiving such tenders was the 14th February, 1896, and, within such date, two tenders were received for the two services.

That on the 14th February, 1896, a letter was received at the Post Office Department from Hon. A. A. C. LaRivière, in the following words :—

House of Commons,
Ottawa, 14th February, 1896.

Dear Colonel,—I beg herewith to inclose a telegram from Mr. J. D. Burke, of Morris, Manitoba, offering to renew his mail contract on the old terms, and to ask that the tenders for contract to carry mails from the office of Morris to railway station be not opened, but that the old contract for the same be renewed as requested.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) A. A. C. LaRIVIERE.

Lt.-Col. White,
Deputy P. M. General,
Ottawa.

And that the said tenders were not opened in the department, but by order of the then Postmaster General, a new contract was entered into with said John David Burke for the performance of the two services at the total sum of $227.50 per annum.

That on the 23rd September, 1896, information reached me that said contracts had been renewed at a price exceeding that for which a tender had been received, and, accordingly, I directed an inquiry into the matter and learned, on the information of the clerk having charge of such tenders, that the tenders in question were still unopened in the department, whereupon I directed their being opened and found amongst them a tender from George Spence (the lowest tenderer) to perform both services at the rate of $100 per year instead of $227.50, the amount at which said contract had been entered into : and accordingly, I directed that steps be taken for the cancellation of such renewed contract and for the service being offered to George Spence on the terms of his tender, namely, $100 a year.

FISHERY OVERSEER, HARRY LINLEY.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked :

What amount of money has been paid Harry Linley, fishery overseer at Lake Erie, county of Kent, Ontario, during the years 1893, 1894 and 1895, for salary in each year ? Also, what amount has been allowed him for expenses in each year ? How are his expenses made up, and are vouchers for each item required of him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The following sums were paid to Harry Linley, fishery overseer :—

1893	$112 50	$169 07
1894	125 00	98 39
1895	125 00	67 40

Expenses made up in detail of horse hire and living expenses whilst travelling on official duty. Vouchers are required when it is possible for the officer to obtain them, otherwise the name of the person to whom the money is paid must be inserted in the account, which account is sworn to before a justice of the peace.

RETURNS ORDERED.

1. A statement showing what sums of public money have been spent on Port Stanley harbour, with dates. 2. At what dates and on what conditions, the control of said harbour passed into the hands of the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, and through them to the Great Western and subsequently the Grand Trunk Railway Company. 3. Whether such conditions have been observed.—(Mr. Casey.)

1. Copy of all reports made by the engineers of the Public Works Department since the 1st day of January, 1890, as to the condition and requirements of the Goderich harbour and of the north breakwater.

2. Statement in detail of all amounts voted for the construction and improvement of said harbour.

3. Statement showing how much has been expended on said harbour since the Government of Canada undertook the work as a harbour of refuge ?—(Mr. Cameron.)

Copy of all reports, valuations and all other papers relating to lands in the township of South Monagan, county of Peterborough, flooded by reason of the construction of a dam at Hastings, Ontario, and owned by Joseph Clarke and others. —(Mr. Kendry.)

Copies of the contract awarded to Mr. Gédéon Beaulieu, contractor for the building of the post office at Rimouski, of all correspondence between the said contractor and the Government, and of all other documents in relation thereto.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Return of all papers and correspondence regarding the claims of Messrs. Penhallwick, of Edenwold, for destruction of machinery by Indians.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return of all papers and correspondence in regard to the claim of Wm. Anderson, of Touchwood Hills, for destruction of his property by Indians belonging to the Indian Reserve.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence and tenders, the names of the parties tendering, the amounts of their tenders, and the names of the parties awarded the contracts for the historical monuments at Lundy's Lane, Chrysler's Farm and Chateauguay.—(Mr. Casey, for Mr. Gibson.)

Copies of despatches, minutes of Council, and other documents relating to the meeting of the International Railway Congress, St. Petersburg, with a copy of papers submitted by the High Commissioner for Canada to that Congress.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of despatches, minutes of Council, and other documents relating to Imperial stamp duty on Colonial Government securities.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of despatches, minutes of Council, and correspondence relating to the formation of an International Customs Bureau for Brussels.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of minutes of Council, despatches, and correspondence relating to the investment of trust funds in 1888.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of despatches, minutes of Council, and correspondence relating to the Antwerp Exhibition of 1885.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of despatches, minutes of Council, and correspondence relating to the London International Railway Congress, 1895.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of despatches, minutes of Council, and all correspondence relating to the death duties imposed upon colonists domiciled in England.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou, for Sir C. H. Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence which has passed between the Government and party or parties in reference to the "Montreal, Ottawa, Georgian Bay Canal" scheme; also all papers in connection with any application for financial aid towards this project.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Poupore.)

Copies of all reports of inquiries, &c., made to the Government, in or about May last, by the Inspector of Indian Agencies and Reserves, in relation to complaints made by the Indians of the Abenakis village of St. François re Sales, in the county of Yamaska, against their agent, Mr. A. A. Mondoux.—(Mr. Mignault.)

Preparation and printing of the return of the Eighth General Election for the House of Commons of Canada.—(Mr. Leduc, for Mr. Lavergne.)

Statement showing the amount of money expended by the Dominion Government since the first day of July, 1873, for constructing, equipping and subsidizing railways in Canada, with the number of acres of land granted as subsidies, and their estimate value. Also, a statement showing separately the part of such expenditure made on railways in each province of the Dominion and the North-west Territory, deducting any sums that may have been charged against any of the provinces or the North-west Territory in their debt account with the Dominion.—(Mr. Martin.)

SUPPLY—ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take up the time of the House for a few moments while I refer to a matter which has already attracted the attention of the House and the country. On the 22nd inst., I had the honour of addressing the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), in reference to a telegram which appeared in the newspapers, and which I read on that occasion. That telegram had apparently been sent to "L'Electeur" newspaper, and it reads as follows :—

Ottawa, Sept. 18th, 1896.

You can assure my friends that fast line will be all right and that both Quebec and the country will gain by delay. I am advising.

R. R. DOBELL.

Mr. DAVIES.

In my question to the hon. member, I ventured to ask him whether that telegram had been sent by him, and whether it referred to a 17 or 20-knot line. I also stated that, after the hon. gentleman had given his answer, I should ask the Government whether it meant to assume the policy indicated by the hon. gentleman in that telegram. On the 24th instant, the hon. gentleman—and I must thank him for his courtesy—told me that he desired, when the Orders of the Day were called, to make some reference to the telegram upon which I had questioned him. I told the hon. gentleman that I had an engagement, and he told me that he would not bring the matter up until I was in my seat. I left very shortly before the House closed, and the next morning I was somewhat surprised at finding that the hon. gentleman had made the following statement, which I take from "Hansard" :—

Mr. DOBELL. Before the House adjourns, I wish to say a few words of personal explanation with regard to a question which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) put the night before last. I am sorry to trouble the House at this late hour, but I do not wish to defer the explanation longer in justice to parties upon which an unjust reflection has been cast, under which I do not desire they should labour any longer. The hon. member asked me if I had sent a telegram which was published in the "L'Electeur," and I replied, without hesitation and without the least mental reservation, that I had seen that telegram in "L'Electeur," but that that was the first time I had seen it. Well, yesterday I received a message that made me look through the replies I had sent to several telegrams which I had received just a week ago, and I found that I had sent a message to a private friend, a week ago, exactly in the terms of the message which appeared in "L'Electeur," but I never expected that message to be published in that newspaper, and I did not send it for that purpose, and did not give my consent in any way to its publication. I think it is due to my hon. friend from Three Rivers that I should make this explanation.

I can only say that the want of memory of the hon. gentleman surprised me more than I can express. On the first occasion he said positively that he knew nothing at all about this telegram. The question was not whether he had sent it to "L'Electeur" or confidentially to intimate friends, but he stated positively that he knew nothing whatever of the telegram, as read by myself and as published in "L'Electeur." Sir, it was somewhat surprising to me that a matter so important, not only to the city of Quebec, but to the whole Dominion, should have so little impressed the mind of the hon. gentleman that he had to refer back to the answers which he had sent broadcast over the Dominion in reply to telegrams sent him, no doubt, by private friends, to ascertain whether he had expressed any opinions in reference to the fast line, which is a matter of the greatest possible importance to the trade and commerce of this Dominion. Not only the province of Quebec, but the other

provinces of the Dominion, feel that this is one of the most important questions with which the present Government has to deal, and it seems difficult to account for this singular want of memory on the part of the hon. gentleman representing particularly a constituency in the city of Quebec, which is more specially interested in this matter concerning which he sent this telegram. Now, I merely regret, for the sake of the hon. gentleman, and for the sake of Quebec, that the matter was of so little importance that he had to jog his memory by referring to the files of the telegrams which he had sent. I told the hon. gentleman on a former occasion that I would ask the question whether this telegram referred to a 17, an 18 or a 20-knot line. Of course, when the hon. gentleman asserted so positively that he knew nothing at all about the telegram I dropped my question, which I beg to renew; and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether that telegram refers——

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg pardon?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to put a question in that way. The hon. gentleman knows that he must give notice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am following out the question which I put on that night and which I dropped because the hon. gentleman stated that he knew nothing at all about the telegram, and I have a perfect right now, Mr. Speaker, to ask whether the telegram referred——

The PRIME MINISTER. Order, order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I leave it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell).

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order has been raised, and I understand the hon. member (Sir Adolphe Caron) is speaking to it. I may say, in the first place, that I was inclined to check the hon. gentleman on the ground that he was referring to a past debate. But there is an exception to the rule respecting a past debate, covering the case of a question asked or answer given across the floor. So far as that part of the hon. gentleman's remarks are concerned, I take it that they refer to a question or answer, though it was not one put in the regular way by notice; still the question was asked and answered. However, as to asking an hon. gentleman a question without notice at any time, while the hon. gentleman may ask a question, but no Minister or member of the House need answer it, no notice having been given.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There can be no doubt of the correctness of your decision, Mr. Speaker. I understand it exactly in that way. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to refuse to reply. Just as the hon. gentleman forgot about the telegram, so he may say that he does not wish to reply to my question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I put the question and the hon. gentleman may say whether he will reply to it or not.

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in replying to the question put by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). I am somewhat surprised, Sir, that he does not know how to appreciate the perfectly frank, open statement I made to him. I do not consider, Mr. Speaker, that I was under any obligation to make the explanation that I did, because I felt that, as a matter of accuracy, I was perfectly right in saying I had no knowledge of the telegram that was sent to "L'Electeur," because I sent no message to "L'Electeur" or any other newspaper. I would like to give the exact details of how that message was sent. I was writing a letter in my own room, when I received a telegram stating that dissatisfaction existed with my expression respecting the fast line. I did not write the reply myself, but said to my secretary: Write a telegram that the fast line will be all right and that the country will gain by the delay. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that in the multiplicity of telegrams that I had sent, I had forgotten that one. But the spirit of that telegram I am now prepared to defend, and as to the slip of memory, I think my explanation is quite a reasonable one, and that one might easily forget a hasty message sent off in that way. As to the telegram itself, I hold that whether the fast line is eighteen knots or twenty knots, it will be an immense contrast to the line of steamers which the late Government have been content with for the last eighteen years for they have been content with 12 and 13-knot steamers carrying cattle. I have over and over again said that it was not worthy of Canada to have such a line, but I consider that 18-knot steamers would be such an improvement that it might fairly be said that the country had gained greatly by the delay. I am very sorry, Sir, that the hon. gentleman has not been able to appreciate, as I said before, the explanation offered by a gentleman in a perfectly open and frank way without the least mental reservation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand the hon. gentleman refuses to answer my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can get away from the discussion of the present question without calling attention to the extraordinary dubiousness which characterise the hon. gentleman's

(Mr. Dobell's) remarks. In the first place, he said he was not under any obligation to make the explanation he did to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). That depends upon the hon. gentleman's own feeling in the matter. Evidently the answer he gave to the House on the interpellation of my hon. friend from Three Rivers conveyed to the House and the country the impression that he had written no such telegram as was referred to. He did not confine his answer to a denial of having sent such a telegram to "L'Electeur." If I remember aright, he said he had never sent the telegram at all, thus conveying to the House and the country the idea that he knew nothing about it, but that some mischievous fellow had simulated his position and had penetrated to his inner consciousness and had sent the telegram which appeared in "L'Electeur." The whole country got the idea that some one had forged the telegram or that "L'Electeur" had published a telegram which never was sent. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman, I submit, owed it to himself and to the House and to the country to lay at rest any such imputation, because, it appears that he did send the telegram to a friend and told him that he was to advise other friends, and so the matter became public. I think the hon. gentleman owed it as a duty to himself and to the House more than to my friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) to set himself right, which he did frankly and truly. But the doubtfulness now comes as to what he means about this fast service. He says in the telegram : Do not be afraid ; all the doubts and clouds are clearing away. The delay I am advising is going to bring this matter out right, and Quebec will be perfectly satisfied. The hon. member from the other part of Quebec (Mr. Langelier) says that Quebec would not be satisfied ; he says that any man who would go upon the hustings in Quebec to-day and defend anything less than a 20-knot service, would be hustled off the hustings.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is now distinctly referring to a previous debate, and I cannot allow that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will not refer any longer to a previous debate. My hon. friend who leads the Government has stated, and it is within the memory of this House, that a fast line is to be the policy of the Government. I know he received a rude shock when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) got up immediately and warned him that if he brought down a vote for a fast line, or for any line that went any further in expenditure than the present steamship service between this country and Great Britain——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not bring up anything that was said in a previous debate. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that he cannot get round this rule of the House by putting a hypothetical case. He must frankly leave that old debate alone.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I saw it in a newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it was in connection with a past debate in the House, it would still be obnoxious and open to the same objection.

Mr. FOSTER. If I read an editorial, how would that stand ?

Mr. SPEAKER, The hon. member must know that he cannot refer to a previous debate in the House this session for the reason that it would make our discussions interminable.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will take up to-night's debate, and certain information I have from the debates that took place in this House last year and previous years, and I believe I am safe in saying that the leader of the Government is in favour of a fast line. Now, my hon. friend argued in this House on two several occasions, differently. My hon. friend, however, in his telegram which we are discussing to-night, says to his friends in Quebec : It is all right, you will get just what you desire by this delay I am advising—as if he was in favour of a 20-knot service. To-night he says that an 18-knot service would be preferable, and far better than anything we have ever had. I do not disagree with him in that, it would have been better. But my hon. friend, by his remarks, to-night, seemed to imply that he is still in favour of an 18-knot service. Now, will my hon. friend be perfectly frank, and tell this House whether he is in favour of an 18-knot service or a 20-knot service. He is a member of the Government. He need not answer that question unless he likes. But he knows what he is in favour of, and my hon. friend would relieve this House, and the country, and the people of the city of Quebec, very much if he would just be frank and open, and make a clean breast of it, and tell the House what he considers a fast line service to be. I see my hon. friend about to rise.

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Speaker, we know too much——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken before.

Mr. FOSTER. I bow to your right as the guardian——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken, spoken, Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. gentleman only give way to allow the member for Quebec to answer a question ?

Mr. FOSTER. Only for that purpose. I did not think, Mr. Speaker, would so paternally interfere to protect my hon. friend from Quebec West as to warn him that he

need not speak. I hope when his honour the Speaker sees some of us on this side going to the verge of indiscretion in being ready to make an answer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will take my statement, of course, that when he sat down I thought he had finished his speech, and I thought the hon. member for Quebec got up to make a reply. But if the hon. gentleman only sat down to give way to the member for Quebec, of course, I was not right in stopping the member for Quebec, if he chose to answer the question.

Mr. FOSTER. It was a question.

Mr. DOBELL. Well, I should much like the privilege once for all to state that I am in favour of such a fast line of steamship service as will do credit to the country, and be perfectly satisfactory to the whole Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. I congratulate my hon. friend with all my heart. My hon. friend proposes to do something, or to be in favour of something, which all sensible men must agree with; he is in favour of such a fast line as will benefit the country, and will please every person in the Dominion. But I congratulate my hon. friend, also, that in the short time he has been under the tutelage of the leader of this Government, he has been able to catch the peculiar style of the First Minister in being able to give us an utterance in words without leaving the least definite idea on the House as to what he means. My hon. friend shows that he, like the other members of the Government, is fast becoming an adept in concealing his ideas, and in having no policy, and consequently not any longer blundering into an expression of policy. I noticed the anxiety of the leader of the Government when the hon. member rose to give his answer to that question; he did not think his pupil would be so apt. He was afraid that his pupil might be frank, and might give an honest statement to this House of his views as to what a fast line was. He will distrust him no longer. Not a tremor of nervousness will pass over the face of the leader of the Government hereafter when the member for Quebec West rises to answer a question; he will make it as delightfully indefinite as his leader ever did in this world, and that is pretty indefinite. But still, we have no light as to what the hon. gentleman's fast service is. It is going to be something better than we have had, something that will please everybody; but if any one in this House knows whether he is in favour of a 18 or a 20-knot service, from what he has stated to-night, he catches on much more quickly than I can.

SUPPLY—SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT AND THE RIGHT HON J. A. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to bring before the House a very important question connected with the subject we have just had up. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has just returned from a conference with the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, and the House would like to know whether the hon. gentleman discussed with Mr. Chamberlain that fast Atlantic service, or the Pacific Cable; whether it should be a 20-knot service across the Atlantic, and also what was agreed upon as to the Pacific Cable—in fact whatever Imperial issues may have been brought up in the historical conference between these two distinguished men. I think the House would be interested, and so would the public, if the hon. gentleman would take the House and the public into his confidence. I think the question I have put to the Minister of Trade and Commerce will not delay the House very long.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I had a long, pleasant, and extremely interesting conversation I must admit with the right honourable gentleman referred to, but I do not think it would be in consonance with my duty or with the public interest to give any further details at present.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mail service $2,336,000

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to a certain mail service in the Island of Cape Breton to which he referred in this House on the 11th of the present month. I venture to say that he made statements upon that occasion that he will now correct after he has had an opportunity of further reference to the papers that are on file in his department. The service to which I refer is the stage service between Port Hawkesbury on the Straits of Canso and the town of Sydney. It will be in the recollection of the House that the Postmaster General very abruptly stated on the occasion to which I refer, that the service as now being performed cost $9,000 a year, and that there were offers in the department to have it performed for $2,700, that the contract had been renewed from time to time without any tenders or notice of tenders being given, and that therefore there was something wrong in connection with it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I will adduce such facts before this committee as will convince them clearly that every matter in connection with that contract was as straight as an unbroken line, and that every conclusion come to with regard to it was

strictly accurate and guiltless of the least suspicion of wrong and in every way unimpeachable.

What are the facts in connection with this mail contract? The mail service between New Glasgow and Sydney began about 38 years ago, the contractors being Lindsay & Co., and the annual subsidy to it was about $11,000. I state the amount approximately because I have not the figures at my hand, nor could I get them from the department. When the railway was finished to the Straits of Canso in 1880, the department let the service to the then contractors for a sum pro rata of the whole amount. That is to say, the sum given for the distance between the Straits of Canso and Sydney, 100 miles, was based upon the sum given for the whole service from New Glasgow to Sydney. In 1880 the sum given for the service from the Straits of Canso to Sydney was $5,724, Lindsay & Co. being the contractors. Mr. Morrison the present contractor was then a member of the firm of Lindsay & Co., and in 1883, he bought out the other partners and carried on the mail service himself for the sum of $5,724. This went on for some years, and in 1886 a stage line was established by the central route so-called, namely, from the Straits of Canso via the Grand Narrows down to North Sydney, at a cost of $5,000. That made the mail service from Canso to the two Sydneys over $10,000 a year. Mr. Morrison, as the committee will understand, when taking over that contract for the conveying of the mails from Canso to Sydney based his tender upon the probable receipts that he would get from passenger traffic. He then had the whole of the traffic passenger travel from Hawkesbury to Sydney. But immediately on the establishment of the central stage mail route via the Grand Narrows, it took away a large portion of the passenger travel, diminished his receipts, and disturbed the basis upon which he made his calculation when taking the contract. He represented this matter to the department in 1890, long before I came to this House, when Mr. Morrison was a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and when the member representing that county in this House was a strong friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. Therefore, no politics can be asserted to have in the least influenced the Government at that time. He represented the state of affairs to the department. He showed that his contract was leading him to ruin, that he could not carry it on, inasmuch as the Government had established a rival stage line by the central route. He showed by facts and figures that he was unable to carry it on, and that no one was able to carry it on for a less sum than $9,000. The department then, as they had a legal right to do under the post office law, made a temporary arrangement with Mr. Morrison for carrying on the stage line at the sum of $9,000. This was early in the year 1890, and it went on until I came here. In the meantime, in 1891, the railway was opened through the island of Cape Breton on exactly the same line on which the central stage line was being conducted. That did away with the central stage line, and Mr. Morrison continued the stage line by way of St. Peter's to Sydney, with the same number of horses and the same equipment as before. When I came here I found this order of things, and I represented to the department that that stage line was just as necessary now as it was when it was first established. Any one looking at the map will see that the railway running as it does, along the north side of Bras d'Or Lake and across the Grand Narrows to Sydney, is no accommodation to the people on the southern side of the lake. It can no more serve them for the purpose of mail carriage than could the Canada Atlantic Railway that runs from Ottawa to Coteau Landing. Hon. Mr. Haggart was then in charge of the department, and he continued the temporary service for one year more. That carried it up to 1892. The department then decided to break up the stage line into small sections, upon a report being sent into the department, by the post office inspector recommending that the stage line be done away with, and that the whole service be reduced to merely a postal route. This aroused a storm of disapproval all along the line from Port Hawkesbury to Sydney. The stage line ran through my county for about 60 miles, and through the adjoining county to Sydney for some 40 miles; and from the people all along that hundred miles strong representations were sent to the department protesting against the breaking up of this stage line. Telegrams were sent in from the clergyman at East Bay, from the clergyman at Red Islands, from the councillor at East Bay, who is a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and from the warden of the municipality of Cape Breton, who is also a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, as the Minister of Finance well knows. These gentlemen all protested against any interference with the existing order of things and with the breaking up of the stage line. In like manner, from my county strong representations were sent—from the clergyman at Red Islands, St. Peter's, L'Ardoise and River Bourgeois, the most populous places along the route. What was I to do? I simply pressed on the Administration the views and requests of the people who were pressing them upon me. I was thoroughly acquainted with the service which was being carried on. I knew it was as necessary then as it was when first established, and I requested the Government to continue their temporary arrangement for another year. They did so. They carried the service on in that manner until 1893. When 1893 came, the then Postmaster General—I am glad he is in the House now—told me the line would have to be put up to tender and contract. And here I draw the

hon. Postmaster General's attention to that fact, because he very loudly stated the other day that there were no tenders called for; but if he had examined his papers, he would have seen that the contrary was the fact. Tenders were called for in the following manner:—

MAIL CONTRACT.

Sealed Tenders addressed to the Postmaster General will be received at Ottawa until noon on Friday, 26th of January, for the conveyance of Her Majesty's Mails six times per week each way between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney under a proposed contract for three years and eleven months from the 1st of February next. Printed notices containing further information as to conditions of proposed contract may be seen and blank forms of tender may be obtained at the post offices of Port Hawkesbury and St. Peter's and at this office.

CHAS. J. MACDONALD,
Post Office Inspector.

Post Office Inspector's Office,
Halifax, December 15th, 1893.

This notice was published in three papers in the island of Cape Breton, namely, the North Sydney "Herald," the Sydney "Advocate," and the Port Hawkesbury "Journal," and was posted in every post office from Port Hawkesbury to Sydney along the route for which tenders were called. In these ways the notice was published for six weeks before the 26th of January, the last day for the receiving of tenders. So that the committee will at once see that the regular legal notice was given. The following tenders came in and were filed in the office of the Postmaster General:—

Received at the Post Office Department at Ottawa up to 12 o'clock noon on Friday, the 26th January next, under an advertisement issued by the Post Office Inspector for the Nova Scotia Division, dated the 15th November, 1893, ultimo, for the conveyance of mail six times per week between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney, distance 100 miles, on and from the 1st February, 1894, next.

Present cost of service, $9,000. Name of present contractor, John Morrison.

There were two tenders—that of F. McInnis for $6,700, and that of J. Morrison for $9,000. These were the two tenders received in response to that notice. Hon. gentlemen, then, will admit that everything thus far at least was regular. The tender of Mr. Farquhar McInnis was the lowest. He is a most respectable and reliable man, a friend of mine personally and politically. I did not care who might have the service, so long as it was properly performed. Accompanying Mr. McInnis's tender was the following letter, which was also filed in the office of the Postmaster General:—

Port Hawkesbury, C.B., Jan. 22, 1894.

To the Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am this day mailing you a tender for the mail service from Port Hawkesbury to Sydney with P. A. McDonald, M.D., of Hawkesbury, and Duncan McConnell, of Long Point, as sureties. They are both good and responsible parties and should my tender be within the limit of consideration, I would refer you to Dr. Cameron, M.D., Mabou, Inverness County, or to the agency of the Merchant's Bank at Halifax at Port Hawkesbury.

In the event of my tender being accepted, please notify by wire as the time is so very short to get plant on the road in order to be to work on the 1st February. I have the most of the plant on hand and can complete the balance if necessary with short notice. Meantime,

I reman, yours respectfully,
FARQUHAR McINNIS.

It will be seen that Mr. McInnis stated that he had most of the plant on hand, ready to commence service if the tender was awarded. His sureties were perfectly good for the amount for which they were called upon to become surety, which was $14,000. These two gentlemen would be perfectly good for that amount or any other. The committee will remember that the notices were given to tender and that tenders were received, and that the letter I have just read accompanied Mr. McInnis's tender. Mr. McInnis subsequently whote the following letter:—

Port Hawkesbury, Feb. 8th, 1894.

Sir,—In comformity with advertisement calling for tenders to carry Her Majesty's mails between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney, I tendered on the 26th ultimo. I have since considered the matter fully, and in view of the difficulties in the way of stocking the line at this season of the year and other uncertainties, I have decided to withdraw my offer and hereby notify you that I will not accept the contract in the event of my tender being the lowest.

Yours respectfully,
FARQUHAR McINNIS.

After this withdrawal, there was only one tender left, the tender of Mr. John Morrison. I find another letter in the department signed by Dr. P. A. McDonald, one of the sureties of Mr. McInnis. This letter is as follows:—

Port Hawkesbury, 9th Feb., 1894.

To the Hon. P. M. General,
Ottawa.

In re Mr. Farquhar McInnis's tender.

He now considers that he cannot perform the contract for the amount, and therefore desires to withdraw his tender. The weather is stormy and the roads partially blockaded and consequently it would undoubtedly cost several hundred dollars more to start a contract now than it would at any other season of the year.

In view of these facts I hope you will allow him to withdraw his tender before awarding the contract.

Your obedient servant,
P. A. McDONALD.

What was the department to do? Two tenders were regularly received, and one of the tenderers withdrew his offer, so that there was only one left, Mr. Morrison, and he received the contract. If there is anything straighter in the department, I would like to know it. Were there any other offers

made, irrespective of tenders? If so, they would be irregular, but however irregular, were there any? I shall read the only one that was made, and that was made long after the tenders were awarded and when the service was being performed by Mr. John Morrison, and that offer was made in this irregular fashion by Messrs. John McLeod & Sons, of Cleveland. Here is the offer they made, and hon. gentlemen will see at once that it was in every way irregular. It was dated Cape Breton, 12th April, 1894, months after the tenders were called for, months after the date specified for their receipt, and when the contract had been given and Mr. Morrison was doing the work under that contract:

Cleveland, C.B., 12th April, 1894.

To the Hon. Sir A. P. Caron,
Postmaster General.

Sir,—We understand that you have not awarded the mail contract from Port Hawkesbury and Sydney to John Morrison; if not had the mails to come off the train at McIntyre's Lake station instead of Point Tupper—there is practically no need for the eastern mails to go to Port Hawkesbury—and he will accept the contract for $7,800, and if the contract would not be entered into at once or till navigation is open, would do it cheaper. We will furnish satisfactory security.

Yours truly,

JOHN McLEOD & SONS.

Hon. gentlemen will see there is not very much difference between this irregular offer and the regularly allotted contract. John McLeod & Sons offered to do the service for $7,800 from Hawkesbury Station to Sydney. To McIntyre Station the mails are carried by rail. The Postmaster General, seeing that they were carried that distance by rail, caused Morrison to begin at McIntyre Station and change from Port Hawkesbury to McIntyre Station, shortening his contract some six or seven miles, and deducting from the $9,000 a proportionate rate. That cut down his receipts to $8,400. McLeod & Sons offered to do the contract in this irregular way for $7,800, making a difference of only $600. That is the only offer that the Postmaster General has in his hands to-day, although I am willing to do him the justice of admitting that when he made the statement the other day that he had offers to do the work for $2,700, he was making that statement under a misapprehension of the facts. Let me now direct the committee's attention to what the Post Office Inspector for that division suggested in breaking up the line. The committee will remember that this service is being performed from Hawkesbury to Sydney by a stage line, the conditions of which are that the distance carried per hour should not be less than six miles, that there should not be less than two horses. This entailed the employment of 24 horses or six relays to every stage in the whole system. The Post Office Inspector after the mail service was opened by the railway on the north side of the island and by the Grand Narrows—which railway is no accommodation whatever to the southern side so far as the mail traffic goes—wrote the following to the Postmaster General:—

Post Office Inspector's Office.
Halifax, N.S., 13th May, 1892.

Sir,—With reference to the letter from the mail contract branch No. 960 B, of the 10th instant, in which it is stated that the arrangement with Mr. John Morrison for the mail service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney will come to an end when the arrangements for the Cape Breton Railway service are completed, I shall be glad to have your instructions as to what arrangements are to be made for the services of the offices on this route.

In my report No. 665 of the 24th December, 1890, I recommend the following new services:—

Port Hawkesbury and St. Peter's, daily..	$2,082 24
Big Pond and St. Peter's, tri-weekly....	540 00
Sydney and Sydney Forks, tri-weekly...	90 00
	$2,712 24

Now, the hon. gentleman will at once see a great difference between the service suggested by Mr. Macdonald here, and the service as it is now carried on. As I said, it was then, and is now, a stage service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney. Mr. Macdonald suggested a reduced postal service, in the shape of a daily service between Port Hawkesbury and St. Peters, and a tri-weekly service from St. Peters to Big Pond, a distance of 40 miles, and no service at all from Big Pond to East Bay, a distance of some 20 miles. Yet the hon. Postmaster General was under the impression—and honestly under the impression, because he does not know the geography of the country, and the purport of these papers had not been studied by him as closely as he otherwise would have done, if he had given close attention to the question before speaking—that the whole service being performed by Mr. Morrison, was the very service suggested by Mr. Macdonald, the inspector. But, from what I have read, he will see the difference between the two. One is a daily stage service between McIntyre Station and Sydney, while what Mr. Macdonald suggested, as I have said, included a tri-weekly service from St. Peter's to Big Pond, a distance of 40 miles, and leaving a complete blank from Big Pond to Sydney Forks, a distance of 20 miles. It is impossible to compare the service suggested by the inspector with that performed by Morrison. Perhaps I have dwelt upon this a little longer than the committee will think I was justified in doing; nevertheless, I must bring to the attention of the Postmaster General and of this committee the great injustice that would be inflicted upon the people who live in that portion of the country, if the hon. gentleman were to do with this stage line as he proposes. If the hon. Postmaster General will look at the map of Cape Breton, he will agree with me that the railway on the northern side is no accommodation to the people from St. Peter's to East Bay, because the Great Bras d'Or Lake lies between

them and the railway. When the winter comes in and navigation is closed, there is no way to get out, except by this stage line or by private conveyance. There is nothing to prevent the Postmaster General sending mails in any way he likes; still, in doing away with this stage line, he would be taking a retrograde step, for this is a convenience the people have had since 1862, when the daily mail was established. I do hope and trust the hon. Postmaster General will pause before he cancels this contract. There is one other suggestion I wish to bring to the non. gentleman's notice, and, as the request is a reasonable one, I think he will agree with it. Mr. Morrison's contract will expire on the 31st December, 1897, fifteen months from now. Will the Postmaster General cancel it at this season of the year and throw this man's stock of horses and equipment for a heavy stage line on his hands, and ruin him? Why not let the contract run until its expiration, and, in the meantime, the Postmaster General can ascertain what are the best steps to be taken in the interests of the mail service and of the convenience of the people living upon that route, and who are, as I say, shut out from communication with the railway when navigation closes. Mr. Morrison got this contract fairly and properly, in response to a call for tenders sent out by the Postmaster General's own department, and published in every paper in Cape Breton, and posted in every post office from Hawkesbury to Sydney; and, when his tender of $9,000 was accepted, he filed securities to the amount of $12,000, as required. He is the only contractor, and has been doing the service remarkably well, and the service is honestly demanded by the people in that section. For these reasons, I hope the Postmaster General will allow the contract to run until its termination. I would remind the hon. Postmaster General that this road runs 60 miles through my county and about 40 miles through the county of Cape Breton. The facts are quite familiar to my hon. friend in the adjoining county (Mr. McDougall), whose constituents are equally interested with mine, and the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), the two gentlemen representing that county. In justice to the contractor, who has done his work efficiently, in carrying out a contract into which he entered in good faith, and to the people thereby accommodated, I trust the hon. Postmaster General will reconsider the statement he made, and will allow this contract to run to its termination, which will be only fifteen months from now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will not wade through this vast return unless my statements are challenged; but I simply say that the contract now in force is one so manifestly improvident that I could not, in the proper discharge of my duties, allow it to continue in force; and it is my intention to recommend its cancellation, and that new tenders be called for, on due notice in the proper way, and upon the advice of the proper officers of the department. The return upon the Table discloses this state of facts; This service in Cape Breton district has been held by the same contractor, or his son, for many years. At first, the service was performed for the sum of five thousand odd dollars; and by some peculiar circumstances it was renewed in favour of the contractor for nine thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. When?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The renewal took place, I think, in 1890.

Mr. GILLIES. The contract was first taken by this man Morrison in 1883, from Hawkesbury to Sydney, for $5,724, as the records of the department will show. It was increased in 1890 to $9,000, for the reasons I have given.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then this went on. It was a temporary arrangement continued.

Mr. GILLIES. To 1892, then to 1893, and then tenders were called for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think a contract involving this large expenditure should have been renewed from time to time except after open public competition. I do not find that from the time it was entered into until this moment, there has ever been a fair opportunity given to the public to tender. Now, I quote from the papers laid before the House, the total receipts from the post offices served by this line—I think I have the report in these papers—amounts to $242 a year. Am I right on that point?

Mr. GILLIES. You are wrong.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is more than one office on the route that furnishes more money than that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, I won't quarrel with the figures. Perhaps some one will turn them up.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman should not mislead the committee, even if he has to wade through the papers, because that statement is very misleading.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am quite prepared to lock horns with the hon. gentleman on any branch, if it is necessary to do so. I did not propose to do more than deal with the improvident character of the existing contract, but I am quite prepared, on the statement contained in these papers, to discuss everything with the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will make it easier for him. For instance, what is the revenue of the office at St. Peter's, or Sydney, or Red Island, or Arichat?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Here is a telegram I find on page 21 of the return. It appears, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman who preceded me, has taken a great interest, according to these documents, in the renewal of this contract. He stated in his remarks that he was wholly indifferent as to who the contractor was, provided the service was properly performed. I do not find any such indifference on his part in his communications to the department; but I find running through these documents a great anxiety manifested by the hon. gentleman, in telegrams and letters sent by him to the department, and to the late Postmaster General, and to the superintendent, urging them to renew the contract with Mr. Morrison, not to invite public tenders, but desiring them to interfere in every possible way with fair and open competition.

Mr. GILLIES. Were these telegrams and letters sent in before this contract was called for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is suggested that I made a misleading statement; if I did so, I did it on this telegram, and it is my only authority. This is a telegram from Sir Adolphe Caron to J. A. Gillies, Cape Breton, dated October 2nd, 1892:

Regret exceedingly cannot comply with your request to continue Morrison's contract. Cost would be $6,000. Receipts from all offices interested, $242.

Mr. GILLIES. That is a mistake.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is a mistake.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the return placed in my hands by the department.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman can convince himself that it is a mistake from taking up the report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing about it, but I will take the hon. gentleman's supposition. We will assume there is ample demand for the service, for the purpose of argument. I am now dealing with the contract I find in force, and I say that when this contract was in existence in 1890, and expired, the proper course to take was to give the public a fair opportunity to tender for it; and I say with the exception of the pretended tender that they invited in 1894——

Mr. GILLIES. 1893.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The advertisement was issued in December, 1893, and called for tenders returnable on or before the 26th January, 1894. With that single exception, I do not find there was an offer to the general public to tender, nor was it ever put up for tender between the time it expired in 1890, and the time when it was renewed in 1894.

Mr. GILLIES. It did not expire in 1894.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was renewed from year to year. The hon. gentleman knows full well that it was renewed from year to year, at his urgent request.

Mr. GILLIES. You do not understand it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I see I shall have to take up the time of committee. I supposed that my predecessor was well informed when he wrote that telegram. This contract was never submitted to tender except at the time I mention, in December, 1893. An attempt was made in 1892, and the following correspondence is on record. This is signed J. A. Gillies:

Sydney, C.B., Oct. 18th, 1892.

To Sir Adolphe Caron,
Postmaster General.

Please continue John Morrison's contract for carrying mails from Hawkesbury to Sydney for another year upon its present basis. This is essentially important to me. Writing your answer.

Was it his interest or was it the public interest that had to be considered ? I do not find any indifference as to who should be the contractor in this case. Then the hon. gentleman telegraphs or writes again:

18th October, 1892.

To Col. Wm. White,
D. P. M. G.

Please urge Postmaster General to continue Morrison's contract upon the present basis for another year for carriage of mails from Hawkesbury to Sydney. Do this for me. It is absolutely necessary.

(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

And the next day he follows it up with a communication to Sir John Thompson in the same words:

Will you kindly see Sir Adolphe Caron immediately, and get him to allow Morrison's contract for carrying mails from Hawkesbury to Sydney to remain upon its present basis for another year. This is absolutely important and I wish you to carry it out for me. Answer.

(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

Then he writes another communication at great length—I will not read it all unless hon. gentlemen desire to hear it. It is dated 19th October, 1892, and is addressed to Sir Adolphe Caron. After urging a renewal of this contract, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) says that he understands it will soon expire—I presume that point might be admitted—and he urges that it should be renewed in favour of Morrison. He says:

Have faithfully stood by the Government in the last two contests.

Mr. GILLIES. I never wrote that letter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a letter from the Rev. Father McInnis, parish priest.

Mr. GILLIES. Then it is not my letter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You alluded to it, if you did not endorse it.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman must not say that; because there is no allusion to it in my letter. I never saw it, and I never heard of it until I saw it in that file. It should be beneath the dignity of a Minister of the Crown to make a statement of that kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The letter continues:

Have faithfully stood by the Government in the last two contests, and therefore entertain the hope that you will see your way clear to renew Mr. Morrison's contract for at least another year upon its present basis.

Mr. Gillies, M.P., feels very strongly on this point, and I trust he will succeed in his effort to get a renewal of Mr. Morrison's contract, and thus confer a great favour upon the largest number of his constituents.

I have the honour to be, sir
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. McINNIS, P.P.

Then Mr. Gillies on the 19th October, the very day that was written——

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General said at first that that letter was from Mr. Gillies, M.P., and now it appears that it was not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I corrected that. My attention was called to it by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Mr. FOSTER. But there were cheers when that was read.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You will not have much chance to cheer when I get through. On the very same day that letter was written, and it is a coincidence at least, Mr. Gillies wrote urging the renewal of this contract. I do not see him urging, that in the public interest it ought to be put up for tender, but I find him using his influence the other way, and he says:

If this line be disturbed this year, it will ruin me in Richmond County, politically.

On the 21st he telegraphed to the Postmaster General:

Sydney, C.B., Oct. 21st, 1892.

To Sir Adolphe Caron,
Postmaster General.

Will Morrison's contract be continued for another year as requested. If not matters will be worse than serious. Please wire answer immediately.

(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

Then he telegraphed to the Deputy Minister the same day:

Sydney, C.B., Oct. 21st, 1892.

To Col. Wm. White.

Please urge my request immediately continuance Morrison's contract another year. Extremely and essentially important that this be done. Please answer.

(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

Well, Sir Adolphe Caron replies at last. He has been standing fire during these days, and on the 22nd October, 1892, he says as follows:—

Ottawa, 22nd Oct., 1892.

J. A. Gillies, M.P.,
Sydney, C.B.

Regret exceedingly that I cannot comply with your request to continue Morrison's contract Costs would be $6,000——

It grew to be $9,000 afterwards.

—Receipts from all offices interested, $242. It would be impossible for me to justify such an expenditure.

(Sgd.) A. P. CARON.

He went 50 per cent better in a short time. After the Minister declared that it would be impossible for him to justify such an expenditure, on the 9th November, a couple of weeks later, he telegraphed Gillies and McEachren, Sydney, C.B., as follows:—

Ottawa, Nov. 9, 1892.

Messrs. Gillies & McEachren,
Sydney, C.B.

Present arrangement to continue until 31st December. New arrangement to be for one year from date if Morrison accepts terms offered.

(Sgd.) W. WHITE.

Mr. GILLIES. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and the terms offered, what were they? Mr. Gillies writes to Sir Adolphe Caron on the 31st, as follows:—

Sydney, Dec. 31, 1892.

The Honourable Sir A. P. Caron,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir Adolphe,—

I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th inst., in which you state that the present arrangement for the conveyance of the mails from Port Hawkesbury to Sydney will be continued for one year from the first of January next. I write to acknowledge your letter and to thank you for the just and liberal spirit with which your department met the case.

With compliments of the season,
I am, yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

And so it went on for a year.

Mr. WALLACE. What were the terms offered?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the terms offered were $9,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, no.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $6,000. On the 29th November, 1893, when the year's contract was about to run out again, another attempt is made to renew it by Mr. Gillies, but the Government decided to offer it for tender, and Mr. Gillies having learned from the Government that they intended to offer it for tender writes on the 29th November, to Sir Adolphe Caron in regard to the matter, and he requests in these words:

The forms of tender, please send to the postmaster at Sydney and if there be no infringement of the regulations you will not send any to St. Peter's.

Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) explain to the House and to the country, how he came to ask not to publish the tenders in St. Peter's, an important point on the line of service ?

Mr. GILLIES. Read the reply of the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I will read his reply. He rebuked you for it. Mr. Gillies goes on to write :

You are already fully aware of my desire that Mr. Morrison be continued as contractor, both from the excellence of the equipment and long established line, and also of his own personal worth.

I feel very grateful to you personally and to the other members of your Government for the kind, business-like and liberal manner in which they met me while at Ottawa this month.

I am, dear Sir Adolphe,
Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

Mr. GILLIES. Read the Postmaster General's reply.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read it all.

Ottawa, Dec. 5th, 1893.

J. A. Gillies, Esq., M.P.,
Sydney, C.B.

My dear Gillies,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 29th ult., recommending that mail service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney be advertised for one year from the 1st January next.

In reply, I beg to state that there is not time to advertise this service between now and the beginning of the year, as the law requires that the notices be exhibited for at least six weeks before the tenders are opened. It is usual to advertise services for four years, not one year as you suggest. As to your request that no notice may be sent to St. Peter's, this cannot be entertained as in the words of the statute, the advertisement shall be by public notice put up in the principal post offices concerned in such contract.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) A. P. CARON.

It would appear from the letter of the 14th December that there had been an offer made because the Minister writes as follows to Mr. Gillies, and he refers to a letter of the 9th of December from Mr. Gillies, which I do not see on the file :—

J. A. Gillies, Esq., M.P.,
Sydney, C.B.

Ottawa, 14th Dec., 1893.

Dear Mr. Gillies,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., respecting the mail service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney in which you state that Mr. Morrison cannot accept less than $9,000 per annum for this service. In reply I beg to say that an arrangement for one year from 1st January next will be made with Mr. Morrison, but on expiration of that term the service will have to be discontinued.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) A. P. CARON.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) allow me to ask him a question ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. As I understand it, and I would like to know if my understanding is correct, before tenders were asked for, the contract was for about $6,000 ; but after tenders were asked for it increased to $9,000. Is that a correct statement of the case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says it was $9,000 before.

Mr. WALLACE. But I am asking the Postmaster General who has got the documents in his hands.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The information is equally valuable, I suppose.

Mr. WALLACE. We are asking the Postmaster General for his statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And I am answering. On the 6th day——

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Postmaster General tell the House whether the amount was $6,000 or $9,000 ? Surely it is not an answer for him to ask an hon. gentleman on the back benches, what it is, and to give his statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is concerned in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. How is he concerned ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is concerned as a member of this House who has attempted to prevent the continuance of this improper arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Every member may be concerned in it, but we are dealing with the official, that is, the Postmaster General ; and, when the House asks him to lay before it what was got in a certain year, it is no answer to tell the House that which some one else tells him. He ought to know his case. He knew his case sufficiently well the other day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know it sufficiently now, and, if my hon. friend will be patient, he will get the information. I have the floor, and I propose to proceed. On the 6th day of January, 1896, Sir Adolphe Caron replies to Mr. Gillies, as follows :—

My Dear Mr. Gillies,—

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I propose to answer the hon. gentleman's question, and I would ask the Chairman to keep order. I propose to answer it by giving the

official answer, not giving my own words. I am going to read a letter from my predecessor, the late Postmaster General, which, perhaps, may be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, at least.

Mr. FOSTER. The information seems to be second-hand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may not be a reliable source, but I am going to give it.

Mr. FOSTER. Any man who is for the time being a Minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER—must give the information, when he is asked.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I have sat in this House for years, and I have never yet heard a Minister refuse to answer a question, and hon. gentlemen will not make much progress by refusing to answer civil questions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is no mogul. He comes down to this House and refuses to give it information.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is there to answer questions—the servant of the people.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This document, if the hon. gentleman will please preserve himself in patience for a moment, will give him all the information he desires:

Ottawa, 6th January, 1896.

My Dear Mr. Gillies,—In accordance with the request which you make in your letter of the 3rd inst I beg to give you the following information regarding the Port Hawkesbury and North Sydney mail service.

1st. A daily mail service was established between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney on 1st February, 1880, with Mr. T. S. Lindsay as contractor, the rate of pay being $5,724.89.

2. The service was performed by Mr. John Morrison between the 1st April, 1885, and the 1st March, 1894.

3. The rates were $5,724.89, and $9,000 per annum.

4. The rate was increased to $9,000 on 1st February, 1890.

5. Tenders were last invited by notices dated the 13th December, 1893, and were due to be opened on the 26th January, 1894.

6. The notices were posted up at Port Hawkesbury, St. Peter's and Sydney.

7. The tenders were Farquhar McInnis, $6,970, and John Morrison, $9,000 per annum. Mr. McInnis was released from his offer on his pleading that there was not time between the notification to him of the acceptance of his offer and the date on which the contract was to commence.

Yours faithfully,
ADOLPHE CARON.

Now, the hon. gentleman sees when the increase took place, and, if he had been patient with me, he would have got that information without that manifestation of feeling, which, I am sure, he regrets.

Mr. FOSTER. I actually do not understand it yet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I cannot supply the hon. gentleman with understanding.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not ask you for any, because you have little enough of your own.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. McInnes tendered, and his tender was subsequently withdrawn. The amount of his tender was $6,970. He was certified to by Dr. Cameron, the late member for Inverness. The tenders were invited in December, 1893, to be opened on the 26th day of January, 1894, the contractor to be prepared to enter upon his work on the 1st day of February, five days thereafter. Whether it is a sound argument or not, it is complained of, and the records in my hands show that this was an unreasonable condition—to advertise in the dead of winter for a contract, and the tenderers not to have more than five days' notice whether or not their tenders were accepted, and, if so, to provide all their necessary equipment. I am surprised to find that the hon. member for Richmond, after these tenders had been received, endeavoured to ascertain particulars in regard to them, and I am equally surprised that, before a contract was entered into, any such information was given to him. Nevertheless, such appears to have been the case. On the 2nd of February, 1894, the following telegram was sent to the Deputy Postmaster General:—

Hawkesbury, Feb. 2nd, 1894.—Have been expecting letter from Postmaster General, but none arrived yet. Please wire me names and amounts tenders Hawkesbury and Sydney route.

J. A. GILLIES.

To that the Postmaster General replies as follows:—

Ottawa, 2nd February, 1894.

My dear Mr. Gillies,—

Referring to your telegram of to-day asking to be informed as to names and amount of the tenders for the Port Hawkesbury and Sydney mail service, I regret exceedingly it will be impossible for me to accede to your request in this matter as the regulations of the department impose on me the obligation of keeping inviolately secret all information regarding tenders until the contract is awarded.

I think, however, that I may stretch a point and tell you confidentially that the lowest tenderer is for $6,970, and that the person making it is strongly recommended by Dr. Cameron, M.P., and other prominent gentlemen in the locality.

That letter was written before the contract was entered into. Well, that information went down to Port Hawkesbury, and it was followed by the communication dated 8th

February, 1894, from Mr. Farquhar McInnis withdrawing his tender. He said :

I tendered on the 26th ultimo. I have since considered the matter fully and in view of the difficulties in the way of starting the line at this season and other uncertainties, I have decided to withdraw my offer, and hereby notify you that I will not accept the contract in the event of my tender being the lowest.

And the Inspector, on the 9th of February, wrote to the Postmaster General in regard to this tender in which, after alluding to this withdrawal, he said :

The weather is stormy and the roads partially blockaded.

Mr. GILLIES. That is McInnis's surety.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is from P. A. McDonald. He continues :

Consequently it would be almost impossible to distribute fodder along the route, and it would undoubtedly cost several hundred dollars more to start the contract now than at any other season of the year. In view of these facts, I hope you will allow him to withdraw his tender before awarding the contract.

P. A. McDONALD.

The contract went to the old tenderer Mr. Morrison. But I find that, a former member of this House, Mr. Paint, on the 29th May, 1895, addressed a communication to the department with regard to this outstanding contract and he forwarded a protest, in which he set forth :

By this public instrument of protest, be it known to all whom it may concern that on the 29th May, 1895, before me, Richard John Wicksteed, notary public in and for the province of Ontario, duly commissioned and practising in the city of Ottawa, of the said province, personally came and appeared Henry M. Paint, of Point Tupper, gentleman, who, being duly sworn, declared that in 1889 and 1890 one John Morrison, of St. Peter's, Cape Breton, was paid $5,724.88 by the Postmaster General of Canada for the conveyance of the mails between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney. By the terms of the contract he was required to furnish accommodation for passengers to be drawn in a stage, to be drawn by not less than two horses. In 1890 and 1891 Mr. Morrison got $6,270.73, whereas Henry Archibald, of Port Hastings, Cape Breton, was then and since carrying nearly all the mails for him by railway. In 1891, 1892, 1983 and 1894, Mr. Morrison got an increased sum of $9,000, with extras, as perquisites. In the beginning of the year 1894, John Morrison, the father, transferred his contract to his son, the father being then candidate for the local legislature. In January, 1894, a very short advertisement appeared in three journals of Cape Breton inviting tenders for the service above mentioned. These tenders to be received in Ottawa, and to be opened on the 26th day of January, 1894, and service to commence on the 1st day of February, 1894. By thus allowing only five days in midwinter to commence a service of greater cost to the country, than any other of its kind, it was attempted to avoid competition. But competition did occur and was bought off. When the valuable and heavy mails for the mining population and interests of Sydney, Cape Breton, were carried by Morrison's coach for twenty years, he received about $5,000. Now, when the railway carries the great bulk of the matter he receives in the vicinity of $10,000. Only a few local mail bags having to be delivered by him. It may be said that the railway destroys his passenger business. In reply, I assert that long before the railway was completed, it has disgusted and turned aside the travelling public from its coaches, by doubling the fare or largely increasing it in the winter season when the steamboats were laid up. In consequence, passengers preferred to hire a private conveyance and local teams. Morrison, for some twelve years did all in his power to destroy the Conservative Government at Ottawa. I would myself be willing to, and do hereby tender for the practical delivery of the mails and the perfect performance of the service and between Hawkesbury or McIntyre's Lake Station, the service to begin on the 1st of July, 1895, the route to be divided into five sections or a less number as agreeable to the Government and its inspector, for the yearly sum of $4,950.

On the 29th May, 1895. Mr. Paint wrote to the Postmaster General as follows :—

I have the honour to inclose herewith a protest which I have formulated against the mail contractor at St. Peter's, Cape Breton, re John Morrison & Son, contractors. I ask, sir, that the investigation that you shall order may be exhaustive, close and searching, as I may now be compelled to defend myself publicly.

A rigid inquiry, such as you in your wisdom will insist upon, should be sufficient to prevent any further attention being given to it before the House of Commons committee.

Your most obedient servant.
HENRY M. PAINT.

Then on the 30th May, 1895, the then Premier, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, wrote to the Minister as follows :—

My dear Sir Adolphe,—

I had an interview the other day with a friend who complained of the manner in which the mail service was performed between Hawkesbury and Sydney, although there is an exorbitant price paid to the contractor. I then informed him that if he would put his allegations in writing, I would have them investigated. This morning I received a letter and affidavit by which Mr. Paint makes certain charges and offered to perform the service for $4,950, which he says cost $10,000. Will you have this matter looked into.

Sincerely yours,
MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Then follows the acknowledgment and other formal papers, but I am not aware that the request of the hon. gentleman has ever been complied with or that the charge that the lowest tender was bought off has never been looked into. I have myself received a letter from Mr. Paint in the following words :—

(Privato.)

Point Tupper Railway Station,
Cape Breton, 6th August, 1896.

Hon. Wm. Mulock, M.P.,
Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Although not a Liberal, will you permit me to give you my views on the

mail contract now held by John Morrison operated from McIntyre's Lake railway station to Sydney, ninety-four miles, for $9,000 per annum. You may remember that Fraser, M.P. for Guysborough, N.S., read my protest and tender in the House of Commons two years ago to perform the service for $4,950. I still offer to take it for that money; but I would require to divide it into four stages. If you do this and put it up to tender, the service can and will and shall be performed daily for $3,600 and less. The law compels Morrison to drive a pair; he only drives one horse, which is quite sufficient, as the railway takes the mails now that are of any importance. The local mails must still be carried. One horse is ample and will be satisfactory. No matter what reports come to you from any source whatever, even from your deputy. My plan is the only one if you want efficiency and Government funds saved. I am on the spot and know best. The public have not had a fair chance to tender for this special service for thirty years. I will give you a sketch which will help you in forming your opinion.

Then he gives me his sketch. Sir, I find the report of Mr. C. J. Macdonald, Post Office Inspector, on file in the following words:—

Post Office Inspector's Office,
Halifax, N.S., 13th May, 1892.

Sir,—With reference to the letter from the mail contract, branch No. 960 B, of the 10th instant, in which it is stated that the arrangement with Mr John Morrison for the mail service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney will come to an end when the arrangements for the Cape Breton Railway service are completed, I shall be glad to have your instructions as to what arrangements are to be made for the services of the offices on this route.

In my report No. 665, of the 24th December, 1890, I recommend the following new services:

Port Hawkesbury and St. Peter's, daily.	$2,082 24
Big Pond and St. Peter's, tri-weekly....	540 00
Sydney and Sydney Forks, tri-weekly..	90 00
	$2,712 24

Mr. McDOUGALL. That does not take in the whole line.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL—

Am I to understand that the present arrangement with Morrison is to be terminated on the 31st instant?

The hon. gentleman says that does not take in the whole line. I understand the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) says it leaves out a piece of twenty miles, and as to two other important sections it proposes to give a tri-weekly mail instead of a daily mail. Suppose that, for the sake of argument, we ascertain what will be the cost, according to the Inspector's own statement and assuming the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Gillie's) statement to be correct. For the service from Port Hawkesbury to St. Peter's daily, the cost will be $2,082.24. From Big Pont to St. Peter's, tri-weekly, will cost $540. If the Inspector is right, a daily service could be got for twice that, or $1,080. Then from Sydney to Sydney Forks $90, or daily for twice that, $180. Then the hon. gentleman says there is a line of twenty miles left out. From my observation, I should think a service of that kind could be performed for $600 a year. So that gives us a total of $3,942. In the face of these statements and these records, and believing, as I do, that the contract of January of 1894 did not represent the result of a fair competition under fair circumstances, I think I am only discharging my duty by terminating that contract and inviting new tenders upon the advice of the Inspector, on the ground, the official inspector at Halifax, who is familiar with the geography of the country, or if not, will make himself familiar with it. After that we will settle whether the public are paying too much or too little. I shall not exercise my own judgment as to selecting the time of calling for tenders; I will be guided by those who know best. If the Inspector is of opinion that the present is not an opportune time, I will be governed by the practical advice of that officer, who, I am told, is a very reliable officer. On his advice a time will be selected. But I could not, with this record before me, allow that contract to run out its time. I am perfectly satisfied, and I am sure every hon. gentleman in his House is satisfied, that the service is costing the country too much money. Mr. Paint says that he will do the work for $3,600, and when you consider these figures as given by the Inspector——

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Paint's figure is $4,950 is it not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the 6th August he sent me this letter, in which he says he will do the work for $3,600 or less.

Mr. GILLIES. Do you consider that an offer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a statement from a responsible man to which I am obliged to give some weight. I do not call it an offer, because I do not know whether he is in a position to put up the security and so on.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Paint does not say that he will give such a service as Mr. Morrison is performing for the money he has mentioned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let us see what he does say:

You remember that Fraser, M.P. for Guysborough, N.S., read my protest and tender in the House of Commons two years ago to perform the service for $4,950. I still offer to take it for that money; but would require to divide it into four stages. If you do this and put it up to tender the service can and will and shall be performed daily for $3,600 and less.

I do not know how much less, but he says "less." So, if the result of putting it up for tender is to ascertain the fair value of the service, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr.

Gillies), on thinking it over, will agree with me that it is a proper course to pursue, instead of allowing this improvident contract to continue. I am pressed on all sides for an increase of mail facilities, and I think it is the wiser course to save leakage and waste, and, with the money so saved to serve districts that require it. We must extend the mail service, but it is not incumbent upon the Government to allow improvident contracts to continue. The matter has been brought up in this House more than once, and we have the sworn evidence of Mr. Paint that the lower tender was bought off, and that there was a proper case calling for investigation long ago, and the moment it came to my knowledge I decided upon a course.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Postmaster General made some statements to the House which require investigation by a person more familiar with the locality through which this service is performed, than the Postmaster General appears to be. He told us that the revenue from the office, according to the report he held in his hand——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The letter from my prdecessor.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Postmaster General made use of that, and took it out of his department and gave it to this House as authentic information. I want to show to the House the inaccuracy of the statement, and the extent to which the hon. gentleman was misleading the House and the country. Previous to 1880 the contractor, Mr. Morrison, and those who preceded him in that service, performed a great portion of the service that is now done by railway from Point Tupper to Sydney, a distance of nearly a hundred miles. He did not only the mail service, but the passenger and the express service, which brought a revenue to the contractor of not less than $10,000 a year. I do not propose to give the exact figures, but any hon. gentleman who will look into the matter will see that the revenue from the passenger service could not be less than $30 a day, which would make for the whole year about $9,000. The whole express service going to North Sydney and Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, went over that route, and the revenue derived from it was earned by Mr. Morrison and those who preceded him. Under these circumstances, the House will understand that the contractor was better paid by $5,000 at that time, than he could possibly be paid with $10,000 under the present arrangement, when the passenger and express services are largely done by the railway for at least one-half the portion of country that was previously being served by Mr. Morrison. The railway to-day, I am glad to say, is one of the best paying pieces of road under the management of the department, by reason of the number of passengers and the volume of business carried over it. But at the same time the business pertaining to one-half the territory through which that road goes now, was done over the stage route conducted by Mr. Morrison. Now, Mr. Morrison to-day goes over that same territory, on the same road, with a single exception which only took place within the last few years, of about seven miles, and with the same equipment. I understand his contract provides for the performance of the service with the same equipment, the same coaches, the same number of horses. I believe the regular service requires 24 horses, with six spare horses, or about 30 in all. Any hon. gentleman will understand that the cost of feeding a horse for twelve months for a service of that kind would be about $250. If we take the stabling, the shoeing, harnessses, coaches, sleighs, furs, and all the equipment the contractor requires, it would amount to one-half or more than half the amount that he received previous to the building of the railway. Now, as I said before, Mr. Morrison was in the receipt of all the revenue derived from his contract with the Government, and from the passenger and express services going over this route up to about 1880. At that time I myself started an agitation for getting another mail service through what is known now, and has been known since, as the central route by way of Grand Narrows, the route over which the railway was built. About then that service was established, and it injured the service that Mr. Morrison was carrying on to the extent of nearly one-half the passenger traffic. In 1887 the Government undertook to build a railway over that route, which was completed in 1890, but even before it was completed, the very fact that a road was building, and the very fact that the central route, inaugurated between 1880 and 1881, was becoming more popular, reduced the passenger traffic, and the consequent revenue, from day to day, and with the beginning of the operation of the railway, Mr. Morrison was deprived almost entirely of his regular passenger traffic, and was altogether deprived of the express business; because the express business was principally going to the extreme point of Sydney and North Sydney, and the mines in the county of Cape Breton, lying along the shore east of the Sydneys. The House will understand from this explanation the difference between the circumstances in which Mr. Morrison finds himself to-day, and ever since the building of the railway, and the circumstances he occupied previous to 1880, and previous to the building and operation of the present railway.

Now, the Postmaster General stated that the revenue derived from that route through the post offices on that route, only aggregated $240. Why, any person with any understanding of business, ought to inform himself, on discovering a statement of that kind on the public records, whether the statemenet was right or wrong, before he came before any assembly and made use

of it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will name but a portion of the offices, and the localities in which they are situated, that are being served by this mail service. First, I will name a number of important settlements, villages and towns lying at a short distance from the mail route, that is the direct road over which the mail is carried, and which are served from Mr. Morrison's line by side services. There are Arichat, Descousse, Little Arichat, L'Ardoise, Loch Lomond, Grand River and Fourchu. These are mostly populous villages doing a great deal of business. Now, the mails destined for these different points have been carried over the road by Mr. Morrison's stage for distances extending from 5, 10, 20, 30 and even 40 miles. Right on the line itself the principle point is St. Peter's, where Mr. Morrison resides. Then there is Grand Anse, Red Island, Big Pond, East Bay, Salmon River and Irish Cove, and many other. This is a thickly populated country; and there are a number of other offices along that line that I will not mention now. Will any one, hearing these names mentioned, and having any knowledge of what business ought to be in a country where such towns, and villages, and settlements exist—will any one, I ask credit the statement made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). My complaint is that, when he was questioned in respect to this matter, he made no reasonable or fair attempt to correct himself. He fell back on a report that he says he took from the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I fell back on the letter of the then Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron).

Mr. McDOUGALL. My complaint is, that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) did not go into this matter in a business-like way. Knowing, as he did, that this matter had to come before the House, it was his duty to ascertain from the records of the department the revenue of the different post offices along the route. He ought to be able to name the different offices served under Morrison's contract, the different side services connecting with this line, and the amount of revenue derived from these offices, and not rely on a telegram which had the appearance of error on its face. It was only by doing so that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) could give reliable information to this House. It seems to me that the only reason the Postmaster General can have for going into this question in the manner he has done, is owing to the fact that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has taken such an interest in having this service remain intact, as one continuous service from Port Hawkesbury to Sydney, in prefrence to breaking it up into five or six different and disconnected contracts. Every one who knows anything about a mail service through the country, must know that it cannot be satisfactory, if broken up. One contractor arrives at a certain hour at his destination, the other is waiting for his arrival, going to the next point, he finds he was so many hours late, and so continuously along the line the service is delayed and the public is suffering.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The inspector advised this course.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It matters not. The Postmaster General ought to know his business, regardless of the inspector. He ought to be able to judge the inspector's report, and he ought to be able to judge the communications and correspondence and complaints coming to his department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the inspector is right.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then, why not delegate the whole duties to the inspector and give him the entire charge of your department? The only reason which the Postmaster General can give for his action in this matter is because my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has taken an interest in continuing this service intact as it has been for the last thirty or forty years. Perhaps there is another reason, and that is that Mr. Paint made an offer for the contract and made a statement by letter. The Postmaster General made use of the statement as official information from his department, that Mr. Paint informed him that Mr. Morrison had done all in his power for twelve years to destroy the late Government. Does that indicate that there would be any collusion between the late Government and Mr. Morrison for the continuance, through improper means, of the contract for that service? The Postmaster General quoted against himself, when he said that Mr. Morrison did all in his power to destroy the late Government for the last twelve years, and up to the date of the letter, which, I think, is only a year or two ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not up to the date of it. I think the papers show that he has been supporting Mr. Gillies.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It appears, also, that Mr. Paint was offering to perform the service for much less than Mr. Morrison is performing it at. Well, I do not know any one who would stand $500 for Mr. Paint in the part of the country he resides in, not to speak of guaranteeing him to carry out a contract at the figures the Postmaster General has given. We know the reason why Mr. Paint has written letters against Mr. Morrison. It was because Mr. Morrison did not support him in his elections for this House. I may state to my hon. friend and to the House, that I was approached, about twelve years ago, by Mr. Morrison and asked to intercede for the renewal of his contract. At that time, and for all the time before then, and, I believe, for all the time since then, Mr. Morrison was not a political

friend of mine. But I knew what the public interest demanded. I knew no man in my county who would like to see the service taken from Mr. Morrison and given to others who, perhaps, could not perform it as well. I knew that, if I tried to take that service from Mr. Morrison, I would be making myself unpopular with the people who sent me to this House, and who wanted the very best man that could be got to have that contract. That was long before the hon. member (Mr. Gillies) had a seat in this House. It was before the building of the railway. I remember interceding for Mr. Morrison, and I interceded for him because I knew he had given satisfaction to the public, and that no other man could undertake the service for less money and do it as efficiently. It was an efficient service that the country required, and not a service to please the contractor or the men who wanted to get the contract. Coming, as I do, from a locality where I had every means of knowing how this service was performed, and knowing the importance of the service, I thought it was my duty to make this statement to the House, notwithstanding the statement made by the Postmaster General, who based his remarks upon papers from his department, without going fully into them. I am sorry to see the Postmaster General place himself in the position he did. If he had given as much care and study to the correspondence and information in his department as he gave to outside information, some of it from irresponsible parties, he would have acted very differently. He would have made up his mind in a different manner from that which he did, when he informed the House that he had such information as justified him in cancelling that contract twelve or fifteen months before it expired.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) need not have worked himself up to such a fury against the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in relation to the telegram that was sent by his predecessor (Sir Adolphe Caron). I leave it to the reason of any right-thinking man, if a Postmaster General one month in office is bound to make further inquiries, when he finds a telegram in his office, left by his predecessor in the department, stating that the receipts from all the places served by this route were $242.

Mr. GILLIES. He should have made inquiries before he made the statement to the House.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). He simply stated what his predecessor had said, and he read a telegram of the late Postmaster General.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why should the hon. gentleman use the telegram when he had the information in his department?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). What better information could he have in the first instance than the statement of his predecessor? I admit that if anybody had said that was not correct, he ought to have inquired. But I notice that the hon. member for Richmond himself did not deny the statement, or say that the receipts were more. You will search this correspondence in vain for one word from the hon. member in reply to the telegram of the late Postmaster General that the receipts were $243, or stating that he was wrong. There is no doubt that he was wrong; there is no doubt that the receipts were more than that; but is the present Postmaster General to be blamed because he takes the statement of his predecessor as correct, when there is not a word of denial from either the hon. member for Richmond or the hon. member for Cape Breton? Has it come to this that the Postmaster General or any other Minister, when he gets a statement made by a previous Minister, must inquire whether it is correct or not? Is he not bound to accept that statement as correct?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Well, the hon. gentlemen are the best judges of the late Government. But I submit that such a statement would not be made by any man who understands the functions of a government. The present Ministers would require ten times as much time as they have at their disposal if they had to take every letter written by their predecessors during the last eighteen years and institute an inquiry to find out whether it was correct or not. A fine state of things that would be. These gentlemen are attempting to show that this matter is all right when it is all wrong. The hon. gentleman says he has assisted Mr. Morrison; that is to say, he did all he could. I would like the hon. member to point out one word he said for him from 1890?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think I said that about ten or twelve years ago I had interceded for Mr. Morrison.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). He was only getting $5,700 odd at that time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But he was getting all the revenue from the passenger service.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). In the summer time that was not large, because everybody who travelled to Sydney went by boat, and not by coach; and the hon. gentleman knows that previous to the building of the railway the winter traffic was not very large.

Mr. GILLIES. The boats were only semi-weekly.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Once a week sometimes and twice a week sometimes, and they only began in June and stopped in October.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). But the larger part of the travel was by boat in summer when the boats ran. Up to that year Mr. Morrison seems never to have made any claim, and the hon. gentleman never made any claim for him for any increase. In 1890 he gets the amount raised to $9,000 without a single fact being put before the Government. In reading this correspondence, it is a very curious thing that there is not a line on record showing who made the application, or the reason for the increase. One would suppose that when the department increased the amount from $5,700 to $9,000, they ought to have had something to offer to justify the change. But there is not a word; there is not one of the facts put forward now by the hon. member for Cape Breton when arguing for his friend Morrison.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The county was then represented by a friend of the hon. member for Guysborough, and a supporter of the present Government, and it is quite possible he interceded.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That is to say, so well satisfied were the Government with the word of a gentleman in opposition that they would accept it in carrying out a transaction of this kind? Is that the position—that this increase was made, because Mr. Morrison was recommended by Mr. Flynn, who then represented the county of Richmond? If the hon. gentleman is satisfied with that argument, I am. But there is not a letter even from Mr. Flynn asking for the change. If the statement had been made by the hon. member for Cape Breton that Mr. Morrison was going to lose so much by the building of the railway, I could understand it; but after the matter is made public, the hon. member comes and makes such a statement, which should be in this correspondence if there was anything in it. The hon. gentleman knows that about the year 1890, a change took place in the political feelings of Mr. Morrison, and from that time he has been a strong Conservative. I do not blame him, but I only mention the fact, and the change paid him. In relation to the asking for tenders for the mail route, I want to correct my hon. friend from Richmond, who I know would not wilfully for a moment make a misstatement. But the evidence is against him, so far as Mr. McInnis is concerned, and his ability to carry out this contract, I suppose Mr. McInnis will be the best judge of that; and my hon. friend gives him a very high character, saying that he is a great friend of his personally and politically, and consequently a man of repute. Let us see what Mr. McInnis himself says about the whole transaction. He does not seem to think that his friend the hon. member for Richmond would look after his interest as well as he ought to; consequently he gets somebody else to attend to it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. He is not in Richmond county.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does he live in Cape Breton county?

Mr. McDOUGALL. He does not.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does he live in Inverness county?

Mr. McDOUGALL. He does.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Why did he not go to his own member?

Mr. GILLIES. He did.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Well, we will find out. He referred to Mr. Murdoch McCrea, ex-M.P.P., for the county of Richmond.

Mr. GILLIES. Does not the hon. gentleman remember the Postmaster General reading a letter from Dr. Cameron to the Postmaster General of that day on behalf of Mr. McInnis?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There is no doubt about it—saying that he was a good man. But I want to show that he was not satisfied either with the hon. member for Richmond or with his own member. He went to Mr. Murdoch McRae, an ex-M.P.P. of the county of Richmond and now an official of the present Government at Ottawa, appointed to office by the late Government.

As the mail contract from Hawkesbury to Sydney is up for tenders, and I am thinking of tendering for it, I thought I would write you to know if you would protect my interests at the opening of the tenders on the 26th instant, or could get some friend that would look after the matter for a small fee, as I presume Mr. Gillies will be there for Mr. Morrison, and will get it for him if at all possible for him to do so, and no doubt he has the inside track, as the time is short between the opening of tenders on the 26th and the contractor to go to work on the 1st of February makes it look very risky.

This is the honest friend of the hon. member for Richmond, his political ally, the friend of whom he spoke so highly, when, a moment ago, he rose in his place to show that the hon. member for Inverness had spoken of him in the highest terms. He went on to say:

But I think I will try, and if successful will make the best of it, even if the time is so unreasonably short.

Mr. McRea, when he got that letter, wrote at once to Sir John Thompson, so that the Government were fully apprised of the matter.

My dear Sir John.—The inclosed letter explains itself. The distance from Hawkesbury to Sydney is 100 miles, and the idea of the tenders being open on the 26th of the current month and the service to commence on the first of February, just six days afterwards, is preposterous, unless there is some reason for it that I cannot apprehend. The present contractors have been most inveterate and energetic opponents

of the Conservative party for the last twenty years, and still retain the contract. I believe in the last election Mr. Morrison supported Mr. Gillies. His having done so may give colour to the charge that the Post Office Department is conniving, by a very contemptible trick, to continue the contract.

Mr. GILLIES. Where is the possible harm in the giving of the contract when the notices for tenders are advertised six weeks ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am reading the letter to show what the opinion of this man was. I will show the contract in a minute. How did Mr. McInnis stand himself in relation to the matter ? To put himself right with the Postmaster General, on the 22nd January, 1894, he wrote the following letter, and it will be noticed that Mr. McInnis was ready and able to go to work. I make this statement here, and I claim no privilege as a member of Parliament, that unless he had been bought off, he would have gone to work.

I am this day mailing you a tender for the mail service from Port Hawkesbury to Sydney, with A. P. McDonald, M.D., of Hawkesbury, and Duncan Macdonald, of Long Point, as sureties. They are both good and responsible parties and should my tender be within the limit of consideration, I would refer you to Dr. Cameron, M.D., Mabou, Inverness County, or to the agency of the Merchants' Bank at Halifax at Port Hawkesbury.

Here was a reference to a bank, an M.P., and a well-known physician. Mr. McInnis says :

In the event of my tender being accepted, please notify by wire, as the time is so very short to get plant on the road in order to be at work on the 1st February.

He knew very well that the other man was getting $9,000 besides perquisites, and he went a good deal lower, and he knew very well that Mr. Morrison would get the contract at $9,000, because of the contract referred to by Mr. McRea.

In the event of my tender being accepted, please notify by wire, as the time is so very short to get plant on the road in order to be at work on the 1st of February. I have the most of the plant on hand, and can complete the balance if necessary with short notice.

What then is the information ? The explanation is that it was made worth the while of this man to withdraw.

Mr. GILLIES. By whom ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). By those interested in the contract.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. gentleman say, from his place or anywhere else, that Mr. McInnis was bought off by Mr. Morrison or anybody else ? He makes a cowardly insinuation.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I make the statement that he was bought off by some one or other interested in the contract, and I claim no privilege of Parliament when I make the statement, and Mr. McInnis can proceed against me.

Mr. GILLIES. The only person interested in the contract was Mr. Morrison.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman need not argue the legal case. Mr. Morrison has an action against me.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Morrison bought out Mr. McInnis?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I make the statement, in order that it may cover Mr. Morrison and every other person, including the hon. gentleman himself, interested in the matter, that those interested in the contract purchased McInnis off and paid him the money. I claim no privileges of Parliament in this respect. And the hon. gentleman can proceed against me at any time.

Mr. GILLIES. You will not state that Morrison or any person bought him off?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Morrison might set up the plea that an agent did it without his knowledge, and then his son was interested in it. His son got the contract, when Mr. Morrison was running for the local House, and perhaps his son paid it. All that I know is that the son took the contract to relieve the father. I can understand the feelings of the hon. member for Richmond in this matter, because he had a great deal of trouble. I can well understand how he was worried in working this matter and how he had to work it in a way sometimes that he would not do in private matters. I can quite understand how he was being worried on every side and his writing to Mr. White: My dear Mr. White, I wish to get the contract so as to get some peace for my troubled soul. I can understand how that troubled soul led him on to send a telegram to Sir Adolphe Caron and another to Mr. White, and in case the double-barrelled gun would not go off, he sent another to Sir John Thompson. But the late Postmaster General did not take his own course and decide the matter. It is rather suggestive that it needed two telegrams sent in the same day, one to the Minister, and one urging the deputy to urge his superior to do that which the superior had been requested to do. This indicates the great trouble the hon. gentleman was put to ; I am sure the evidence before the House is such as to indicate that the hon. gentleman must have passed through the fiery furnace of tribulation, when he was so anxious to have his troubled soul set at rest by the signing of this contract. Let it not be forgotten that in 1890 the contract was raised to $9,000. Up to the end of 1891 it was continued at $9,000, and the same in 1892, and the same in 1893 ; and it was not until 1894 that tenders were called for. It will be seen that the hon. Minister, for whom I have some sympathy, decided that this should not continue. Once he felt his

soul must be relieved of its burden about this contract. He, too, said that he would throw aside the influences that surrounded him. Noble purpose! and so he sent a telegram, as read by the present Minister, in which, in a moment of strength, he said:

Regret exceedingly that I cannot comply with your request to continue Morrison's contract. Cost would be $6,000.

It was then $9,000.

It would be impossible for us to justify such an expenditure.

I like to see a man rise to a great occasion; I like to see a man holding the noble position of a Minister of the Crown, standing by the country. But the curious thing is that, within less than three months, the hon. gentleman did justify the expenditure to himself. No doubt, the messages that came to him, one after the other, worried him so that the Morrison contract became a nightmare to him. He felt it was necessary to continue it, in order thereby to continue the life of a political friend for another parliamentary term. And so his backbone gave way, and Morrison got his contract. Let us be thankful that great men have moments of strength which enable them to rise above mere external circumstances and assert their native dignity. But, while this contract was being continued for three years, there was a report, dated 1890, which had been sent in by the deputy, to whom reference has been made, suggesting a new way for dealing with this contract. I am not going to say this is the right way, but I wish to point out that there must be something wrong about the department and the contract, when their own inspector for the province of Nova Scotia writes and makes this suggestion, and they not only write to say that it is not a good suggestion, but completely ignore his report. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) said that the Minister ought to be above his deputy and ought to go into every question. I entirely dissent from that, and for this reason—that no Postmaster General that ever was, or ever will be, in Canada, can master the intricacies of the postal service of this country. I venture to say, in the presence of the hon. member for Three Rivers, a former Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), that all those who have been at the head of this department, together, have but a faint idea of the postal system of the whole Dominion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In the case of a $9,000, they ought to know the particulars.

Mr. FRASER. They evidently had the particulars from the deputy, but they acted in the very opposite way from his report. But that statement of the particulars must come from the deputy. There would be no need for a deputy, if the hon. member for Cape Breton is right.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Inspector.

Mr. FRASER. Inspector or deputy, for the Minister must depend upon them for detailed information respecting his department. The fact is that this is a job and to continue it would be to perpetuate a job. Can there be anything wrong in asking for tenders, so as to ascertain if this contractor is getting too much? I do not know whether Mr. Paint could or could not run a mail route. I know that he was able on one occasion to carry the county of Richmond, and that he sat in this House, and I know he was going to run again, but, for some reason, did not do so. It surely would be criminal on my part to refuse to accept the statement of a Conservative ex-member of this House. I highly commend what the hon. Minister has done.

Mr. TAYLOR. Carried.

Mr. FRASER. The chief whip (Mr. Taylor) is afraid that there is still worse to be exposed, and he wants this subject to be dropped. But the facts must be known. It is assumed that a contract of this kind should be continued from year to year, but I contend that a contract of this kind should not be continued. Inquiry should be made, and I am glad the hon. Minister has decided to make inquiry. I know the people of the county very well, and I have many letters from men in Richmond and Cape Breton, who are in favour of such action as that the Minister has taken.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to Senneville, in the county of Jacques Cartier. It is an important municipality, frequented by a large number of summer residents. There is no post office there. It formed a part formerly of the municipality of St. Anne's, but is now a distinct municipality. I trust the Postmaster General will see his way clear to furnish it with a post office as soon as possible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would do me the favour to call at the department, and I would be pleased to go into the matter with him, and endeavour to meet his wishes.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if the rumour is true that we have seen stated in the Toronto papers, that the Rev. Mr. Dixon, who sold postage stamps in the Toronto post office, has been dismissed from that position, and if so why?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not know that Mr. Dixon was a clergyman, but there has been a change made in the licensee in the Toronto post office. I was informed, and believe it to be the case, that the licensee to sell stamps at the Toronto post office, was a member of a wholesale firm in that city, and was engaged in that

business; that he did not give personal attention to the work of selling stamps, but farmed it out, his only interest being to collect the profits.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the commission given ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the regular commission is 1 per cent. I inquired of my deputy as to the light in which licenses were held, and he informed me that they were treated as revocable privileges, and not as permanent offices. I quite agree with him in that view, and am of the opinion that an office of that kind can better go to relieve some needy person, than be utilized as it was in this instance. I selected for the office a most worthy citizen of Toronto, whom I suppose the hon. gentleman knows, Mr. William Hewitt, a man who had at one time been a prominent hardware merchant in our city, but had been unsuccessful in business, and had grown old, almost too old to earn a living in any way requiring much labour. I know that he has been reduced almost to want. His case was one that appealed to the sympathy of every man who had any sympathy in his bosom ; and when the circumstances of that office were brought to my attention, I considered that it was proper to give Mr. Hewitt that little means of keeping soul and body together. I may say, however, that I stipulated with him that he was not to dismiss the employees there, a couple of women, but to continue them until they could get other employment. I guarded their interests as well as possible. Of course, that is only a temporary understanding. I would further say that in acting as I did, I did not know, nor do I know now, Mr. Dixon's politics. I do not know the gentleman at all ; but if I find any similar case in the department, or if the hon. gentleman will point out to me any person holding a privilege of this kind under similar circumstances, I shall deem it my duty, no matter what his politics may be, to follow the precedent I have set in this case.

Mr. WALLACE. I know Mr. Dixon as a gentleman who was a minister in the city of Toronto, and who preaches without any compensation. I know that for about 18 years he has held the privilege of selling postage stamps in the post office in Toronto. I think it is an arbitrary act to displace him without any charge of incompetency being made against him, or any charge of any kind except that he was a member of some commercial firm. I have no doubt that he performed the duties of selling stamps with entire satisfaction of the citizens of Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman say he discharged the duties personally ?

Mr. WALLACE. Not at all. The hon. gentleman has said that two ladies are performing those duties, and those two ladies, he says, are to continue to perform those duties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only temporarily. I do not even know their names.

Mr. WALLACE. He tells me that these two ladies are to continue to sell stamps in the post office after Mr. Hewitt has been appointed, although he has discharged Mr. Dixon because he did not personally attend to the work of selling stamps, but allowed it to be done by two ladies. I do not think the Postmaster General has made out a very good case. He says that Mr. Hewitt is a poor man. I am not aware whether Mr. Dixon's circumstances, financially, are those of a poor man. I do not suppose the Postmaster General has made an inquiry to find out whether he is displacing one poor man to put in another poor man.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I observe in the Ottawa "Citizen" of last Saturday an item which I think refers to Mr. Dixon. It says : "Mr. Dixon is a partner in a wholesale house." That means in the city of Toronto. This is a telegraphic despatch, and I assume it to be correct.

Mr. WALLACE. The Postmaster General did not make the change until he saw that statement in Saturday's "Citizen."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the Postmaster General any information of his own that he could give the committee ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given that information as a citizen of Toronto, and I only sent for that paper to confirm what I stated.

Mr. WALLACE. What firm is he a member of ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the name of the firm is Ansley, Gillespie & Dixon, furriers. I thought that item in the "Citizen," a Conservative paper, would convince the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that we are face to face now with a new principle upon which dismissals are to be made. The Postmaster General lays down as a principle that wherever he finds a man who is doing his work, if he is not an officer in the civil service where it requires some strong action of the Government to dispossess him, but is subject at any time to change, if it is made apparent to him that this gentleman is not as poor as another man, he will dispossess him from that office and put in a man who is poorer. Now, that does not seem to be a good rule of conduct to go by. Is the Postmaster General going to adopt it as a principle that he will dismiss every man—even though he does his work to the complete satisfaction

of the department—simply because there is a poorer man who would like to have the position. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not given the information here of his own knowledge that Mr. Dixon is one of a firm of wholesale merchants, but he relies on a newspaper report to back him up in his assertion. He (Mr. Mulock) has confessed here himself to-night that no one person is able to do the stamp-vending, and that there are two ladies who are engaged at it. Mr. Hewitt is an old man and cannot do the work himself. Now, if the Postmaster General is informed by his department that the work has been well done, and has been supervised by Mr. Dixon who must employ help, surely he has no ground to dispossess Mr. Dixon. My information is that Mr. Dixon is a preacher of the Gospel, has been a missionary, and that for eighteen years he has performed his work to the utmost satisfaction. He is a respectable man in every way and very acceptable to the people who have done this work. Mr. Dixon does not farm it out, because he has to have persons to assist him. And if he superintends the work, and it is done to the satisfaction of the department and the public, it does seem to me we are getting upon very sandy ground, if we adopt the principle that because there is a poorer man somewhere around, a good official is to be dispossessed of his position. That is not a satisfactory principle to go by.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under the circumstances, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) was perfectly right in dismissing a man who is clearly a member of a wholesale firm, and a man who took no interest whatever in the duties that were supposed to devolve upon him as holding a commission for the sale of stamps. Mr. Dixon did not attend his office, but virtually farmed it out by employing two girls, possibly at low salaries, to discharge the duties. He pocketed the balance of receipts himself, and did nothing at all in the office. We know under the present condition of the country that there are too many poor people who are willing to take any little position for the purpose of earning an honest livelihood. Hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for that condition of affairs, for they have unquestionably contributed a good deal to it by their policy. I consider the Postmaster General was perfectly right in dismissing a man who was evidently receiving a very nice annual income for which he did little or nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was his income ?

Mr. McMULLEN. He paid the salary of the two girls and pocketed the rest of the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

Mr. McMULLEN. We have good reason to believe that it is worth a considerable sum. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) gets up here and tells us that this gentleman has been a missionary. We do not want to reflect upon any person, but if Mr. Dixon was a man in the position that the Postmaster General had a right to conclude he was, a member of a wholesale firm, and was pocketing an annual sum without doing a single stroke of duty, the Postmaster General did perfectly right, and I hope if there are any more such cases he will deal with the rest of them in the same manner. I hope he will give the poor and industrious classes in this country an opportunity of filling positions of that kind, and not allow the money to go into the pockets of men who are evidently in a position to live comfortably without it. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows this gentleman very well. He says he has been a minister and a missionary.

Mr. WALLACE. He is a minister yet.

Mr. McMULLEN. I earnestly hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) has received considerable benefit from Mr. Dixon's efforts in that direction ; but I have to say that so far he has not shown any evidence of it. We are glad to know there are such people in the country, but we do not want to make them all commissioners for selling stamps. We do not want wholesale merchants, who presumably have a considerable anuual revenue from their business, in the position of selling stamps, while the poor people are not able to make a living. Why should an office of that kind not go to a perosn who is in need of it. It is a laudable act on the part of the Postmaster General to deal with this case as he has done, and I hope he will repeat his action in every similar case where the work is farmed out as it has been in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the Postmaster General tell us what is the amount of the sales of stamps each year at this office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am unable to inform the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman think it is a large sum ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no opinion which the hon. gentleman is willing to accept.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to try and get an opinion for the House. The hon. gentleman does not seem to think he is bound to give any information to the House at all. The hon. gentleman dispossesses an old official because he thinks he is a member of a wholesale establishment, and because another man is poor. Another hon. gentleman gets up in the House and makes a charge that this official pays low salaries to the girls, and

pockets a large amount of money. It is only fair we should know what the amount of the transactions at that office is. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) not informed himself from his deputy. Has he gone to work and dispossessed an old and thoroughly good and efficient servant and never inquired into the facts at all. Surely the hon. gentleman has not proceeded that way.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) turns up the post office report, he will find that the sale of stamps in Toronto is something like $370,000 a year, and that 1 per cent on that would be $3,700 per annum.

Mr. WALLACE. One man does not sell all the stamps there ?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. There are over a dozen places where stamps are sold in Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we have no solid ground at all to judge on. We must appeal to the Postmaster General to set us right in this matter, and surely he will give us the information before the item passes. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) tell us how many vendors of stamps there are in the city of Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there are sixteen branch post offices where stamps are sold in addition to the general office in question.

Mr. WALLACE. I might inform the Postmaster General that there are at least a dozen places in that portion of the city that is in my riding, selling postage stamps and they are not branch post offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is so much more.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. So that this $100,000 is distributed among probably one hundred people.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then it did not take much away from your friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Postmaster General if in the arrangement he has made by changing from the Rev. Mr. Dixon to Mr. Hewitt, he has effected any saving ? Is the commission as much to Mr. Hewitt as was paid to Mr. Dixon ? I might say before the hon. gentleman answers this question that I am informed that the Rev. Mr. Dixon has no business whatever except that of a missionary without salary ; among the poor people of the city of Toronto ; and that the offence, if offence it was, which he committed was the preaching of a sermon to the Orangemen on the 12th of July, in which he perhaps overstepped what some people might regard as the bounds of religion and went into politics. That is the offence for which he is deprived of this petty office. But, so far as I know, he has no connection with any mercantile institution, and I think the item should stand until the members from Toronto are here, who are fully conversant with the subject.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I emphatically repudiate the insinuation of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I was not aware, until I read in the "Citizen" on Saturday, that the gentleman had any connection with the order to which the hon. gentleman refers, or with any order, and I never heard of him delivering a 12th of July sermon or any other sermon to any organization. I have given the one and only reason for my action.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have you effcted a saving?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Hewitt is allowed the same compensation. There is one scale of remuneration allowed to all vendors of stamps.

Mr. FOSTER. Does Mr. Hewitt take this office under the distinct understanding that he is to do the whole labour himself ? The objection seemed to be that the other man was farming out the work, when the fact was that he could not do the whole work himself, and had to employ a couple of girls as clerks. Does Mr. Hewitt avoid all that, or is he to employ any girls ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained to the hon. gentleman once, and I will explain again. As I understand, Mr. Dixon conducted the office by deputy, employing two women or more. I have stipulated that Mr. Hewitt is not to discharge them at once, but to keep them until they get equally lucrative employment. He has inmates of his own family who will assist him in the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Postmaster General know whether Mr. Hewitt is a Liberal and Mr. Dixon a Liberal-Conservative ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know anything about Mr. Dixon's politics. I presume that being a clergyman he takes no part in politics. Mr. Hewitt is a Liberal.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman says that because a man is a clergyman he takes no part in politics, he knows more than I thought ; for he has two clergymen behind him who have taken part in politics.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the expenses of the Toronto Post Office. I think he could save a large amount of money there, and I would advise him to commence at the head and cut down the salaries from the top to the bottom. The postmaster of Toronto is getting a salary of $4,000 a year, while the Deputy Postmaster General of this Dominion is only getting a salary of $3,200 a year. The expenses of the Toronto Post Office amount to nearly $151,000, for a

population of about 175,000 while the expenses of the Montreal Post Office amount to only $143,000 for a population of about 250,000. So that the city of Toronto, with 75,000 fewer people, costs nearly $8,000 more than the city of Montreal. The Toronto district postal service costs nearly $13,000 more than the service of the Montreal district. In the city of Toronto there are no less than 135 letter carriers, whereas in Montreal, with 75,000 more people, there are only 99 letter carriers. I think the Postmaster General, with great benefit to this Dominion, ought to investigate the affairs of the Toronto Post Office, as well as those of other cities, and I believe he would be able to make a very larg saving to the people of this country every year.

Mr. FOSTER. After that appeal, made by one of his strong supporters, I think the hon. gentleman has hardly an excuse for asking for about $107,000 more than was given last year, and adding five or six clerks. I want to press for the information I asked as to the amount of the sales at the Toronto Post Office by Mr. Dixon, and the number of clerks he had to employ; and while I am not going to be so unreasonable as to insist on that information to-night, I would ask my hon. friend to make a note of it and let us have it when we are considering another vote for his department, or on concurrence. But I would add my appeal to the appeal of the hon. member for Kent, that he should strike something off this estimate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When the hon. Postmaster General is bringing down that information, it might be well, in view of the statements made by the hon. member for Kent, to bring down a comparison of the work done at Toronto with that done at Montreal as regards the number of letters and newspapers distributed, and the amount of the revenue. Will the hon. gentleman make a note of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think I can get such a statement, but I will try and meet the hon. gentleman's request.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say to the committee that I find the total revenue received at the Toronto post office is $370,361.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the Montreal revenue?

Mr. BOSTOCK. Before this item is adopted, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to the condition of the mail facilities in the Kootenay country. In Rossland, the lack of proper facilities has been a great drawback to business. The people there are obliged to send their mail very largely through the States, which has a bad effect on the business of this country. There is a daily mail from Rossland down to Spokane at present, but, owing to the arrangement of the boats running between Revelstoke and Trail, the mail service going north and carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway is only tri-weekly, instead of daily. This is a matter that requires serious attention. It would be a great benefit to that country, if it were put right at once. We also require better facilities for communication with the east. There is a good deal of business being done in that part of the country at present, and it is being found by gentlemen from the east, who send their mail to Rossland, that their letters do not reach there as quickly as they expected, and business difficulties have resulted in consequence. I have a clipping here from one of the Rossland newspapers, which points out that there should be a mail received and despatched daily at and from all Canadian Pacific Railway points possible, and, if this cannot be arranged, then there should be such a mail to points east of Winnipeg and the coast cities, such as Vancouver and New Westminster. With regard to post office deliveries, the general delivery windows should be kept open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. every day, and from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., and from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m., on Sundays. There are great complaints, owing to the postmaster not having sufficient assistance to keep his work up to time, so that the mails are not distributed as quickly as they should be. There is another matter I might mention. In the Kootenay country there has been more than one instance in which it has taken a very long time to get letters from places like New Denver and Sandon, in the Slocan country, brought down to Nelson, which is the seat of the provincial government offices, and to which records have to be sent by prospectors and miners. There is an instance of a letter sent from New Denver to Rossland, which was dated the 24th of July, and not received until the 14th August, though the length of time it takes to travel from New Denver to Rossland is at the most three days. The House can easily see that it is a very serious matter for people doing business to have their letters delayed in this way.

I draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to these facts, in the hope that he will be able to see his way to make better arrangements in the future. There is another point which shows the defective way our postal service is carried on in that part of the country, and that is in regard to letters that are insufficiently stamped. There are a number of instances coming up of letters insufficiently stamped, and which are held, as a rule, in the post office at Victoria. Cases have occurred of very protracted delays. In one instance, when a letter was posted on the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway, to a gentleman in Midway, he received a notice from the post office in Victoria, telling him that his letter was waiting for him in Victoria and would be sent to him on his sending sufficient stamps to pay the postage. The

time it takes between Victoria and Midway to deliver a letter is about three and a half days, and, as the mail only runs out twice a week, it usually takes a good deal longer. It is a great hardship that people should have to wait in this way simply because a letter happens to be insufficiently stamped. I think that the system adopted in England would be very much more advantageous, and that is, that the person to whom the letter is addressed has to pay double postage, when the letter is insufficiently stamped, in which case there is no delay. Some arrangement of that kind will be a great benefit to us in British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another little point I had almost forgotten. Who is the postmaster at present at Marsh Hill, Ont. ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have a most efficient postmaster there. He manifested his great respect for and high appreciation of the officer under its new head, by resigning a position which is highly prized by most gentlemen, and accepting in lieu thereof the honourable, if not very lucrative, position of postmaster at Marsh Hill, in which he receives the annual salary of $10. It is not considered necessary, under the circumstances, to require such postmasters to devote the whole of their time to the discharge of their duties. This is one of the cases in which a public official is permitted to serve his country by deputy. With regard to the remarks of my hon. friend from Yale (Mr. Bostock), I would say that he and some of his colleagues from British Columbia have called my attention to the insufficient mail service in that province, and it is the intention of the department to endeavour to improve that service without delay. We are endeavouring to prepare specifications with a view to that end, and are in communication with the railways and considering the propositions from steamboat companies, with the view of trying to carry out the suggestions and wishes of the representatives of that province. As regards the insufficiency of the staff at Rossland, the post office at Rossland is what is known as an accounting office, and the postmaster is not paid a fixed salary, but is remunerated on a general scale applicable to all postmasters at accounting offices, and he is obliged to supply his own staff. Allowances are made for the maintenance of the office, and if, therefore, that is insufficient, it rests with the postmaster himself to supplement it, for the scale of remuneration is one that has been in force for years, and I never heard it proving insufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to the case of the postmaster at Marsh Hill. There is an excellent chance there for him to carry out the principles he has just laid down in the case of Mr. Dixon. The postmaster, Mr. King, is a fairly wealthy man who owns a saw-mill and carries on a business. There are certainly men at Marsh Hill, men who are much poorer than Mr. King. In carrying out the humanitarian ideas he has expressed, the hon. gentleman will be expected to find some poor man in Marsh Hill to displace the richer man who is so largely engaged in other business. More than that, I am afraid that Mr. King is violating the rule laid down in that he does not attend to the work himself. Mr. Dixon's head came off because he did not do his own work. Now, Mr. King, in June last, left his work——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was not postmaster.

Mr. FOSTER. He was appointed in June.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not in June.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; in June or July.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a different month.

Mr. FOSTER. I can say with my hon. friend and myself when in Queen's and Sunbury, he would be bound to bear witness that Mr. King was there. We saw him in the flesh ; but he was not there to carry on his work as postmaster at Marsh Hill. He is doing this work by deputy, I believe, making nearly $9 a year out of it himself and giving about $1 to some poor fellow who is doing the work.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the hon. gentleman an applicant for the position.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; I would rather leave it for my hon. friend.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, probably I need it more.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to the hon. gentleman's statement as to British Columbia, I regard it as a matter of the greatest importance that the West Kootenay country should be supplied with a daily mail. The place is becoming very populous ; there is a very large amount of trade there, and trade will go where the best trade facilities are offered. One of the most important factors in that regard is postal accommodation. The United States towns along the boundary line are being built up at the expense of our Canadian towns, and there is nothing that I know of that the Government can do at the present time that would so much promote the trade from Canada as to supply the facilities of a daily mail. From what I know of the country, I believe that this mail can be supplied easily and without great expense. The trade of the country will justify daily communication and the Government should give the encouragement required in the way of postal facilities.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Postmaster General need not bring down the figures I asked for showing the comparison between

the Toronto and Montreal post offices. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) seemed to think that the post office at Toronto was very extravagantly managed under the late Administration, because although the population of the city was less than that of Montreal, the post office cost more. I find, however, on consulting the report, that the revenue from Montreal post office was $317,000, while Toronto was $370,000, the difference in the expense of running the two offices is $8,000 in favour of Montreal, while the difference in the income of the two is $53,000 in favour of Toronto.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to income—
Commissioner's salary $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if the Government have considered the abolition of this land board at Winnipeg ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is not in his place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding. This question is one that may well engage the attention of the Government ; but, so far, it has not been taken up.

Resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the Huose.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE presented the fourth report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House, as follows :—

Your committee recommend that Messrs. J. O. Pelland, J. A. Geoffrion and H. R. Fiset be appointed as translators of the debates, at salaries of $1,000 each, to replace Messrs. McLeod, Vanasse and Bouchard, whose services are to be dispensed with on the completion by them of their share of the work of translation of the debates of the present session, and that the appointment and remuneration of the above-mentioned Messrs. Pelland, Geoffrion and Fiset date from the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 36) to incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Davin.)

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved :

That the fourth report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House be adopted.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe the hon. gentleman should not bring this up now. The rule is that, without the consent of the whole House, such a resolution cannot be moved without notice.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Will there be any discussion ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, of course.

Mr. SPEAKER. An hon. gentleman takes objection ; and, therefore, this motion cannot be submitted without notice.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I will give this as a notice of motion for Thursday next.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Bruneau.)

GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

The Order being read for introduction of Bills,

Mr. DAVIN. At this late period of the session, I do not intend to leave the Bill standing in my name to remain any longer on the Notice paper. I had intended to bring in a Bill that would have given the Territories responsible government. It would have been impossible for me to carry such a Bill without the co-operation of the Government, and as the Government had decided not to have any heroic legislation this session, there was no use in my having the Bill even printed. But if spared. and if I have the honour of sitting in this House in a future session, or in a future Parliament, I shall certainly bring before the attention of Parliament a Bill that will give the Territories responsible government. They have at present responsible powers with the exception of two trifling details ; but there is a serious disability and it is this: that owing to their present state of pupilage they do not get either the full amount of money they are entitled to nor have they the responsibility and the power to govern those great Territories in a way that, in my opinion, would precipitate their progress at a rate they can never hope to attain when they are governed three-quarters there

or half there, and half here. I shall therefore not move for leave to introduce this Bill.

STAFF OF THE INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). I beg leave of the House to make a personal explanation. I am in the painful position of one who has unwittingly deceived the House by a statement I made on Friday evening, when we were discussing the Weights and Measures estimates. I stated, and I really thought I was stating the exact truth, that when the service was remodelled by the Conservative Government which succeeded Mr. Mackenzie's Government, the staff that was appointed a short time afterwards did not contain a single one of the officers who had been appointed in that department under the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie. Well, since then I have discovered that I made a mistake in making such a statement, and so positively. I have had a return prepared which it would have been more prudent on my part, I acknowledge, to have had prepared before I made that statement, and it shows that when the organization made by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie for the Weights and Measures was set aside, the staff consisted of ninety-seven officers. A year afterwards, in 1879-80, when the new staff was organized by the Conservative Government, sixty-seven officers were appointed, and out of those sixty-seven, I find that seven belong to the old staff appointed by Mr. Mackenzie. I was so completely under the impression that the whole staff had been swept away and that none of them had been left, that I took it upon myself to make the statement I did, and I beg now to correct it.

DISMISSALS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not wish to be considered unduly pertinacious, but I would like to call the attention of the Government again to the subject I mentioned yesterday, and that is the supplementary return in regard to the dismissals in connection with the bridge at Pictou on the Intercolonial Railway. My object in referring to it so soon again is that the session is, as we all hope, drawing rapidly to a close, and I should not like to be compelled to occupy any amount of time on that subject. If the First Minister will kindly take occasion to urge on the Minister of Railways, who is not in his place for the moment, to have the supplementary return brought down, it would, I think, avoid considerable discussion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). What documents are missing ?

Mr. DAVIN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The documents covered, as I contend, by the Order of the House. The Minister of Railways promised yesterday to give his attention to it. A return was brought down, but I called the attention of the Minister to the fact that very important correspondence referred to in the return was omitted. He promised to inquire into it, and either have the return corrected or else state reasons for not having another return made. The urgency of the case is obvious.

REGINA COURT HOUSE.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works, that it is dangerous to allow any large building in the North-west Territories to have its heating unattended to in case of severe frost. Unless somebody is appointed to attend to the heating of the Regina court-house—a building which has cost the country from forty to fifty thousand dollars—it may be very seriously damaged. As the Minister has nothing against J. K. Lambert, and, as he has been undoubtedly deceived in the matter, I hope he will reappoint Mr. Lambert to the position, as he has by implication promised to do.

THE LOBSTER FISHERY.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer for a moment to a paragraph which I see in the Montreal "Gazette" today, and which reads as follows :—

> Reports have been received at the Department of Marine and Fisheries that a number of American vessels are fishing for lobsters outside the three-mile limit in the Straits of Northumberland, between Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island. This is the close season for lobsters, according to Canadian law, but the question will probably be raised whether it is to be made applicable to foreign vessels fishing outside the three-mile limit.

I would respectfully ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any steps are likely to be taken to prevent the fishing of lobsters outside the three-mile limit in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, because, if it is allowed to be continued, it will most effectually destroy our lobster fishery in the future.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The matter was brought under the attention of the department yesterday, and telegraphic orders were sent to take the necessary steps to protect our waters in that respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

NORTH ONTARIO INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. McGILLIVRAY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a paragraph in the Orillia "Packet," a newspaper publish-

ed in Orillia, East Simcoe, adjacent to North Ontario. It says:

Mr. F. J. Gillespie attended the monthly meeting of the council of Rama Reserve, on Monday. He desired to secure the trade of the Indians, which Mr. C. W. Myers has heretofore enjoyed for eighteen years, to the satisfaction of the whole band. At the close of the usual business of the council, Mr. Gillespie put forth an appeal on his own behalf, reading a letter from Hon. Mr. Laurier to the effect that the Premier would be pleased to see his friends get the trade, which he was sure Mr. Gillespie deserved. He also read a letter which he claimed was from the Minister of the Interior. These were both private, though the chief appeared to believe it was an order from headquarters. The council referred Mr. Gillespie to the audience, and he repeated his appeal to them. Mr. Gillespie was understood to intimate that if he secured their trade, he would exert an influence in the favour of the Indians, in the matter of annuities, &c. Otherwise that influence would be detrimental to them. This influence, however, Mr. Gillespie denied, when asked whether he had been correctly understood.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have allowed the hon. gentleman to go thus far, in order to ascertain if this was what I would consider a proper question to bring up on the Orders of the Day. The hon. gentleman will have a much better opportunity to bring the matter forward on going into Supply.

SUPPLY—NORTH ONTARIO INDIAN RESERVE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McGILLIVRAY. Mr. Speaker, I shall just read to the House the end of the paragraph which I have already referred to, because I have a question to ask, and I do not think it would be fair to ask that question until the whole paragraph is read. The end of the paragraph shows that Mr. Gillespie did not succeed in his intention.

The chief appeared to have so understood Mr. Gillespie, and to the end did not seem to have his mind fully disabused of the impression. After a discussion which lasted for an hour or more, a standing vote was demanded and the council reluctantly consenting, the motion that the trade be continued to Mr. Myers was carried amid cheers and without one dissenting voice.

I might say that I have had several communications from the Indians themselves and from others interested in them, asking me about this paragraph. I was asked to see the Minister of the Interior before the Indian council was held, because the letter was being used upon the reserve prior to that meeting. However, there is no Minister of the Interior, and I did not know until a day or two ago that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) was acting Minister. Now, the Indians of North Ontario are a most obedient lot of men, and they obey all constituted authority in every way. Mr. Gillespie was my opponent in the by-election in December last; not in the general elections. As this paragraph says that these letters to Mr. Gillespie were private, I have no doubt they were private, and I hope neither of the Ministers who wrote them, intended that they should be used in any such improper way as that in which they appear to have been used. In justice to the First Minister, and in the interests of the Indians of our country and particularly those of North Ontario, I think it should be known to them that they are, as in the past, free agents to the extent to which they have been free agents. Mr. Myers has done their business satisfactorily for eighteen years. Most of his lifetime he has been an active Liberal in politics, and he is pretty independent now, sometimes voting one way and sometimes another. Outside of the question of his politics, Mr. Myers is a most respected citizen, and a man entirely beloved by the Indians. His store is adjacent to their territory, whereas the store of Mr. Gillespie, the friend of the Prime Minister, is several miles away from the reserve. It would be in the interest of the public generally, if we could have a declaration from the First Minister that, if such a letter was written by him, it was never intended to be used for such a purpose.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). What is the question of my hon. friend?

Mr. McGILLIVRAY. I would like to know whether the Premier authorized the use of that letter in such a way, if, indeed, he wrote such a letter at all. We have only got it from his friend Mr. Gillespie that he did write such a letter, and that a similar letter was written by the hon. the acting Minister of the Interior.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is what I read in the paper which the hon. gentleman was kind enough to send me in advance:

Mr. F. J. Gillespie attended the monthly meeting of the council of Rama Reserve on Monday. He desired to secure the trade of the Indians, which Mr. C. W. Myers has heretofore enjoyed for eighteen years, to the satisfaction of the whole band.

At the close of the usual business of the council, Mr. Gillespie put forth an appeal on his own behalf, reading a letter from Hon. Mr. Laurier to the effect that the Premier would be pleased to see his friends get the trade, which he was sure Mr. Gillespie deserved. He also read a letter which he claimed was from the Minister of the Interior. These were both private.

Well, I am quite sure, if it be a private letter, I do not know what was in it. If there was nothing more in it than that, I would be glad if Mr. Gillespie got the trade. I think that is all right, and I will not go back on that sentiment.

Mr. McGILLIVRAY. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) allow Mr. Gillespie

to use the letter in that way among a band of Indians ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman asked me if it was a private letter.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not yet heard from the Minister from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell).

Mr. DAVIN. In this connection I would remind my hon. friend from Quebec West that I called his attention five or six days ago to an allegation which has been sent to me, authoritatively I think, to the effect that Mr. A. E. Forget, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at Regina, had sent out circulars to the agents telling them that they were to deal only with friends of the Government. I may say that I remember a similar intimation, but it was during the rule of the third Napoleon. It was a message from Paris telling prefects that they were to take care and make a distinction between the chickens of the friends of the Government and those of their enemies.

The PRIME MINISTER. We need not go so far as France for that.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope my hon. friend from Quebec West will be able to assure me that I have been misinformed. But if I am properly informed, I hope he will put a stop to this very improper procedure—improper especially in the North-west Territories ; because I can state without fear of contradiction that the rule of confining the patronage to the friends of the Government has never been pursued there. In Regina, the capital, leading Reformers were accustomed to get patronage from this very department. The present President of the Reform Association of Regina, Mr. J. K. Kerr, has been accustomed to get large patronage from the Indian Department.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There was nobody else there to supply it.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. There are two other gentlemen in the same line of business.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). None of them could do it as well as Mr. Kerr.

Mr. DAVIN. Is he a friend of the hon. gentleman ? Anyway, we have never pursued that rule, and I hope my hon. friend will be able to say that he does not believe in it.

Mr. DOBELL. I have only to say that I have no knowledge whatever of the matter that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaks of.

Mr. DAVIN. Did my hon. friend not enquire about it ?

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I have received letters this session, and I have them now in my possession, from Reformers who live in Regina, complaining that for the last three years they have not received a single order from the Government for supplies. Yet the hon. gentleman has just stated to the House that they administer affairs there so impartially that the orders are given out indiscriminately to Conservatives and Reformers alike. I have the most positive proof that such is not the case. I have in my possession letters asking me to call the department's attention to the manner in which supplies have been got from friends of the Government and nobody else, and I was rather surprised to see the hon. gentleman get up in his place and make the statement he did to-day.

Mr. McGILLIVRAY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. There is evidently a history in connection with that letter, and I would ask my hon. friend if he has any objection to bringing down the letter which Mr. Gillespie wrote to him asking for the patronage of that band of Indians. Evidently Mr. Gillespie, who is a defeated candidate, has applied to the Prime Minister, asking his influence to get him that trade ; and the Prime Minister, on the ground that those who help him must be helped, has evidently sent a sympathetic letter to Mr. Gillespie which that gentleman has been hawking around among the Indian bands, and the purport of which is that the Prime Minister would be very glad if Mr. Gillespie got the patronage. This is very important, and I rise to ask if the Prime Minister would have any objection to lay the letter of Mr. Gillespie on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is not serious when he asks that question.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a very serious matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not take it seriously.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says that the course which he supposes has been followed in this case was only seen in France during the time of Napoleon the Third.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the fowl question.

Mr. LANGELIER. I can state that the same course has been followed in Quebec during the whole time the late Government was in power. I can mention a remarkable instance of it. Strict orders were given to the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries not to purchase anything except from certain merchants whose names were mentioned to him. On one occasion he wanted a knife of a peculiar kind, costing 40 or 60 cents. Not finding the article in the stores in which he had been ordered to purchase exclusively, he went to the store of a Liberal hardware merchant and purchased

the knife. There was so much correspondence on the subject that the agent told me he would have preferred to have paid ten times over for the knife himself. The correspondence lasted several weeks, and the effect of it was that his official head would be cut off if he repeated the experiment.

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

(In the Committee.)

Department of Justice $1,110 83

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Solicitor General for an explanation as to the additional amount required for contingencies.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The $1,000 is required to cover the additional amount rendered necessary by a change which we have adopted in the system of taking cases. An additional amount is required for travelling expenses. I am informed by the Deputy Minister that heretofore the amount for contingencies has been found to be too small.

Salary of an additional county judge in Manitoba $2,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Solicitor General give the House the information which has led him to provide for this appointment? What information has he outside the action of the provincial legislature? Has the hon. gentleman gone into the real necessity of making the appointment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have not hitherto proceeded at all on the ground that if a provincial legislature should create an additional judgeship, we, therefore, should provide the salary, but have always gone carefully into the necessity from our own point of view.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite appreciate the point made by my hon. friend from Pictou, and I think we have provided against his objection in this way. The attention of the Government was drawn to the fact that it would be necessary to have an additional judge for this district, by the judge who presides over it. Hereafter it will become necessary to amend our own statutes with references to judges in Manitoba, and in the interval opportunity will be afforded to make the necessary inquiries to be in a position to give the information required.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is not able to say at present whether this appointment is really required. Under the circumstances, considering that the House will meet in a very few months again in regular session, I think this item should be allowed to drop.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have gone to the very best sources of information on this subject. I have gone to the Attorney General of the province, or rather I have received a portion of the information as to the public need for this appointment from the Attorney General, who is charged with the supervision of the administration of justice in the province, and who is presumed to know something of its requirements. But in addition to that, I have also got the statement from the judge presiding over this particular judicial district—and his statement must be presumed to be entirely devoid of any political bias—and he says that the particular district with which he is connected requires that another judge be appointed to assist him in the administration of justice there. So much for the information. The appointment is, of necessity, of a provisional character. I do not say that we cannot proceed to make the appointment after this item has been voted, but it will still remain in the control of the House, because until such time as the statute is amended, the appointment is essentially provisional. Therefore, at any time, until the statute is amended, by dropping this item in the Estimates, the appointment will cease.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am very anxious, as far as I can, to assist the hon. gentleman. But I would again point out that he has hardly established the necessity for this appointment. In the first place, the legislature covers the opinion of the Attorney General in all cases. The Attorney General must have given his opinion to the local House before any provision for an addtional judgeship was made. In the opinion of the local legislature, there is a necessity for this, but that has never been considered sufficient to warrant this House in taking supplementary action to provide the ways and means. Then, in regard to the county court judges, I think that most of the judges in this country—and it is not disrespectful to say so—would be very glad to have assistance, and none of them are exceedingly anxious to do all the work they have, if, by any possibility, their duties could be lightened. So that, without disrespect to them, I think that this House, having a request for assistance from either a Superior or county court judge has not, in that alone, sufficient reason for going to additional expense. I have had an experience myself in this House of the difficulties of providing adequate compensation for the judges in the different courts of this country. There is, I sometimes think, an unreasonable prejudice against the salaries that are paid to the judges, and I know that many members on both sides of the House, and I think many members of the profession are of the opinion that in Canada, whether considering the county court judges or the judges of the superior courts, the difficulty is not as to the number of judges, but as to the inadequate salaries paid. And,

rather than increase the number of judges, it seems to me the additional money should go to increase the salaries of the judiciary as it exists, making them comparable with the salaries paid in other British dominions to judges or in connection with the administration of justice. But I feel that if I object, as I do most strongly, in view of the statement of the Solicitor General to the appointment of this judge at the present time or upon the information conveyed to the committee, I shall be supported by gentlemen of the legal profession on either side of the House, not only because of the prejudice to which I have referred in regard to the increase of expenditure in connection with the administration of justice generally, but because of the very scanty information we have as to the necessity for this expenditure at all. And in regard to the committee having this matter under control, I think that on reflection the Solicitor General will see that practically this is a permanent appointment. If it be not so, if it be merely an appointment ad hoc, and it is possible is to be swept away by the Crown omitting to come down and ask for the provision necessary, then there is more serious objection than ever to the appointment. Practically, as the hon. gentleman knows, Parliament having voted this money, will proceed to adopt a Bill for uniformity in the matter, as it has done on previous occasions. I think it was the session before last that I myself brought down and was able to press through this House, a Bill to make uniform the legislation and practice, covering just such cases,—where we had been giving from session to session these salaries to the county court judges—to make their position similar to that of the other judges of the land. So, in this case, we are practically making provision here which will saddle the country for all time, as in the case of any other county judge, with the duty of paying that additional judge in the province of Manitoba. The information we ought to have are the facts as to the condition of litigation in that district, the actual amount of work done by the present judge or judges, the amount of arrears and all these particulars have been thoroughly examined in connection with previous appointments. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press this item.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Speaking personally, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in what he says as to the inadequate remuneration given for the services rendered by our judges. But, dealing with the case in hand, it seems to me I have given the best possible information upon this item. I have given the statement of the gentleman in charge of the administration of justice in the province that this appointment is necessary. He must have made that statement with the sense of the responsibility which attaches to it. Still, it may be considered by some hon. members of this House that it was tainted somewhat with political bias. But we cannot overlook the fact that the judge charged with the administration of justice reports that it is necessary, and a reason is given by him which, I think, must appeal to our sense of right. The increase in business in Winnipeg is the reason that must appeal to us. Then there is the reason arising out of the fact that the jurisdiction of the court has been extended from $200 to $400. At least, these are the reasons upon which I must base the application.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would call attention to the fact that further inquiry is necessary. The hon. gentleman does not know and the committee does not know the judge's reasons. The conclusion at which he arrives is, no doubt, bona fide, but the facts upon which he bases that conclusion are most material. Let us look at some of the facts by which such a matter is to be judged. In Nova Scotia, with a population of 450,000, we have only seven county court judges. In the province of Manitoba, with a population of about 200,000, they have at present four county court judges.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Five.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Five including this one.

An hon. MEMBER. No ; five already.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then that makes it all the worse. In the province of New Brunswick there are six county court judges for a population of 320,000. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will see what will happen. If on the statement of a county court judge the hon. gentleman bases such a vote as this, he will have statements equally fair and equally reasonable—and I think a great deal stronger—from all the other provinces, and his own position will be made most embarrassing. He cannot come to this committee and say because a county court judge in Manitoba and the Attorney General of the province have given him assurance, therefore, this increase must be allowed in connection with the administration of justice, without treating in a similar manner all other similar representations—and the committee will understand as well as I can explain it what the result of that will be. So, in view of the manner in which this business is viewed in the older provinces, and the unfair and apparently unreasonable proportion in regard to the distribution of work over the provinces that this would create, I trust that, as it would only be a matter of a few months, the hon. gentleman will let this item drop and will then come prepared to give us, not the conclusions arrived at by the judge and the Attorney General of Manitoba, but the ground upon which those conclusions were based.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope my hon. friend will act on the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), because there is a strong feeling against adding to the burdens that the people bear in this regard, and there is a strong feeling against giving adequate remuneration to the judges, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Pictou. That supplies a reason why we should not unnecessarily add to their number, and thus make it still more difficult to meet what are really just claims. But let me point out to the Solicitor General that in the North-west Territories, with a vast area many times larger than Manitoba, and with a population about half that of Manitoba, we have only five judges. They are very fully employed, but I have heard no complaint that they are overtaxed, as I have heard no complaint that they are overtaxed in Manitoba, and we have only five Supreme Court judges and not one county court judge in the North-west Territories. But there is a reason why the Solicitor General, in my opinion, is bound to let this vote drop. The principal reason he gives to excuse us to ourselves for passing this vote, is that we can take what strikes many of us as an inconvenient course, because by and by we could take a still more inconvenient course. We do not like to pass a vote like this without knowing whether this judge is necessary. The hon. gentleman says we are only passing this vote as a temporary one, and that by and by we can suspend it in mid-air; and although the judge has been receiving salary, he may be dismissed. Constitutionally, we are not justified in voting money for an additional judge without evidence that such an appointment is necessary. The Government can have no idea how strongly impressed the public mind is, partly justly and partly unjustly, with the view that the incidence of the burden they have to bear in consequence of supporting the judiciary, is a great deal too high. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has frequently dilated on this subject in this House, and I am surprised that he has not risen to protest against this increase in the burdens, and also against this innovation. I think that when the committee turn their minds more fully to the vote, the feeling will be so strong that the Solicitor General will have to drop it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want this item to pass without asking my hon. friend to consider seriously whether he had better press it at the present time. Now, I have had a great deal of experience as Minister of Finance in reference to judges. Year after year there has been from certain influential quarters in this country a very determined pressure for heightening the salaries of the judges. The statement is made, and there is a great deal of truth in it, that in order to get the men you ought to have for the superior courts, you must pay them larger salaries; and although it has been found possible to fill all vacancies on the bench, and although I think the general character of our courts has been high, yet I have for several years acknowledged the strength of that argument. I have paid a good deal of attention to it, and up to the present time it has been impossible to pass a vote through this House providing for raising the judges' salaries. My impression, gained from the study of the question, is that the end might be accomplished in a different way. I honestly believe that we have too many judges in Canada at the present time, and that a considerable reduction in the number might be made without any detriment at all to the administration of justice. I think that the claim made for an appreciation of the judges' salaries could be met in connection with a judicious reorganization of the system of the judiciary which would diminish its numbers, and while appropriating the same amount of money, would add to the salaries of the judges who remain. Now, what have we in this case? I must ask the attention of the committee and of the Minister of Finance to the facts which are developed by the Estimates now before the House. Sir, the Estimates are the largest now that have ever been brought down to this House. They are over two millions more than any preceding Government has brought down out of consolidated revenue fund; and we come to-day to the point where my hon. friend is asking us to vote him for current expenditures on consolidated revenue account, two millions and more of money than he can possibly hope to get out of the whole of the revenue of Canada for this current year. Now, if that be the case, and if we are providing no ways and means for meeting that, we are coming face to face with an expenditure of over two millions more than we can get out of revenue, with the only alternative of borrowing upon the London market to pay our current expenses. I say that no Finance Minister can, with equanimity, come face to face with that state of things, and I think my hon. friend will see that at such a time —and I am not going to dilate any more on that phase of the question now—but at such a time nothing more than an absolutely necessary expenditure should be made. Now, is this absolutely necessary? The Solicitor General is himself authority for saying that it is only provisional. He says in effect that the appointment cannot be made provisionally even until there is more legislation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he says in effect that it is provisional.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I ask my hon. friend what kind of a judge he can get on a provisional tenure. Will you get first-class lawyers, such as ought to be judges, when you say to them: We are going to take you out of your practice, we are going to make you a judge for a little while, and may be Parliament will then cease to vote your salary, and down you will go again! You cannot get any men whom you ought to appoint upon the bench to come in under those circumstances. It is another arrangement like this "ad hoc" business, which does not make for dignity nor the standing of the judiciary of this country. That is a point which I would strongly urge upon my hon. friend. Now, unless there is an absolute necessity for this measure, and none has been made apparent, let us, as men who have the finances of the country to look after, and not as party men at all, seriously ponder over this matter, and let us come to the conclusion that if it is not absolutely necessary, we ought not to vote it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I do not understand the hon. gentleman's argument at all. If he means that he is merely talking for the sake of talking to the country, and talking against time, I can understand what he is doing.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend ought not to say that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not want to say a word at all offensive.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the committee a serious statement, and I pledge my faith to that statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman says he is serious, I will accept his word.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman ought to accept my statement without any such pledge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I accept it frankly.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman commenced with an unworthy insinuation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I made no insinuation. I made the statement feeling that the hon. gentleman was not serious.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I think that is the worst insinuation that one sensible man can make against another.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then I do not understand an insinuation. I say the impression made on my mind was that the hon. gentleman was not serious in pressing this objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman cannot come to any better impression.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman won't allow me to form my own impression. Does he intend to take charge of the consciences and minds of members on both sides of the House, and dictate to them? I have no objection to any criticism he may make. He started off with talking about the feeling that was abroad in the community that the judges are paid too much; that the whole question had to be considered. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) never took that into consideration during the many years he had the power to do so, and if the very moment he takes his seat upon the other side of the House, he makes a declaration that no judicial appointments shall be made until the whole merits of the question are investigated, surely he will perceive why I assume that he was not serious and was poking fun at us. I must believe that, when a gentleman who for eight years had charge of the finances, is suddenly transferred to the other side, announces without hesitation that no appointment ought to be made to the judicial bench until the whole question of the salaries paid to the judges had been revised and carefully considered. The hon. gentleman also ventured the assertion, that it would be found that many of the judges were paid too much. If he were serious and believed in that, how in the name of goodness could he recommend votes to this House year after year, without ever suggesting the desirability for investigation? That is why I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was poking fun at us, and I told him so frankly. Now let us talk seriously about the proposition before the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows there is a dual power in this matter, and that the Parliament of Canada is not absolutely and entirely its own master in respect of it. He knows very well, that the local legislatures create the court, and unless the Parliament of Canada is convinced that the creation is unnecessary and improper they are bound, and they always hitherto have felt themselves bound, to appoint the officers to carry out the judicial work which the local legislatures decree ought be done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not correct.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not recollect any instance at the moment, in which it was not done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a standing case in Quebec, in connection with a provision there for the appointment of assistant judges, and that has never been acted upon since the Act was passed by the local legislature.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I remember one case

in Quebec arising out of an appointment made by the late Hon. Mr. Mercier. Be that as it may, in this case we have it recommended by the Attorney General and by the government of Manitoba, that another county court judge is necessary in that province. You have that recommendation endorsed by the present judge of the county court who informs the Justice Department here, that it is absolutely essential to the administration of justice that he should have assistance. We have the fact known to us that this part of Canada, above all others, is increasing in population. I agree to some extent with what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that in other parts of Canada the judges now have not got enough work to do. Any one who knows the facts, in the maritime province, knows that the judges have not enough work to do. I am informed that in large centres of population like Montreal and Toronto, and in Manitoba where the population is increasing year by year, such criticism cannot be applied, and that the judges have plenty of work. I am surprised that a gentleman like the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), a legal gentleman of his standing who has held the position of Minister of Justice, should for a moment hesitate to take the proper action to carry out the decision of the local government where they declare that this judicial officer is necessary, and where their declaration is supported by the recommendation of the judge of the district. Suppose we do not do so, what other inquiries can you make? Are you going to send a gentleman out there to put the judge upon his oath, and ask him how many cases he has tried, how many he is unable to overtake, and what remanets there are? The true rule is, that the Justice Department must satisfy themselves generally that conditions have arisen which justify the local government in calling for another judicial appointment. They are not bound to have an investigation as to how many hours a day the judge sits, how many cases he has been able to try, and how many he has not been able to take up. Of course the Justice Department must be satisfied that the demand made by the local government, in whom the constitution vests the power, is reasonable and proper. If it is plain that the power is being exercised improvidently there might be occasion for the Government to advise Parliament to stay its hand in making the appointment. But there is no suggestion of that kind here. You have the conditions which are always necessary in such cases. You have in the first place the declaration of the local legislature that the appointment is necessary, and in the second place, you have a declaration from the judiciary there that in its opinion the appointment is necessary. These two combining together, and the amount not being so very much, I cannot see the reason for the very grave objection which hon. gentlemen opposite have presented.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to explain to my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) why he formed a wrong impression of what I stated. My hon. friend attempted to restate what I stated, and in the attempt he put in my mouth words that I never used, and he made his argument upon a set of statements that were never made by me in this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) used to be in the habit of doing that when he was on this side of the House. But, I thought when my hon. friend took upon himself the dignity of a Minister, that he would leave that bad habit aside. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) stated in so many English words, that I talked about the salaries of judges not being sufficient, about it being necessary to reorganize in order to give sufficient salaries without an adequate expenditure; and he said, that I had made a demand that until investigations were made into this we should ask for no judges's salaries. I made no such statement. My last words were as absolutely clear as the English language could make them. After having talked about the state of our finances, I said that for my part I would vote for no more judges' salaries until it was made plain to this House that there was an absolute necessity for the judge. I went upon that ground and upon that ground alone. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) formed his impression and thought I was not in serious earnest, because he took a wrong assumption as being the statement I made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad that the hon. the First Minister is in his place, because I regard this as a very serious matter indeed. A proposal is made by the hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to vote $2,000 for the salary of an additional county court judge in the province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in making that proposal to the House stated distinctly (unless I entirely misunderstood him) that he did not expect that appointment to be made, and that it required legislation on the part of this House which would precede the appointment. And when he was asked whether he had satisfied himself as to the absolute necessity for that judge being appointed, the Solicitor General said he had not, but in the meantime there would be ample opportunity to do so. He stated that an Act had been passed by the local legislature to this effect, and that he had in addition the opinion of the judge, whose duties I presume would be relieved to the extent of 50 per cent if this appointment is made. But, the hon. the Solicitor General stated frankly to the House that he had not the information that would enable him to say that it was absolutely necessary to make this appointment. He said there was no difficulty in voting this $2,000, because legislation

would be required before the appointment could be made.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not say that the hon. gentleman said that legislation would be required; but he expected that legislation would be required so as to make it conformable to the local Act. He said, that this would give ample time for the Department of Justice to obtain the necessary information as to whether this appointment should be made or not. That was a very clear and distinct statement. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries starts a very dangerous proposition—I use that term most advisedly—he propounds the very dangerous proposition, that this Parliament is bound to vote salaries for all the judges that any local legislature may choose to provide for. I say, Sir, a more dangerous proposition than that, and one more calculated to induce local legislatures to provide for unnecessary additional judges, could not possibly, in my judgment, be made to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Was the hon. gentleman referring to me?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To you.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the hon. gentleman will do me the justice of saying that I expressly guarded myself by saying, unless the action of the local legislature was improvident.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman did qualify it by saying, unless the action of the local legislature was improvident. But who is to be the judge of that? If you lay down the bald proposition that this House must provide whatever salaries the legislation of the local legislatures renders necessary, I say it is calculated to lead to most improvident legislation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman do me the courtesy to say, if the proposition I lay down is not the correct proposition constitutionally, what is the correct proposition constitutionally?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to conclude my observations, I will leave no doubt upon his mind what I think the correct proposition constitutionally is. The question of what is provident or improvident is a relative one. The hon. gentleman knows, that the legislature of the province of Manitoba, with a population of 200,000, has passed legislation requiring six county court judges, about the same number as exist in the province of Nova Scotia, with half a million people. Gentlemen who are engaged in the legal profession in the province of Manitoba, may have information which we do not possess. We must go by general principles, and there must be some relation between the judiciary of a country and its population; and, when you find a proposition made for as many judges for 200,000 people in one part of the Dominion as there are for half a million people in another part, I say you have prima facie evidence that an improvident demand is made. I am told that a petition also came from another province for some two or three additional judges, but that there was two or three years' delay in granting them, showing that this House has never felt bound to respond immediately to the provision made by the local legislature, by voting the salaries. I am told that two or three years afterwards, when those appointments were made, the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. McMullen) denounced the voting of those salaries in a speech of two hours' length. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman had not good grounds for the position he took: I am not aware of the facts, as I was not here. But I merely mention that as evidence that it has been customary for local legislatures to make provision for judicial appointments without this Parliament responding by providing the salaries. There is a graver objection still to this, and that is in the statement advanced by the hon. Solicitor General, that this is to be a provisional appointment. He gives as a reason why the House should vote this money now, that, if information is obtained afterwards, the House can readily drop the amount, and the appointment will fall to the ground. Objection has already been taken to that proposition, on the ground that you could not obtain the services of any man qualified to discharge the duties of a judge, who would leave the profitable business in which he is now employed—and he ought to be employed in profitable business in order to be entitled to such judicial preferment—and take this position, if the appointment were merely a provisional one. But there is a much more fatal objection: that is, that this strikes at the root and foundation of the principle of the independence of the judges. If you appoint a judge, under the Canadian constitution and under the law passed by this Parliament, everything goes to show that at the moment a man is put on the bench, he is placed beyond the control and influence of the Government; and yet my hon. friend the Solicitor General has gravely proposed to this House that we should make an additional appointment, and that it should be in the power of the Government, if satisfaction was not given, or for any other cause, to drop the salary and allow the gentleman to lose his position. I say that the very first principle in relation to our judiciary is undermined when an appointment is made to rest on the will or fiat of the Government of the day, or some other Government which may succeed them. I think the First Minister will agree that,

under the circumstances, as stated by the Solicitor General, it is only right that this item should be dropped until the Department of Justice have absolutely satisfied themselves as to the necessity of having this expenditure made and this appointment completed; and that an appointment to the bench in this country shall not be, in any sense, a provisional appointment, resting on further information that may or may not be obtained, and leaving the salary and position of a judge in any part of this country at the pleasure of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was not in the House when this discussion arose: but I am quite sure my hon. friend has mistaken the views and the language of my hon. friend the Solicitor General. To my mind, the Solicitor General could never have said that the appointment contemplated under this vote was a provisional one, because there is no such thing under the law and the constitution of this country as a provisional judge. A judge, when appointed, is appointed for life, and can be removed only in the manner we know. Therefore, I think my hon. friend is quite mistaken in the views he attributes to the Solicitor General. The reason for the appointment of a judge is this. In the first place, there is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman has said as to the character of the legislation under which we have to proceed. I have always said, and I can only repeat, that the provisions of the British North America Act in regard to the administration of justice and the appointment of judges is most unsatisfactory. If there is one thing that does not reflect credit on this Act—which, on the whole is, I think, creditable, and the hon. gentleman was one of the fathers of that Act—it is that provision. Under section 92 of the British North America Act, the administration of justice is entrusted to the provincial legislatures. Section 92, with subsection 14, reads as follows:—

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say:
>
> 14. The administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts.

Here it is very clearly defined that the provincial legislatures, and not the Dominion Parliament, have the power, and the exclusive power, of establishing courts, determining what shall be their jurisdiction, determining the number of judges, and so on. My hon. friend will not contend that we have any jurisdiction over these matters. We have none at all. We cannot say to the legislature that the Supreme Court or the county courts of the province shall be composed of four, or five, or six, or two judges alone. The hon. gentleman said it was outrageous to say that six county court judges were necessary for Manitoba, when no more were required for Nova Scotia.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think I said outrageous. I said that "prima facie," by the only means by which we could form a judgment, that is, the population in relation to the number of judges, it seemed improvident.

The PRIME MINISTER. Accepting the statement of the hon. gentleman, I wish to put this question to him: what jurisdiction has this Parliament over local legislation in this respect, either in Nova Scotia or in Manitoba? What jurisdiction have we to say to the people of Manitoba: You are improvident, and to the people of Nova Scotia: You are provident? We have no jurisdiction at all over that. And it is our duty to take the action of the legislation in any province in these matters, unless—there must be some limit to that—unless there is a case of absolutely gross fraud or something of that kind. Otherwise, this House has no power to revise the discretion of local legistures.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has not this House again and again declined, and properly declined, to provide the salaries after local legislatures have provided for judgeships?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware of any such case and would be glad to hear of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the case of the province of Quebec, a provision in the statutes for the appointment of assistant judges has never been acted upon.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is altogether astray. The statute to which he refers provided for the appointment of two additional judges and was passed in 1890.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I am referring to an Act that has been on the statute-book in Quebec for about twenty years. I have examined the Act and know what I am talking about.

The PRIME MINISTER. I believe the hon. gentleman is astray yet. The only instance I know is that of the Act passed about 1890, which never came into force. It was to have been brought into force by proclamation. Moreover, if there had been such a case in the province of Quebec as the hon. gentleman mentions, of which I am not aware, I cannot conceive how this Government could go against the wish of the legislature when there was cause shown. The hon. gentleman asked why six county court judges should be necessary in Manitoba, while the province of Nova Scotia does not require so many. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that the distances in Manitoba are immense, and that a judge has sometimes to administer justice in what would be a kingdom elsewhere. That might

be one of the reasons why the constitution provides that the administration of justice shall be within the exclusive powers of the provincial legislature. While they alone have to provide for the organization of the courts, at the same time the British North America Act provides, by section 96, that the Governor General in Council should appoint the judges of the superior, district and county courts in each province except the court of probate in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This is a most extraordinary provision and a blot on our constitution. I do not see why the legislature which provides for the establishment of the courts and the number of judges should not at the same time have the power to provide for the payment of the judges. The logical conclusion of section 92 of the British North America Act, which gives powers to the local legislatures to provide for the establishment of courts and the number of judges, would be to place under the same legislatures the duty and responsibility of appointing the judges. But that is not the case. The local legislatures provide for the number of judges required, but they have neither the duty nor the responsibility of making the appointments, and this Parliament has to do so. I should like to know what we, under such circumstances, have to do but execute the views of the local legislatures. What can we do otherwise? I say very humbly, and I submit it to the judgment of the intelligence and fairness and common sense of any man, here or elsewhere, in order to give a proper interpretation to the working of the constitution, that we are bound to take the will of the local legislature unless we are satisfied that the local legislature has gone upon a basis which is absolutely untenable, amounting to fraud or wrong. Otherwise I cannot see that we can substitute our discretion, indeed we have no discretion whatever. I am sorry I did not know this matter was coming up because I have the correspondence and will bring it down at the next stage of the proceedings.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table, at the same time, the letters of the Attorney General of Manitoba and the county court judge?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly, these are what I refer to. The Attorney General of Manitoba sent us the request of the county court judge setting forth that he was unable to discharge the duties of his office and required another judge. The district is a very large one to administer. Then the legislature of Manitoba created a new district under the law. This new district requires a judge, and that is why we ask Parliament for power to pay the new judge. In this matter we exercise no discretion but take the case as it was made by the Attorney General of Manitoba and brought to us. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have so many judges in Manitoba. That may be, but my hon. friend who leads the Opposition is one of the fathers of this constitution, and he is one of those who placed this power in the hands of the local legislatures.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the new and very serious position in which this vote is put. The hon. First Minister frankly states that the Government exercises no discretion whatever, and he announces the very interesting doctrine that, in view of the present Government, we ought not to exercise discretion in this matter, but that wherever a provincial legislature sees fit to create a new judicial office, all we have to do, is to vote the salary required. The hon. gentleman may possibly be right. It would, on the moment, be very bold in me to say he is absolutely wrong; but I think he will agree with me that he has announced, for the first time, a most important opinion with reference to the construction of the British North America Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not for the first time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say it is contrary to the traditions and practice of the Department of Justice of this country, under every Administration, to follow out the hon. gentleman's opinion. That department has invariably exercised its discretion before coming to Parliament to ask for a single dollar for an additional judge. In the case to which I particularly refer I find that the Department of Justice always refused, with a single exception, to act under the provisions of the old statute, under which an assistant judge, so called in the statutes, could be appointed "ad hoc" in any of the various districts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Ad hoc judges.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Practically, an "ad hoc" judge; called an assistant judge during that time—certainly an ad hoc judge. I found that my predecessors had objected, in the strongest manner, to taking action under legislation of that kind, which involved coming down to the House for money to pay the barrister or other person, who for the time would act as assistant judge. Now, the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia will be surprised to hear this doctrine, because, in every case where they have reorganized or rearranged their judicial districts, the Government have assumed, and the Department of Justice have gone on the assumption, that they were responsible, as a government, for every additional dollar asked for, whether for new judicial districts or for old ones. And, in connection with the county courts of the province of British Columbia, one of these judgeships—I do not know whether this position is filled now or not—was for a long time, both before my day

and afterwards, left open and not filled, because the department was not satisfied, from the investigation and examination made, that that office was really called for or required, could not advise the Government as to the necessity of coming to Parliament and asking for that amount of money. So there has always gone on a friendly correspondence between the Attorney Generals' departments in the different provinces and the Justice Department, in connection with this matter or after legislation of this character on a proposition or suggestion for an arrangement of judicial work or judicial districts. And so, while I will not say that the hon. First Minister has no warrant for the ground he has taken, I do say that I have not heard that doctrine previously announced in this House. I do not agree with him as to what was intended under the British North America Act, that the Act only provides that the local legislatures shall create the office and this legislature supply the money, and the Executive or the Crown nominate the officer, and that it is merely automatic, with no discretion in this Parliament and no responsibility on the Executive. On the contrary, I say the Federal Government is held, and properly held, responsible by the people of this country for the appointments to this judicial office, for the number of them, and for their character, and for the increase of expenditure brought about by appointments; and that responsibility has never been shirked by any Government that has hitherto been called to account for it. Whether my view be right or wrong, I can only say that the hon. gentleman has, for the first time, pointed out the contrary. The Solicitor General brought no such idea from the Department of Justice. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that that hon. gentleman did his best to show the necessity for this vote and to show the grounds for which he should provide for the office. He did not say, as the Prime Minister did, that it followed, because the statute had been passed in the province, that this expenditure should be made. The First Minister will see how outrageous that doctrine is. If the provinces have no responsibility, if they can create any number of offices, distribute this work as they please, and add to the burdens of the people of Canada at large sufficient to pay the salary, unnecessary expense, and even extravagance, will be caused by any capricious action on the part of the local legislatures. We had warning on that subject from the province of Ontario. The present Minister of Justice himself found that the Act which he passed involved in practice unnecessary expenditure. Formerly, a judicial district in which the population reached a certain figure—80,000 people—was entitled, ipso facto, to two judges. But the hon. gentleman lived long enough, as the head of the government of Ontario, to find it necessary to come down and propose legislation to provide that one judge should do the work in these districts. In the province of Ontario, I understand, one county judge is provided for a population of 80,000. In the city of Halifax, with a population of 50,000, there is one county court judge. In the city of St. John, with about the same, there is one county court judge. We are asked to provide two county court judges for the northern district of Manitoba, and yet I venture to say that the Solicitor General has no more idea than I have as to the population. The population would naturally be one of several good tests as to the need for this appointment. But this committee is absolutely in the dark on the subject. The position of the First Minister is far more tenable than that of the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General felt that it was his duty to convince the committee that the office is required, but the First Minister gets rid of all these difficulties and meets all arguments by saying that this is not a matter of discretion, but a matter of duty. I remember, on another subject, hearing the First Minister taking altogether different ground as to the matter of duty. I never took the ground that this Parliament was bound to act automatically on any subject coming within its jurisdiction, and I hope I shall never be driven to such a position as to say that we are to deal with any matter without consideration, discretion and responsibility. But the view I take is so diametrically opposed to that of the hon. gentleman, that, unless this item is to stand until these reports—the report of the Attorney General and the report of the county judge—are before us, I will take the responsibility of moving a resolution to indicate how strongly opposed I am to the proposition which the First Minister advanced.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is quite at liberty to take any course he sees fit; but I would suggest, as we are within a few days of the close of the session, that my hon. friend could move it at a later stage with just as good effect. I will agree, I may say, that, when we have this item up in concurrence, the same latitude of discussion shall be allowed with regard to it as is now allowed in committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I defer to the wish of the Prime Minister, on the condition he named. I do not desire to make a further condition, but I would press upon him the desirability of having before the House the two reports that have been referred to—those of the Attorney General of Manitoba and the county judge.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly; they are in the form of letters simply, and I will bring them down to-morrow afternoon.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. An hon. gentleman has put in my hands the statutes to which I referred, and which the First Minister had overlooked, the Revised Statutes of the province of Quebec. Section 2323 reads:

Whenever any judge of the Superior Court, by illness, suspension from office, or other-cause, is unavoidably prevented from performing his duties as such judge, an assistant judge may be named either for a time certain, or during the time the judge first mentioned continues unable to perform his duties, in which last case the appointment of such assistant judge shall determine whether such first mentioned judge resumes the performance of his duties or another judge is appointed in his place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When was it passed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The late Attorney General of Quebec tells me that the statute was first passed in 1857.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought so, before confederation; because it is quite obvious it would not have been passed since confederation. It would not have been allowed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is a re-enactment of the last consolidated statutes for the province of Quebec for 1887.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No legislature would undertake to pass an Act of that kind now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot complain of the tone of the remarks of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and I would be disposed to agree with him in a large measure. But the misfortune is that at the present time we find ourselves in presence of this peculiar provision of the constitution, an extraordinary one, and which cannot be reconciled to the general principle. The general principle is, and it is one upon which we are all agreed, that the party who is responsible for determining how many judges there shall be, and who they shall be, should also provide for their salaries. But such is not the law at the present time, such is not the provision of our constitution, which imposes upon one body the duty of determining how many judges the court shall be composed of, and it imposes upon another body the duty of determining who the judges shall be. Now, I will say this to the hon. member for Pictou, as a proposition of general law, and one that is necessary to work the constitution in peace and harmony, that all public bodies should discharge their duties, whether as legislators or as judges, independently within their own sphere. But let us say for the purpose of the present discussion that all provincial legislative bodies must be presumed to act with a better knowledge of their circumstances than we can have here. That is the theory upon which we must go. Now such being the theory, and my hon. friend must accept it, whenever a statute is brought to us providing for the constitution of a court and providing for an additional judge in any province, the duty of this Government is to take that statute as prima facie evidence of the requirements of the people of that province; and I lay it down as a doctrine of safe government that it is not open to us to question that provincial statute, unless it be so shocking as to be repugnant to the sense of right of ordinary men. I do not see how we can act by any other rule. Now, my hon. friend to some extent, disputed that position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The words "prima facie" were not in the statement I disputed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Unless something is shown to us why this should not be done, it is not open to my hon. friend to say that it should not be done; he must accept the provincial statute as correct and proper, and as representing the needs of the province. It is not open to him to dispute it. But why should it be so? Why should there be so many judges? I tell him that it is not open to him to question the provincial statute. The constitution of the courts has been devolved by the fathers of confederation upon the provincial legislatures. That is the proposition I lay down; but my hon. friend says this is the first time this doctrine is affirmed. Well, Sir, I make bold to say that when we discuss this question again, I shall be able to convince him, by the debates of this House, that the view I now take is not new, but it has been taken again and again by gentlemen who at different times have filled the post of Minister of Justice. My hon. friend asked why there should be two judges in that district. I do not know myself what the reasons are; all I know is that prima facie the men who passed that law are better qualified than I am to judge of the circumstances and of the requirements of the people. But if my hon. friend could say of any Act: This is outrageous legislation, this is an improper exercise of the discretion vested in the legislature, which actually amounts to fraud, or something of the kind; then, I would say that Parliament, in its wisdom, must interfere, Parliament must stay its hand and not confirm such legislation. But unless there is such a case brought before us, I submit again to the logical mind, the judicial mind, of my hon. friend, that the position taken by the Government on this case is sound and cannot be questioned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The First Minister and myself are not, after all, so very far apart. I do not quarrel with much he has said where he uses the words "prima facie." But supposing these reports are laid before us and they make a prima facie case, as they have made to the mind of the First Minister, and there is not, after reasoning here across the floor, any evidence to show that these reports are wrong, I am not at all averse to saying that the benefit of the doubt should be given to the local authorities.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The onus lies upon us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The statement I quarrel with was that the Executive here should exercise no discretion. I say we must exercise discretion and discharge the responsibility.

Mr. DAVIN. If the construction put upon it by the Prime Minister is correct, why should the Attorney General of Manitoba send in a report, and why should it be thought necessary also to have the report of the judge sent down. It would have been enough that the Manitoba legislature had passed this legislation.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is exactly the case.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. No man will tax me with any sympathy with the local authorities in Manitoba, but at the same time I think that if this question had been properly put before the committee, we would not have spent so much time upon it. In Manitoba we have only two sets of judges. We have not, as there are in the other provinces, different courts, supreme courts, superior courts, courts of revision, &c., but we have the Court of Queen's Bench, composed of four judges, who have to exercise their jurisdiction over the whole province, which is subdivided into three judicial districts. We have also five county court judges having jurisdiction in the several subdivisions of the province. But it must be borne in mind that the jurisdiction of these county court judges goes as high as $500.

The PRIME MINISTER. $400.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Therefore a vast number of cases are submitted to their cognizance. They also act as judges in probate, and in some districts they act in small criminal cases; so that our county court judges cannot be compared with the county court judges of the other provinces in the extent of their jurisdiction. Now, it is true that from the number of our population, we appear, perhaps, to have a larger number of judges than we are entitled to. But we must take into consideration the fact that our country is sparsely settled, that the distances are great, and in order to avoid inconvenience to those who have to resort to the courts we have had to establish several county court stations that have to be attended to. It was not my good fortune to hear the remarks of the hon. Solicitor General, but I know that in the northern part of the eastern judicial district where Judge Walker has jurisdiction, the judge of that court is overworked. His district comprises the city of Winnipeg which alone is quite enough for him to attend to, and the consequence is that for several terms he has had to ask the judge of the central section of the eastern district to take over the court in the rural part of his district. This interferes a good deal with the work of Judge Prudhomme who has been attending to the work of Judge Walker. I am not surprised at all when I hear that the local government of Manitoba asked the Federal Government for the appointment of an additional judge. I do not know who shall receive that position, nor am I interested in the matter. The fact is that the territory of this judge is mostly all outside of my own riding, but I happen to know the facts, and I say that as far as Manitoba is concerned, with the few judges that we have, in comparison to the extent of the province, and even in comparison to the population, we cannot be surprised if a request is made for an additional judge.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not have spoken on this question were it not that the Prime Minister said that the principle which he now lays down has been followed, again and again, by Ministers of Justice. I understood him to mean by this, that the British North America Act provides the right of the provinces to lay out a judicial district and intimate that a judge is required; and then that it is the duty of the Minister of Justice and the Dominion Parliament to obey that intimation of the need by appointing a judge. I must say that this does not accord with my experience during the time I have been in this House, because a number of years ago when an application was made by myself for the appointment of an additional judge in our county, the Hon. Sir A. Campbell, then Minister of Justice, took the ground, that although the senior judge had recommended that another judge was needed, and although the bar had asked for the appointment of another judge because the business was falling in arrears; yet, that was not a justification for his making the appointment, and he must himself have satisfactory information that there was more business than could be done by one judge. He withheld that appointment for two or three years upon the same ground, and finally the appointment was made. I remember appealing to the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald with reference to the same case, and he insisted that the Minister of Justice must be the judge as to whether or not the appointment should be made. I remember also that the late Right Hon. Sir John Thompson made a similar reply in this House. I, therefore, contend that the principle laid down by the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) is not that which has hitherto been followed in these matters. But, if the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) is right, why did the present Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) who was the Attorney General of Ontario only a year ago, pass a law limiting the number of judges? Originally the provincial law provided that there might be a senior and a junior judge in a county, but Sir Oliver Mowat found that the applications from judges and from the bar were so

numerous that there was an evil growing up, that too many judges were being appointed, and, therefore, he passed an Act which provided that in any county with a less population than 80,000 inhabitants there should be only one judge. If you apply that standard in the present case and take 80,000 inhabitants as the basis for the appointment of a judge in Manitoba, what do we find? The population of Manitoba is about 200,000, and after this appointment is made they will have six county court judges, who, under the Ontario law, should do all the judicial work for a country with a population of 480,000, more than twice the present population of Manitoba. I am surprised at the present Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) assenting to a proposition of this kind, because he was the man who checked the growth of this abuse in Ontario. Now, that gentleman (Sir Oliver Mowat) comes to this Parliament, and takes the ground that as soon as a provincial government establishes a judicial district, and without his finding from any other source the knowledge that such a judge is necessary, he takes the ground that the local government must be obeyed and that an additional judge must be appointed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot see any inconsistency in the action of the present Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has referred. In one case, as far as I can understand, the Minster of Justice, when Premier of Ontario, found it necessary to pass an Act to limit the number of judges. I suppose the reason he passed that Act was, that if there was not an Act limiting the number of judges the Federal Executive would in the natural course of things be obliged to go on making appointments to fill all the vacancies which the former provincial statute provided for. In this present case he is taking the same ground, and as the provincial legislature of Manitoba has in a certain way constituted a court the Federal Executive is now bound to make a proper appointment. It seems to me that this is the only way in which you can read the federal constitution aright. In my opinion the theory contended for by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) would lead to some such state of affairs as this. If a provincial legislature should pass an Act, as provincial legislatures usually do, constituting a provincial court fixing a certain quorum of judges as necessary for the transaction of judicial business, and if the Federal Executive in its judgment, and in the exercise of the discretion which it is now contended belongs to it, should think that quorum too large, and should insist upon appointing only a smaller number of judges than the provincial legislature has established as the quorum; I would like to know whether there could be any judicial business done in that jurisdiction under those circumstances. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows, that a court cannot be properly constituted until there are so many judges in the court as the provincial legislature determines shall be the quorum. It may be that I am altogether mistaken about this, but I do not think that the fathers of confederation made any such mistake as, according to the contention of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, they must be held to have made. They must have known very well, they did know very well, that if a provincial legislature undertook to pass an improvident Act with regard to the constitution of provincial courts, thus throwing unnecessary burdens upon the federal treasury, the Federal Executive would have the power to disallow such legislation. But, if the Federal Executive should allow to go into force a provincial Act providing for a certain number of judges,—constituting a court in a particular way, and providing for a particular quorum, then, in my opinion, having allowed the provincial Act to go without veto, they cannot consistently nullify that provincial legislation, by the indirect method of refusing to provide for the salaries of the additional judges. If an improvident Act is passed by a provincial legislature which throws too much burden upon the federal treasury in the way of judicial salaries, then the proper course is for the Federal Executive to exercise their supreme power of disallowing such legislation. To my mind that seems to be the logical and constitutional way out of the difficulty suggested by this discussion. It seems to me to be a practical solution of the problem which is presented on its face by our Act of confederation in its partition of federal and provincial authorities. I must say that I was not greatly impressed by the precedent about the Quebec judiciary which the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) mentioned. I am not familiar with the Act to which he referred. To be perfectly frank, I never heard of it before—but as I heard it read, it only provides that assistant judges may in certain contingencies be appointed, and it does not make the appointment of these judges necessary to the constitution of the court. If the Quebec legislature had made such assistant judges necessary to the constitution of the court, and if the Federal Executive had not provided for those assistant judges, then no judicial business could have gone on in that jurisdiction so long as the Federal Executive stayed its hand, and I should think, that, to say the least, it would be straining the constitution of this country to nullify the provincial enactment in that way. I think that the limitation which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries put on his proposition made it an absolutely safe one. But I doubt if that limitation was strictly necessary, as the power of disallowance seems to me to be the appropriate check upon the possible disposition of the provincial authorities, in the constitution of their systems

of judicature, to impose unnecessary or undue burdens upon the federal treasury.

To provide for a retiring allowance to Constable Prudhomme $439 25

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend explain this item ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This man has been in the Dominion Police for a great many years, and he retired previous to the formation of the new Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this under the law ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So I understand.

Penitentiaries—Commissions for investigating the affairs of the penitentiaries of Canada $3,000

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to say a word or two before this item passes, with regard to the management of the penitentiaries of this country. Looking over the Audit report, I find that for Kingston penitentiary alone the expenditure is $120,000 a year, and in round numbers the revenue only $3,000. For all the penitentiaries in the Dominion the expenditure is about $440,000 a year, and the revenue is about $11,000. It is doubtful if there is to be found in any country any penal institution which yields so little revenue for such a large expenditure. I understand that the penitentiaries of the United States are, to a certain extent, self-supporting ; at any rate, they yield a large revenue. The people of this country feel that, if our penitentiaries were properly handled, they could be brought nearer to a self-supporting condition ; and, if this commission is for the purpose of investigating that matter, and any good comes of it, it will be about the best expenditure of money that could be made. It is a common thing to hear of prisoners brought up for trial requesting to be sentenced to the Kingston penitentiary, and not to the Central prison. Whether that is because the Kingston penitentiary is a soft place or not, I do not know ; but some people say that they are better off there than they are outside. I do not wish to appear harsh or hard, or to illustrate the old saying that "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless millions mourn," but I feel that something is wrong with our prison system, when men will commit larceny in order to get back to the penitentiary ; and there are many instances of this. This is a matter that should be thoroughly investigated, if this commission is appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Solicitor General explain the immediate purpose of this vote ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Representations have been made with reference to the management of the different penitentiaries in the Dominion, especially the Kingston penitentiary. It has not yet been decided that there shall be any investigation, so far as the expenditure of this money is concerned ; but it is quite possible, in fact probable, that an investigation will be held with reference to two penitentiaries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The inspector of penitentiaries, a very energetic man, and a man of first-class business ability, came into office only a year or two ago ; and, when I was at the head of the department, I gave him instructions to make very careful and thorough inquiry into the working and management of every penitentiary in Canada. It would naturally be his duty to do that in any event ; but I called his special attention to the necessity of going over every one of these institutions from the top to the bottom, giving him, so far as I could, a free hand in making suggestions. Now, I think the hon. gentleman ought to be in some other position than he apparently is, before asking for this amount. I am not at all against a full and thorough inquiry ; but, before asking for a vote for a commission, the hon. gentleman should be in a position to inform us what report, if any, the present inspector has made, so far as he has gone into the work. I think he has visited every penitentiary in Canada. I think he has been on both coasts, and in Manitoba, and certainly he has been very often at the Kingston penitentiary. I would like to know from the Solicitor General whether he has had an opportunity of discussing this subject with the inspector, whether the inspector has made any formal report upon it, and whether it is in view of any recommendation from that officer that a more formal commission is suggested.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not able to answer the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on that point. I have never seen the report, if any report has been made by Mr. Stewart, who, I believe, is the gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers. But, so far as the department is concerned, it has been suggested to me that this item is necessary. The request made by the hon. gentleman is so reasonable, however, that I think I ought to allow this item to stand until I get the information.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it would be a protection for the hon. gentleman himself, if this is not a very urgent vote, not to take it ; because the pressure would be very heavy, even in the best regulated family, to spend the money if it is at the hon. gentleman's disposal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman must not overlook the binder twine, and the fact that we have still 490 tons on hand and unsold.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not see what that has to do with the commission.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Some investigation has to be made in reference to that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would be very glad to see it investigated.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of Public Works—	
To pay arrears of subscriptions to newspapers, reviews and other publications	$1,450
To provide for one third class clerk omitted in the Estimates	450

Mr. FOSTER. I think that ought to be explained.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). A certain number of newspapers had been taken in the department which has not been paid for for years and years; so, as we owed the money, I thought I would ask Parliament for it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is unusual for the department to owe such large amounts on this account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The facts of the case are these: When I took office I found that a certain number of papers had been received from year to year and had not been paid for. Wishing to pay our debts, I have applied for the money. If hon. gentlemen wish me to strike off the item, I will do it. The money is due. I can give the names of the papers, and I will be glad to give them even now.

Mr. FOSTER. An arrangement was made by Order in Council some five years ago by which the cost of newspapers in the departments was brought down. Undoubtedly too much was being expended by the departments, the sums running from $1,000 to $1,500 for newspapers in each department. After a thorough investigation an Order in Council was passed by which each department was limited to a maximum sum for this purpose—I think it was $500, and the departments were duly notified, and every officer in the departments knew that his subscriptions to newspapers had to be arranged accordingly. This account was sent over while I was Minister of Finance, and I refused to pass it. If the bill has been contracted, it has been contracted by officers without authority, and it ought to be paid by them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers of the department have informed me that the late Minister of Public Works agreed to receive these papers. Of course, if my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance tells me that the Government do not wish to pay for these papers, I am perfectly prepared to have the item struck out. No objection at all. I move that the item be struck out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can do that if he likes. I do not say that he ought to repudiate any debt. But when the officers of the department, with an Order in Council staring them in the face, subscribe to papers in an unauthorized way, then I say that while payment ought to be made it ought to be made by the officers of the department themselves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We must not lay the blame on those who do not deserve it. The officers of my department, if interrogated, will tell you that the late Minister, in spite, perhaps, of an Order in Council or an agreement, received the papers for which that amount is due. We on this side of the House are not responsible for this state of affairs. Both of these papers are unfriendly to us. If hon. gentlemen opposite object to the payment, I am prepared to have that item struck out.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We ought to have the names of the papers. It is claimed that $1,450 will pay for a great many newspapers and periodicals, and after the explanation of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), I think the House ought to know the names of the papers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the item should be struck out. If the late Minister of Public Works, in the face of an Order in Council limiting the amount to be devoted to subscriptions to papers gave subscriptions in this way he should pay for them himself. Those who sent the papers had better look to him for payment.

Mr. SCRIVER. What I do not understand is why these accounts were not rendered year by year as they should have been.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I receive every day accounts for papers that have not been paid for years and years, although the papers have been received.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In other cases, Ministers have had the experience of receiving day by day accounts for newspapers and periodicals, but when they come they are paid in the regular way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) says he got this bill and would not pay it.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think this is an honest debt and should be paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The names of the papers for which the accounts are due are as follows:—

Nova Scotia—

Annapolis "Spectator," $4.50; Antigonish "Casket," $4.50; Halifax "Critic," $4.50.

Mr. FOSTER. What years are these for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Up to the 1st of July, 1896. I will give the names after recess.

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

After Recess.

House again in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Before recess I had begun reading the names of several newspapers whose publishers claimed payment for sending their issues to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt my hon. friend has a long list there, and it would take him considerable time to read it. If the hon. gentleman is assured that the newspapers have been bona fide sent to the department, I suppose the newspaper men ought to have their pay.

Mr. McMULLEN. I object to the adoption of this item. From the statements that we heard in the committee before six o'clock from hon. gentlemen opposite, I think in justice to the country we should strike this item out. The late Minister of Finance stated that by an Order in Council each department was instructed that they should not exceed the sum of $500 each for newspapers. In face of those instructions, if a Minister of any department chose to exceed that sum, he did it in open violation of that Order in Council, of which he was personally cognizant. Under these circumstances I think it would be setting a bad precedent if we are now to gather up the accumulated fragments of newspaper accounts for the last seven or eight years, and put them all into one item and pass it. I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. DAVIN. I think my hon. friend will not embarrass his Minister, who considers that this should be paid. I see from the few items the Minister read out that they consist of small sums of four, or five, or six dollars; and the papers like the "Casket" and others that supplied their issues to the Department of Public Works, could have known nothing of this arrangement, and they are clearly entitled to be paid. I think the Department of Public Works is responsible, and could be made to pay. The smallness of the sum, however, would make it inconvenient for each of these papers to sue the department, but as a fact there would be nothing to prevent one of the newspapers suing the department and recovering. If the motion of my hon. friend is adopted, all that would be done would be to deprive those people of what is justly their due, because they won't take the trouble to enforce their claims, they being so small. The proper thing to do, I think, is to lay down the rule that a thing like this should not occur again.

Mr. LANGELIER. The account should be paid, and charged to the Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the late Government was so absolutely regardless of their duty that they allowed newspapers to come to their department in violation of an Order in Council, until a bill of $1,400 had been accumulated?

Mr. FOSTER. Now you are striking the old note.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, that is all right. I hope the hon. gentleman will discharge his duty to the country, now that he sits on that side of the House, as well as I did when I sat there, and after he has had as long an apprenticeship as I had, perhaps he will. Now, my hon. friend says that the late Government allowed these papers to come to the office, and if they did, they allowed them to come there in violation of an Order in Council of which they were personally cognizant. Had they done their duty, they would have required their officials to notify the publishers to send their papers no longer, but they neglected to perform that duty. Now, I object to setting a bad example of this kind. We should stop at this point and say that in no case, I care not what the papers are, should we pay for them, unless they have been ordered.

Mr. FOSTER. There are a number of religious papers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection to religious papers amongst the rest, but we should not set the bad example of allowing these people to send their papers when they are not ordered, and then being paid for them.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not so much blame the heads of the department as I do the law that allows publishers to send their papers, either to a department or a private individual, and compel him to pay for them. It could hardly be expected that the head of any department would watch all the papers that come there, and keep in mind the very day the subscription runs out, and then send back the next paper afterwards as refused. If an individual does not do that, it becomes a contract, and he is responsible for payment of the paper afterwards. I think the law of contracts in regard to newspapers, is radically wrong, and the provincial government should amend it. I have always held, and I think most people will agree with me, that a publisher should not have the right to send these papers on from time to time, and throw the onus and the trouble upon the individual of keeping trace of the day that the subscription runs out, and then sending back the paper. I am told there are many instances where papers are sent back, and no attention is paid to it by publishers, and the paper continues to be sent on, and a bill is presented at the end of the year for payment. I have no doubt that was the case with many of these papers. The custom seems to have obtained for a long

time, the publishers regard it as a just debt, and I do not think we should repudiate it. Take, for instance, members of Parliament. While absent from their homes, many papers come from different quarters, and those who take the mail out of the office, do not know whether the papers were subscribed for or not. It accidentally happens that two or three issues are taken out of the office, either of papers or periodicals he has not taken before, or of others after the subscription has expired, and therefore he becomes bound to pay the subscription for the year. I can readily understand that the head of a department has so much mail matter coming to the department, that it would be impossible for him to keep trace of the dates the subscription runs out.

Mr. McMULLEN. If any further arguments were needed to prove that it is the duty of this committee to strike out this item, it is the statement just presented by the hon. gentleman. He virtually says that newspaper men will persist in sending their periodicals, even after they are refused; therefore, this would be an excellent opportunity for giving them a lesson by refusing to pay this item. Let the publishers distinctly understand after this that in every case where their periodicals are refused by the department, and they continue to send them on, they send at their own risk. The Minister says, no doubt, some of these papers were returned, and yet the publishers persisted in sending them. I lay the whole blame on the late Ministers who allowed this thing to be continued from month to month and from year to year in their departments. They declined to discharge their duties by returning these periodicals, and thus save the country paying this $1,400. I persist in the demand that the item be struck out.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I take issue with the sweeping statement made by the hon. member (Mr. McMullen). I can understand how it would pay this country very well to have the newspapers sent to the Ministers of the Crown; because they can better understand the wants of the country through its press than in any other way. Here are petitions coming in to have certain things done in a particular district in a far-off province, and here coming to the Ministers, are the papers of both sides who have no interest except to represent the matter correctly. The Ministers cannot afford to pay for these papers themselves and as an educator of the wants of the various provinces, I think they should have them and the country should pay for them. There are certain papers that we might dispense with, but I will not name them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These papers have certainly been received in a bona fide way and it seems to me they should be paid for. For the future we will be responsible, and we will see that this matter is properly attended to.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It is extraordinary that the member for York (Mr. Foster) should be the one to complain of the abuse of this system of subscribing to papers. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is disloyal to his late colleague who has been placed upon the bench and is not in a position to defend himself. He should be the last man to attempt to stop the payment of these small accounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I see a manifest unfairness to my own province in this debate. At the beginning of the discussion a list of papers was placed before the House, and my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) began to read it. Now in the light of what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, we are given to understand that this is a list of claims of a very illegitimate character which have been presented to us for payment. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) only got so far as to name two papers on the list, and these two, it so happens, are in the province of Nova Scotia. One of these was the Annapolis "Spectator." It is most unfair to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that that paper should be singled out for special reference. Another, was the Antigonish "Casket," and the "Casket" is a particular favourite with hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not only a good Conservative paper, but it claims to be a very religious paper.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better keep that on the list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The suggestion from the other side of the House that this good religious paper would present a claim which is unlawful and illegitimate is one which I, as a Minister from Nova Scotia, am bound to resent. I do not see why Nova Scotia Conservative papers should be held up as scapegoats for all the others, and so I think we should have the whole list read. But, if one must be serious in this matter, I must say that the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that this item should not pass, is a suggestion which I must oppose. In the first place I have been a party to putting this item in the Estimates, and that is one reason why I should support it. But there is another reason. In by-gone days—perhaps I should say in my better days, before I fell from grace—I was a newspaper man, and I do not wish to see the newspapers singled out as a special subject for attack by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think they should strain at a gnat and swallow a saw mill.

Mr. FOSTER. Was yours a religious daily?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Any paper which I ever was connected with was conducted on sound religious principles. After

all that has passed through this House with the assent of hon. gentlemen opposite, they need not make such wry faces at this little matter of a newspaper account. Even though it is beyond the $100 limit, yet if a Minister of the Crown, even improvidently, ordered these Conservative papers and received them, I think it would be a small matter for us to refuse to pay for them.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If it is a matter of right then the public money should be paid for these newspapers, but not otherwise. With all due deference to the noble profession from which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has descended, I firmly believe that not one of these claims should be paid unless it is right they should be paid as a matter of contract. If they insisted on sending their papers to the department without being ordered, then they should not be paid for them.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has failed to make out a case. We were told by gentlemen opposite that the late Government was very extravagant, but here is an account for $1,450 which they righteously refused to pass, and yet the present Government are anxious to pay out the money, when there is no legal obligation to pay it. These newspapers have evidently been sent without being ordered, for if it were otherwise, there is no department of the late Government which would not have paid for them. The present Government have no right to demand this money from the House unless they show that there is a legal obligation to pay it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to understand if the late Government refused to pay this amount?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They refused to pay this amount?

Mr. WALLACE. So the member for York (Mr. Foster) has stated to the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do you know that of your own knowledge?

Mr. WALLACE. It was stated in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be some misunderstanding with reference to that. The matter came before the Treasury Board on a demand for contingencies to pay it, and it was decided by the Treasury Board that it should not be paid out of contingencies since the department had had its proper apportionment. In fact the contingencies would not allow the payment of it, with proper regard to the demands on that vote for the year. That simply is an advertisement to the department that it cannot get any money in that way, and must have recourse to Parliament for a vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a certain number of papers that are coming to the department and I cannot stop them unless I first pay for them. If we do not make up our minds to pay for them, we cannot stop them, and they will be constantly coming in. All things considered, it seems to me it would be a great deal better policy to pay for them, and discontinue those that are not useful.

Legislation—Senate—Leather trunks ordered last session $2,150

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have an explanation of that item from the Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know what my hon. friend will expect us to add. I cannot alter the character of the trunks, nor can I alter the fact that they were ordered last session.

Mr. McDOUGALL. By whom were they ordered?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand they were ordered by the Senate Committee on Contingencies.

Mr. SPROULE. While this item is under consideration, I would like to ask, who has the authority to order trunks, because we have different versions as to where this authority lies. It seems to me the contract for the last batch of trunks we got was a very poor one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will acknowledge that the present Government could not order these trunks last session. This is of a class of items belonging to Parliament and regarded in a certain way as outside the line of executive action. Both branches of Parliament claim the right to do some things voluntarily, of their own motion, and I think that this trunk business is one of the things in regard to which the Senate would hardly be willing to accept our judgment. It is the habit of the Committee on Contingencies of both Houses to suggest what should be done. In this way these trunks were ordered under the authority of the Joint Committee of both House on Printing, and I fancy that this has been the custom of Parliament for many years.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood some members of the committee to say that the committee had not the authority to order, and that the power rested somewhere else.

Mr. FOSTER. The rule that was adopted, and that, I think, still exists, with reference to this House, is this. The Printing Committee, acting in connection with the clerk of stationery of this House, and in connection with the Clerk and Speaker of the House, arrange for the stationery and such things for the use of members. Practically, the way in which it is done is this. The clerk of contingencies makes out an esti-

mate of stationery and such things required for the members; that is presented to the Printing Committee; and the Printing Committee, through its chairman, or through a sub-committee, revise that, and, if there are any suggestions or additions to be made, they make them. It then goes back to the clerk of contingencies, and through him it goes to the Clerk of the House, who includes it in his estimates; and from him it is sent to the Minister of Finance, who revises it and places it in the Estimates. Then it comes down to this House, and is generally voted.

Mr. SPROULE. We are as far from having the information as ever. The question I asked was, who has the authority to order the trunks or to make the contract for them?

Mr. FOSTER. After the report of the committee passes, the chairman or the sub-committee of the Printing Committee makes the contract. I think it has been generally left in the hands of the two chairmen.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this difficulty has arisen from a very strained interpretation of the rules of Parliament. Those rules provide for a Joint Committee of both Houses on Printing. Some years ago, it appears, this joint committee was virtually divided into two committees. The Senate chose to assume the right to have the Senate portion of the committee act by themselves; so that the Senate chairman is elected by the Senate portion, and the Commons chairman by the Commons portion. The Senate portion of this committee attend to all matters connected with their House, independently of the other members of the committee. Now, where the rules of Parliament provide for the joint action of both Houses, I cannot see that it is right to divide this committee into two committees. That is the way matters stood when the last trunks were ordered, and that is the way they stand now. In my opinion, the Committee on Printing should act jointly, and not as two committees. If it did, these difficulties would not arise, and there would be some one in this House to answer for the action of that committee. The Senate take to themselves the right to act absolutely independent of this Chamber. They do as they please, and there is no person here responsible to Parliament for what they do or what they do not do. It is because of this strained interpretation of the rules of Parliament, that this difficulty has arisen.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). This vote is the result of the joint action of both Houses. In 1891 the Joint Committee on Printing reported in favour of doing away with the old system of supplying a trunk at the beginning of each session to each member and senator; and instead of supplying a trunk each session, decided to provide one large leather trunk at the beginning of each Parliament. That was approved of by both Houses, and the officer who ordered the trunks did so on this joint report approved by both Houses.

Mr. SCRIVER. It was very unfortuante that the selection of these trunks was not left to the Senate committee, considering the kind of trunks we receive and the kind they receive.

Mr. SPROULE. That was just my object in trying to find out where the authority lay, because the leather trunks we got were very poor ones. I had a competent judge examine one of these trunks, which cost us $25 apiece, and he said they were worth only $12.50 or $13 apiece, and were not by any means as valuable as the trunks which the Senate got for the same money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am told that the trunks we are asked to pay for now are very good ones.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another matter in this connection. I have always regarded the class of stationery we get as very unsuitable for the wants of business men. There is a lot of knicknacks in it which are valueless. We get a lot of small note paper and envelopes, some beautifully printed, that might be useful for young ladies, but certainly not for men who have reached our time of life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak for yourself

Mr. SPROULE. I think we might very well have the selection revised and get a class of stationery that would be useful.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must say that these trunks which were supplied last Parliament were a gross fraud. The trunk I got was made of solid pasteboard, each side of which was pasted over with a piece of sheepskin, and was not fit for anything. If the same kind is supplied this year, I prefer not to have any. I hope that whoever is in charge will see that something worth the money is supplied.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am glad to hear the remarks made with reference to stationery. Of course the expense was all incurred by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). In my days there were no pocket books, no purses and no card cases. The members got some paper, and perhaps there might be some excuse for giving paper on which to write to our constituents, but when this thing costs the country $8,000 to $10,000 a year, I am opposed to it. Hon. members opposite, who take up this thing now, are in Opposition and make a virtue of necessity, but in their day they could have stopped it. If all this tinted paper and the rest was procured by the late Government, it is time it should be stopped. I am determinedly opposed to our spending the

people's money in buying all this trash. When the late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) allowed the people's money to be spent from year to year in this way, it is time for the present Government to take another step and repudiate such practice.

St. Lawrence Valley Exhibition of Three Rivers $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is adopting an entirely new policy. For a number of years past the Government adopted the policy of not granting money to aid exhibitions at the different local points. Applications were sent in from time to time from the exhibition associations of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and I think almost all the other provinces, for aid to hold these fairs, and the rule was established that aid should be given by this Government only to such exhibitions as were of an international or Dominion character. Under the system which prevailed before that rule was adopted of giving grants to local exhibitions, there was a good deal of abuse, and the other policy was adopted; and for a number of years we have had no votes of that kind. Is it the policy of this Government to undertake to bonus all those small divisional or local exhibitions? If so, my hon. friend will find a great many demands made upon him.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Government should explain why they have selected what is evidently a local fair in order to give it this large grant of $5,000. I presume there are at least a hundred fall exhibitions in this country, which, so far as we know, have an equal claim for $5,000 as the Three Rivers Exhibition. As the late Finance Minister has pointed out, it was the custom some years ago to give a grant of $10,000 to an exhibition which was made the Dominion Exhibition for that year. It would make a Dominion exhibition that year. The money was expended largely on lines laid down by the Government, and the expenditure gave an impetus to the portion of the Dominion in which the exposition was held. But this is not such a case. It appears to me that if you commence giving to an ordinary exhibition without making it a Dominion exhibition then, unless the matter can be explained, it seems to me you run too great a risk of bringing down upon the Government claims from every agricultural society in Canada. We have an exhibition in Woodbridge which I venture to say off-hand, is a more famous exhibition than this. We are not asking for $5,000; we are not asking for anything. We have a flourishing exhibition, everything paid for and money in the bank, and we do not require Dominion Government aid at all.

Mr. DAVIN. In this connection I wish to point out that there is nothing in these Estimates to pay the North-west exhibition debts. In the Supplementary Estimates brought in last year there was an item of $12,000 to pay the outstanding accounts of the North-west exhibition, which was a Dominion exhibition. The amount due was $14,000, but I understand that $12,000 was put in the Estimates by the late Government with this view—that they found that amount due in any case and they would take time to investigate the question whether the remaining $2,000 should be paid. The men to whom this money is due belong to both political parties and they have already been a couple of years out of their money. This was really a Dominion matter and the honour and credit of the country was pledged to them. I do hope that my hon. friend will consider these points and will see to it that these debts are paid.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I would not like to admit as fully as the hon. gentleman does the obligation. It is a fair matter of inquiry, and the Government are now making it a matter of inquiry with a view to do justice in the case. With regard to the other question, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) will explain.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I find that in this case as in many others, I feel bound to assume the obligations incurred by the late Government. In this case, Sir, you may scarcely believe me, after hearing what was said by gentlemen on the other side, there is an Order in Council, to which my hon. friend has been a party, accepting a tender for the exhibition at Three Rivers.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A tender for the amount of $5,000. I will have the papers here in a few moments.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend mean by a tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For a building.

Mr. FOSTER. For an exhibition building? A Dominion building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it done by the Experimental Farm in connection with their work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I say is that I found an Order in Council adopted by the late Administration pledging themselves to erect a building at Three Rivers. I simply carried out the pledge that had been given.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better see that paper. The hon. gentleman had better let the item stand meantime.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well.

General Statistics $1,758

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister of Agricul-

ture if he has had occasion to look into a claim on behalf of an officer who held the office of Registrar of Statistics of Births. Deaths and Marriages for Halifax. One of the members for Halifax who had to leave, asked me to call the Minister's attention to the subject. As I remember, there were two officers, one having to do with Protestant cases and the other with Catholic cases. These offices were abolished and a gratuity was voted by Parliament to one of the officers, the case of the other being overlooked. I believe the giving of a gratuity to the other was favourably considered by the department, and the answer sent to the gentleman that the amount would have to be included in the Estimates as in the other case. But I see no mention of it here. In the event of further Supplementary Estimates being brought down, I hope the hon. gentleman will include this amount.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. member for Halifax to whom the hon. gentleman refers sent me some papers in connection with this matter, but, in the press of other matters I have not been able to look into them. I understand that the hon. member for Halifax had an interview with my deputy, explaining the matter to him ; but my deputy, perhaps through oversight, perhaps because he decided against the case in his own mind did not bring the matter to my attention before these Estimates were prepared. I will look into the matter, and if necessary, carry out the understanding formerly arrived at.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Before I left Halifax, Mr. Stoker, who makes this claim, called upon me. I must say I was impressed with the idea that his claim was a fair one, but I have had no opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the Minister. Had I been able to do so, perhaps the item would have appeared in these Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this addition to general statistics ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the main Estimates there is an item of $2,500 under civil government for statistics. On page 34 of the main Estimates, item 86, general statistics, you will find $2,500 for the purpose of carrying on the statistical bureau, which, as my hon. friend knows, is in the Department of Agriculture. It is for paying the clerks and those engaged in the work of collecting statistics. I find in my department the following staff engaged in that work—I can give the hon. gentleman the names and the details, if he desires, but the amount comes to $4,258 for salaries alone for the staff engaged in that department on this work, and engaged for some years on it, as I understand. I found this staff there, and I have not had an opportunity yet to see whether the staff can be decreased. The amount being $4,258, and the amount in the main Estimates being only $2,500, as was the provision of the year before, and the year before that, I believe, it leaves a deficit of $1,758, the amount of this item. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I trust when I have had time to take charge of the department in earnest, and to look into the details, I will be able to reduce that staff, so that I may not have to expend the whole of this amount. But in the meantime, the salaries of the staff actually engaged there amount to this sum ; and until I can inquire into it and see where any reduction can be made, I do not feel justified in asking for a lesser amount.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be very reasonable. I remember going over this with the late Minister of Agriculture, and in canvassing the whole matter with him, and the conclusion we came to was embodied in the vote for $2,500. He had arranged his plans by which the services were to be kept within that vote. Of course, my hon. friend is not able at present to make his reorganization ; he simply provides for what he may have to use, but may not take the whole of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the position.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would like to know how the deficiency in past years has been provided for. According to the Minister this staff has been in existence for some time, and this deficiency must have existed, as only $2,500 was appropriated. How was the deficiency met in past years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand from the officers of my department that it has been met by similar votes in the Supplementary Estimates.

Manitoba Census $1,700

Mr. FOSTER. Does that complete ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Yes. I may say that the original vote for the Manitoba census was $15,000, of which $5,000 was given in the Supplementary Estimates for 1895-96 in case the census should cost more. The whole cost, however, including this $1,700, will be considerably under the original $15,000.

Statistical Year-Book $3,589 16

Mr. McMULLEN. I think some explanation should be given by hon. gentlemen opposite why this matter was allowed to stand over—balance due on 1894, and balance due on 1895.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The explanation furnished me by the chief of my department is that the accounts for the Year-Book of 1894 were not sent in until after the Supplementary Estimates of 1895 had been prepared. I may say that this account was sent in

by the Printing Bureau to our department. The book is printed in the Printing Bureau, and the procedure is that the bureau should send the estimate of the expected cost, and that estimate is taken as the basis of the estimate prepared in the Department of Agriculture. For the last two, and now three, years the Year-Book has been increasing in bulk, and consequently the Printing Bureau has found it much more expensive to print than it expected when the estimate was made. The result is that for the last two years there has been this deficit. The reason this deficit of 1894 was not paid for before was that the completed accounts were not sent in from the Printing Bureau until after the Supplementary Estimates were prepared.

Mr. WALLACE. How many copies of the book are printed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For the Year-Book of 1894 there were 750 copies of the French edition and 2,400 copies of the English edition. The cost of the French edition was $2,763.47 ; of the English edition, $3.091.12.

Mr. WALLACE. Over $3.50 per copy for the French edition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That includes the translation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am afraid the hon. gentleman did not look after things as well when he was in the Government as he ought to have done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For 1895 there were 2,400 copies of the English edition, costing $3,821.93 ; and of the French edition 750 copies, estimated at $1,800. The account has not been actually made up, but the Printing Bureau has sent in an account to my department saying it would come to about $1,800.

Mr. WALLACE. $2,763 for 750 copies of the French edition is an exorbitant figure. Now, if there is a necessity for this book, and apparently there is, there should be a much larger edition printed, it would cost very little more money. I know that requests have been made from many parties to be furnished with additional copies of this Statistical Year-Book, and they were unable to get it, the edition had run out. Several thousand more copies could be printed at very little additional expense.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am surprised the hon. gentleman did not think of that when he was in power.

Mr. WALLACE. Our attention had never been called to it before.

Mr. SCRIVER. It ought to have been. That augurs great carelessness.

Mr. MONK. There is an item of nearly $2,000 here for the translation of statistics into French. I do not deny that that may be necessary, but it seems to me that in future some scheme might be devised by which that expense should be avoided. The statistics are perfectly well understood in English, just as well as in French by the members in the province of Quebec, and it seems to me that something might be done —say if it were placed in the hands of a committee of French members to prevent this expenditure. Most of the expressions used in our province with reference to the statistics are English expressions, and this would consequently appear to be an absolute waste of money.

Cattle quarantine $12,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture, what are the quarantine regulations between Canada and the United States at the present moment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Cattle going into the United States from Canada are subject to a ninety days detention at the frontier, and they are also subject to tuberculin tests before entering into the United States. Coming into Canada from the United States cattle are also subject to ninety days quarantine before they can be released on this side.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that United States cattle are exported from the port of St. John without a quarantine of ninety days. I wish to know whether the farmers of Canada have the right to export cattle via Boston on the same terms, because the rates from that port are very much less than on the Canadian steamers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no provision for the export of American cattle from any Canadian port. There is a provision for the export of United States cattle in transit from one part of the United States, through Canada, to another part of the United States, as has been the case for many years. Canadian cattle exported from Europe are allowed to pass through Portland, subject to certain conditions and regulations of the United States quarantine service. Just lately the port of Boston was also laid open in the same way for Canadian cattle passing in transit to Europe. The conditions under the arrangement made were, that the Canadian Pacific Railway might carry such cattle from the western parts of Canada, through the province of Quebec, to Boston. The United States authorities require certain inspection and certificates, before these cattle were allowed to enter the United States. The Canadian Pacific Railway was obliged by these conditions to provide cattle yards at Richford, the first station on their line going to Boston after entering the United States. After three or four shipments the United States authorities stopped any fur-

ther shipment, until the Canadian Pacific Railway had provided the necessary facilities for taking the cattle out of the cars, and for inspecting, and watering them at Richford. At the present moment our cattle are not allowed to pass through Boston in transit for Europe, and only Portland is open to us for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIN. I have information—I do not know whether it has come to the knowledge of the hon. Minister or not—that cattle are being crowded across from Montana into Assiniboia west, from old Fort Walsh to Point Bute south of Parkbeg. The rancher who writes to me says that this will end in very serious trouble. The Minister is probably aware that trouble did occur a few years ago south of Maple Creek in consequence of sheep being crowded across without any examination.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no doubt the information of the hon. member (Mr. Davin) is correct, although I have not myself received any information with regard to that particular case. I know that along the whole frontier from Manitoba westward, there are constant cases of American cattle coming across the border. The cattle pasturing on the two sides of the line naturally drift from one side to the other, and even supposing the ranchers are willing to do so, it is a most difficult thing to prevent the cattle crossing the boundary. That has been the case for years and it is the case to-day. I really must acknowledge that I am a little at a loss to know how to guard that long frontier, so that this may be absolutely prevented. I may tell the hon. member (Mr. Davin), that recently, Dr. McEachren, who is now chief veterinary inspector for the Dominion of Canada, has taken a trip through the western country and he has presented a report dealing with that very question and others of a kindred nature. That report suggests certain improvements in our quarantine system, which may meet the difficulty to as great an extent as possible. I trust that before long—and I do not wish in any way to cast any reflection on what has been done before—I will be able to make a little more effective the protection of our north-western herds from any contagion from American cattle.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Did I understand the Minister to say that at the present moment Canadian cattle were not allowed to be shipped from Boston? A few days ago, I had a letter from one of the largest cattle shippers in Toronto stating that he was shipping cattle from Boston at 27s. 6d., as compared with the Montreal rate of 47s. 6d. He said that the trade was going via Boston instead of via Montreal. That gentleman may have been mistaken, but of course the Minister may have received more recent information.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Such an arrangement had been made by the United States authorities, but in consequence of no proper cattle yards for the inspection of stock at Richford, having been arranged for by the Canadian Pacific Railway, they have suspended the operation until such yards can be provided. That has occurred only within the last few days.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Agriculture said that cattle could be shipped via Portland on certain conditions. What are these conditions?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The conditions are in short: that the cattle shall be inspected on reaching the American frontier, and it is also demanded that they shall receive a certificate from Dr. McEachren. That certificate is not given by Dr. McEachren as our inspector or official, but it is given by him in his private professional capacity at the request of the American authorities. The arrangement is one that had been carried on for some time before I came to the department and one which I only knew of the other day in consequence of investigations I was making into the subject.

Mr. McMULLEN. The certificates can be easily obtained, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. It is Dr. McEachren's duty to give these certificates, in his arrangement with the United States authorities.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. Minister made any representations to the Canadian Pacific Railway to provide the necessary buildings and equipment for carrying on this trade through the port of Boston? If the difference in the freight rates is as great as the hon. member for Hamilton says it is, it is very important to the shippers of the country, as it affords competition between Portland, Boston and Montreal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are very much interested in that trade being carried on, and I understood the chief veterinary inspector to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were hurrying up the arrangements as quickly as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we must have some explanation why this large supplementary vote is required. I notice that the economy which was on the face of the main Estimates, $70,000 being asked, as against $95,000 for the preceding year, has faded away in this estimate; and the account now stands: $95,629 for 1895-96, against $107,100 asked for 1896-97.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give the information very shortly. In the first place, last winter Dr. McEachren was appointed by the late Minister chief veterinary inspector for the whole Domin-

ion. The hon. gentleman may not be aware, but many members of the House, no doubt, are aware, that for many years, almost since quarantine regulations were introduced into this country, Dr. McEachren has been the veterinary inspector for the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces. Last winter, the late Minister arranged to increase his duties and his salary; and by Order in Council dated, I think, the 9th of May last, Dr. McEachren was definitely made chief veterinary inspector for the Dominion, with an increase of salary of $1,000 a year. The result is that to-day we have to provide for that increase of salary. The late Minister also agreed to provide Dr. McEachren with a type-writer, involving an expenditure of $600, making a total of $1,600. In the main Estimates we had an item for the Pictou cattle disease, and in these estimates we put down $1,000 to pay for cattle slaughtered under the arrangements with reference to that disease. The hon. gentleman may not be aware that in Nova Scotia there is a cattle disease of a rather mysterious nature, which has been under the control of the veterinary inspector for many years. It was thought that by a little more vigorous policy this disease might be exterminated, and orders were issued to try and exterminate it by the slaughter of more animals than usual.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the disease?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nobody knows what it is. It has so far baffled the veterinary science applied to it; but it is of a nature that incapacitates the cattle for proper human use. While not completely exterminated, the disease is kept under control and is prevented from spreading. Then, there was omitted from the main Estimates $4,100, which is the quarantine share of the pay of the Dominion mounted police for their services in the North-west Territories, in looking after that frontier which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has just spoken of, and the diseases of cattle in those territories. Then, there is a new quarantine ground at Victoria, B.C., for which there is a rental due of $380 a year, under a contract which was entered into by the late Minister; and the officers of my department inform me that possession of the ground was taken, before I became Minister. During this season there has already been a very large amount of hog cholera in the province of Ontario, and, under the arrangements of the quarantine service, payments have been made for slaughtered animals affected with this disease.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion do you pay?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I think it is one-third of the value of the animal when it is really affected with the disease, and two-thirds when an animal is slaughtered on suspicion.

Mr. FOSTER. They are perfectly useless when slaughtered. Is there any sale for them?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. They are not allowed to be sold for food. I may say, as showing the necessity for this $1,500 which I am asking for that purpose, that I shall probably have to ask for yet more, because up to this day bills on this account, to the extent of $3,400, have been sent into the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the disease extensive?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It seems to be very intermittent. Sometimes it seems to be entirely stamped out, and then we have new outbreaks. This season, in the province of Ontario, there have been considerable outbreaks, and a considerable number have been slaughtered. The veterinary officers are doing their best to try and prevent the contagion from spreading. We shall probably have to isolate certain districts for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Have all these cases been confined to the counties of Essex and Kent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, not all. There have been some in the neighbourhood of Toronto, and some have been traced to the market of Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that those shipped to Toronto were from the west, purchased by a party in West Toronto.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that is correct, though I speak subject to correction. Then, there is an addition of $1,000, which was necessitated by the inspection of horses for export to England. Some of our horses, I believe, arrived in England were suspected of having glanders, and one or two, I think, were shown to have had that disease. We, therefore, argeed to inspect all shipments of horses to England and see that none of them were affected with this dread disease.

Mr. SPROULE. That inspection will be made at the port of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the ports of Montreal and at St. John, N.B. There is besides $530, being the amount of accounts received from those veterinarians who were appointed by the last Minister, in the month of June, and whose appointments I cancelled. They sent in accounts to this amount for expenses, and I was very glad to be able summarily to cancel their appointments. Then there is $1,889 for travelling expenses and contingencies. In consequence of Dr. McEachren being employed as veterinary inspector for the whole Dominion, he has taken an extensive tour in the west, and will have probably again to

pass through Ontario, in order to investigate and make such reorganization of this branch of the department as may be necessary. This increases very much contingencies and travelling expenses, and I thought it wise to put in a larger sum.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman decided on any plan by which veterinary inspectors over the country shall be appointed for carrying on the Quarantine Department? The plan devised by the late Minister of Agriculture was to avoid the heavy expense of one veterinary surgeon travelling all over the country. The intention was to appoint different surgeons in different localities, who would be available, at any time, by communication from the central office.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have been giving some consideration to this subject, but have not yet been able to go thoroughly into the matter and decide what is best to be done.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Order in Council increasing the salary of Dr. McEachren provide that his whole time is to be devoted to the duties of his position? We know that for years he has acted as veterinary surgeon for this Dominion and at the same time has been manager of the Waldron Ranch Company in the North-west.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that the present arrangement is an enlargement of the old one. Up to the 1st March last, he was paid $1,500 a year, to look after the quarantines in the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces, and there was no stipulation as to how much time or labour he should give to this work. The memorandum or recommendation of the Minister to Council—because it was not passed by Council, although it was a definite arrangement between the Minister and Dr. McEachren, and, I think, was binding in consequence of Dr. McEachren doing the work—provides an extension of his work to the whole Dominion, with an increase of $1,000 in his salary. There is no stipulation as to how much time Mr. McEachren shall give to the work, but simply that he shall have charge of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The uuderstanding was that he should give his whole time to it. The great objection to the services of Dr. McEachren before was that he devoted only partial time to this work and conducted besides other work of his own, amongst which was a ranch in the North-west. The Government felt that his services were very valuable and ought to be utilized by the Dominion, and that the wants of the country in that direction at present, were such, take our whole country through, that the services of such a man should be utilized for the whole of his time. So they came to the conclusion to give him what was thought a sufficient salary for his whole time. There was a memorandum to Council recommending that he should get $2,500 per year, but there was no vote for that. What was passed by the Treasury Board and the Council was that he should receive the appointment and that his salary to the 1st July, 1896, should be at that figure and that thereafter the agreement was he should have $1,000 more, although we could not pass it as an Order in Council as there was no vote for it. But that was perfectly understood. The explanations of the hon. Minister are all satisfactory with reference to the increases. In the case of a man like Dr. McEachren, it has been the policy, in framing the Estimates of late, to take such men who are appointed permanently by Order in Council, and estimate for them, under their own names, as having a stated salary. The former practice was to pay them out of the general vote, and really the Council had the power, at any time, to make the salary whatever it pleased out of that general vote, and Parliament did not know what these gentlemen were getting. I think it would be well to follow the practice in the case of Professor Prince and others, and ask for a special vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite agree that in such cases it is much better to do this. I would just like to refer to the matter of the increase to Dr. McEachren. I understand what the hon. member has said, but I must say that Dr. McEachren understood the arrangement was that his salary should commence the 1st of March. The memorandum from the Minister practically authorizes him to expect his salary to commence from that date.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to say as to that, but the hon. Minister will know more than that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason I say so is this, that at that date the evidence is absolutely conclusive that the Minister did promise Dr. McEachren this increase, and he went to work, in fact, before the 1st of March, and from the 1st of March up to the 1st of July was doing this work for which this extra salary was given.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he certainly deserves the pay, but it was impossible for the Order in Council to give him a rate of salary that had not been voted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is very desirable that, whatever connection Dr. McEachren may have had in the past with the Waldron Ranch Company, that connection should absolutely cease. I have no objections to giving any veterinary surgeon a good round salary for his services, but in the interests of the Dominion it is absolutely necessary that he should be completely cut loose from any associations in the North-west which might be detrimental to the interests of stock-raisers in this country or

the purity of the herds. Otherwise he might be tempted to admit cattle from the United States into the North-west, without inspection, for the benefit of the Waldron Ranch Company. Cattle have before been admitted from the United States without inspection, and I think it is desirable that Dr. McEachren should be in such a position that he will not have any interest in any particular ranch company, and will thus be more likely to deal equitably with all. That is unfair to the rest, and I claim that Dr. McEachren should be required to cut loose from any connection with any ranching company, so that he may deal with all ranching companies on equal terms, which he cannot expect to do so long as he has an interest in one.

Mr. SPROULE. Were we correct in understanding that Dr. McEachren was expected to give his whole time to this work for $2,500 a year? Also, I would like to know whether this item covers payment to Dr. Smith of Toronto, Dr. Cowan of Galt and other veterinaries employed in this work?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those items are included. The agreement between the Minister of Agriculture and Dr. McEachren makes no mention of Dr. McEachren giving his whole time to the work, and Dr. McEachren does not so understand it. When I come to reorganize this department, I will remember what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. SPROULE. That is why I spoke. I understood that Dr. McEachren lectured in one of the schools in Montreal and had other important work besides. This amount would be no compensation for him if his whole time was to be given to the work. He is a man of high standing in his profession and can earn more than this. I understand that if he gave his whole time, he would require a much larger salary, but that he might continue his work, and also do all that the department required of such an officer.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would be a pity to have such a valuable citizen as Dr. McEachren wasting his time in the service of this Government for $2,500 a year. He is a most versatile gentleman. While managing the Waldron ranch in the North-west and also directing the quarantine business in the east, he has made himself busy in interfering with settlers. If he is to be employed by this Government, he should be kept strictly under the control of this Government. He should not have the authority of this Government for showing partiality as between the different ranchmen or between the ranchmen and the settlers, which he has done in the past.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The ex-Minister of Finance is not quite correct in saying that there is an increase in this vote over that of last year. Last year the amount in the main Estimates was $22,000 and in the supplementaries, $8,500. In the supplementaries now under discussion, the hon. gentleman will find that $6,500 is required to pay a deficit on last year's accounts. So the whole standing of last year's vote was $37,143.15, while this year's vote, with the supplementaries, amounts to $34,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To avoid possible misunderstanding, which may have serious consequences, I wish to add a word on the subject of the Pictou cattle disease. The efforts of the late Government and the present Government to investigate, and, if possible, to exterminate it, are commendable; still there is danger that we may magnify the danger of the disease and thus do harm. I believe it is established that the disease is of local character and it has never been regarded as of so serious a nature as to threaten the health of the cattle of the province generally. I remember that a few years ago we suddenly found our cattle excluded from the United States owing to an order issued from Washington. We found that an official had seen some reference to this Pictou cattle disease in the press, and, without knowing its nature, took it for granted that it must be dangerous, and therefore the order was issued. The provincial government had to enter into communication with the Washington authorities, and I am glad to say, that after a short correspondence, the difficulty was removed. I desire to guard against the danger that may be involved in a reference to the Pictou cattle disease without some explanation. It is important that it should be exterminated, but I would not like anybody to think that it is so serious in its nature as to affect the health of the cattle of the provinces generally.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a slight correction I wish to make in the vote of $6,500 in the line of what was said about Dr. McEachren. This item includes $333.33, due to Dr. McEachren for his services, 1st March, 1896, to 1st July, 1896. If some words are not put in with regard to that, Dr. McEachren will not be able to get his salary for these months. Therefore I propose to add:

Including $333.33 for Dr. McEachren, chief veterinary surgeon for the Dominion, being for increased services commencing March, 1896, arranged for by the late Minister of Agriculture.

Tracadie Lazaretto—Omitted in main Estimates $600

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the leprosy island in British Columbia. There are there some six or seven Chinese lepers who are paid for by the different municipalities. We have applied to have these lepers taken over by the Dominion Government,

and I cannot see why this cannot be done as it has been done in the case of the lepers in New Brunswick. Of course I know that the arrangement relating to New Brunswick was made at confederation, and no arrangement was made with British Columbia at the time she entered. I notice also that a case of leprosy has been found in Montreal. That may make many gentlemen in this House take more interest in British Columbia and in the Chinese question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say the matter referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has not been called to my attention. I would like to explain one point with regard to this item of $18,000 for general quarantine and public health. I may say that of this, $9,703.50 is a deficiency in last year's expenses in connection with this department. The actual vote for this work last year was $40,000, as the main estimate was this year; but the actual expenditure under the department, up to the 1st July, 1896, was $49,703.50, requiring me to put in now the difference of $9,703.50, so as to overcome that deficiency in last year's work. Another item is the hiring of a disinfector tug for the Grosse Isle quarantine to the end of navigation this year, $4,790, including the disinfector upon it. This was a contract entered into by the late Minister last spring, and which was not paid for and not provided for in the main Estimates which that hon. gentleman prepared for his department last session. This contract was entered into, and is being performed, by the people to whom it was given, and no provision was made for the payment. There is also $3,000 for a disinfector tug for St. John, N.B., quarantine for next winter. I may say that this work, which is not yet actually under contract, was prepared for and promised by the late Minister. This accounts for the large item altogether of $18,000, which I have here as an addition to the ordinary general quarantine vote.

St. Lawrence Valley Exhibition at Three Rivers $5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am now ready to give the explanation asked for by the late Minister of Finance. An Order in Council was passed on the 4th July last, accepting the tender of F. E. Verret at $1,130 for constructing buildings at Three Rivers for housing the exhibits of the Central Experimental Farm. When I took office, I found that Order in Council, and on the 25th July I confirmed it with this much more, and the contract, which had been awarded to Mr. W. Verret, was transferred to Mr. Dufresne. I only carried out the agreement made by my predecessor.

Mr. FOSTER. If it were put in that form, I should not have made the remarks I did. I have a recollection of that. It was an arrangement made by the experimental farm authorities, that they should have, in a central part of Quebec, at this exhibition ground, permanent buildings, where they could exhibit their farm products. That is not granted to the exhibition. It is an erection by the experimental farm people, or by the Department of Agriculture, of permanent buildings there for the exhibition, and it is owned by themselves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The papers will show that it was.

Mr. FOSTER. It must not be carried in that form, because that would be provocative of claims for aid by all exhibitions. I would suggest to the Minister that the item should read something like this: "Permanent buildings for experimental farm exhibit at St. Lawrence Exhibition Grounds, Three Rivers."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite willing to accept that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if he would not put up buildings at the city of Chatham. I think it would be in the interest of the people of the western part of Ontario, if the Government would send some of the experimental farm exhibits up there.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the explanation given makes this vote still more objectionable. It says: "For housing the exhibits of the Central Experimental Farm." Every place you go, you see exhibits of the Central Experimental Farm and of the branch farms, and I think it is a desirable thing. These exhibits should be displayed at all the fairs throughout the country. Why, then, should there be at this place a special grant to put a special building costing $5,000? I have no information, but I presume that there was not $5,000 worth of buildings altogether on the fair grounds at Three Rivers. This vote is an objectionable one. The Minister stated the Order in Council was passed on the 6th July. I do not know whether there was any particular Government in existence then. One Government was going out, and another was coming in, and there was no money available.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the 13th: we were not there on the 6th.

Mr. WALLACE. The 12th was Sunday, and the new Government came in on the 13th.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the date of the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The 6th July. You passed it all right.

Mr. WALLACE. This Order in Council was passed at a time when the Government was not supposed to perform anything but the most pressing duties before they resigned. The Minister of Public Works says

he is trying to give it effect, because it was passed by the late Government. I think he should have told this House that he was proposing a vote for $5,000 because the case had merits, because this Government must take the responsibility of every vote they ask us to pass. The fact that the late Government passed this Order in Council immediately before they went out, is not sufficient reason for me to consent to this vote. I hope the Government will be able to give us a sufficient reason, which has not yet been given, why this $5,000 should be voted for the purpose of housing the exhibits of the Central Experimental Farm at one and one only of the hundred exhibitions held in this country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I deeply regret that my hon. friend who has just taken his seat knows very much less about the province of Quebec than I should like him to know, and that he takes probably less interest in looking into what is done in the province of Quebec than he should do, from the position he occupies as a prominent public man in this country. I believe that the representatives of the people who meet here as Canadians, should set aside all questions of provincialism, and discuss matters from the standpoint of the general interests of the country. I was somewhat surprised to hear that my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) had taken exception to an Order in Council passed by the Government of which he happened to be at that time a member. Viewing the question from the standpoint of Canadian interests I can tell the hon. gentleman that the $5,000 for the purpose of exhibiting the products of the Expermiental Farm at Three Rivers was money well spent. It was an object lesson to the farmers of a very large portion of the province of Quebec who attended that exhibition at Three Rivers, and the people of Three Rivers and the surrounding districts, themselves expended $40,000 of their own money to produce one of the most perfect exhibitions that has been witnessed for a great number of years in the province of Quebec. If you take the amount of money expended in the maritime provinces, in Ontario, and in the other provinces, and all of which I very willingly conceded, you will see that the $5,000 expended upon the Experimental Farm exhibit at Three Rivers was a very small contribution indeed for that section of the country. I am glad that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has brought down this amount, which is not his contribution so much as it is the contribution of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who formed part of the Government which granted it. I was somewhat surprised to find that he should to-day take objection to that contribution.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) would be more surprised if he found that I took no objection to it.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the somewhat laboured explanation, or attempt at explanation for this grant, made by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). I have been a little surprised to see that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has been far from displaying his usual logic with regard to this matter. I fully agree with him that such grants as this to local exhibitions by the Dominion Government are very objectionable, and for my part I hope they will not be continued, because I do not see where the line can be drawn if the Dominion Government undertakes enterprises of this kind. I fail to see any justification whatever for this grant in the laboured declaration of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). I suppose he attempts to justify it because he representes the town of Three Rivers, but I do not know why the town of Three Rivers should receive $5,000 for a local exhibition like this, any more than other towns in the province of Quebec—the town of St. John, for instance, where they have a very good exhibition open to a large section of the country. In fact, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) truly said the whole principle is a false one, and it should not be followed up. I trust we shall never be called upon to vote an item of this kind again.

Mr. WALLACE. What reason is there for voting it now ?

Mr. SCRIVER. Because you and your party have made it incumbent upon us to do so.

Mr. WALLACE. My party and I repudiate it.

Mr. SCRIVER. Remembering what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) did not long ago in North Grey, I think we can safely say "his party."

Mr. WALLACE. I hope the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will advise the Government to withdraw this item, because there has been no explanation given to satisfy the country why this item should be voted. The experimental exhibits have to be housed at every exhibition as well as at Three Rivers, but the people of the different localities do it themselves without asking for $5,000 from this Government. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) lectured us about setting aside all questions of provincialism. He might perhaps take that advice to himself just as much as anybody I know of. If he refers to me, I can tell him that there is no member of this House who is more prepared to view the claims of every province of the Dominion fairly and equitably. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) tells us that because this comes from the province of Quebec, the province of Quebec is entitled to it. Well, we will have to have a stronger reason than that. I do not think it is a

sufficient answer to say that the province of Quebec demands this money. The province of Quebec has made many demands which have not always been granted in this House, and it is good for the country that they have not been granted.

Mr. BERGERON. Thank you.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think it is fair that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) should reflect so severely on his old associate (Sir Adolphe Caron).

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) tell us if he is in favour of this grant ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will tell you this. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) happened to be one of the Jonas on the late political ship and he was thrown overboard. He knows perfectly well that that grant was made for the purpose of carrying Three Rivers at the last election ; and if it had been necessary a few years ago to erect a drill hall at Woodbridge to carry West York I have no doubt the hon. gentleman would have got it. I admit that he did not need it the last time.

Mr. WALLACE. This Order in Council was passed on the 6th of July. The hon. gentleman is wrong in his dates.

Mr. McMULLEN. Seeing that we have got through the contests, it is hardly fair to treat the hon. member for Three Rivers in that way.

Mr. WALLACE. I am surprised to find the hon. member for North Wellington coming out and supporting this $5,000 grant.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it is hardly fair that the larger provinces of the Dominion should receive grants from this Government for exhibitions when the smaller provinces have to contribute to the expense of their exhibitions out of provincial funds. If we are going to open the door for such demands from every part of the Dominion, I hope the Government will be prepared to treat all the provinces alike. The Experimental Farm is a great convenience to the farmers of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and I think that should be enough for them. The province from which I come has not an experimental farm, and is very far away from any of the stations, a state of affairs which should be remedied. The provincial legislature of Prince Edward Island every year makes a grant of $2,000 or $3,000 out of its own funds to the provincial exhibitions in that province ; and unless this Government are prepared to grant a sum of money to each province for this purpose, I think it is unfair to start with the grant which we are at present discussing. I hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, representing an important section in the province of Prince Edward Island, will see that his native province comes in for a grant. If he is prepared to vote away $5,000 on this occasion, I think he should see that the same rule is applied to his own province. I think this is a very bad precedent to set, but if the Government has plenty money, and is bound to spend it, let all the provinces be treated fairly.

Immigration—Further amount required for the Woman's Immigration Protective Society $500

Mr. FOSTER. That is an addition to the ordinary vote, I think ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The vote has always been $1,000. Last year it was reduced to $500, which they find is not sufficient for their work, and they ask that the amount should be restored to $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What are they doing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are taking care of female immigrants arriving from the old country. They are a number of women in Montreal engaged in this work, and an excellent work it is. They look after the young women who come out unprotected, and see that they get homes.

Mr. HUGHES. Under what auspices is this immigration society managed ? Is there a joint board ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, a board of the leading citizens of Montreal and their wives.

Militia—Pay of a Deputy Assistant Adjutant General at headquarters, Ottawa 1,800

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). This is to pay the salary of the Deputy Assistant Adjutant General, Major Bliss, at headquarters, Ottawa—an office which was created by Order in Council of the 4th of April, 1896. I can explain in detail the duties of this office, if required. The explanation will be found in the General Orders, No. 27.

Militia—Clothing and necessaries $127,207 50

Mr. PRIOR. I would like the hon. Minister to give us some details in regard to this vote. It is a large amount. I see there is another vote taken in the general Estimates of $90,000 for the same purpose.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). This is for militia clothing for the whole militia force, under Order in Council of the 14th February, 1896. The clothing has been ordered, and is to be delivered inside of three months after the 1st of October, 1896, payments to be made on delivery. The Order in Council is here, and gives the quantities.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know whether the property in the city of Ottawa, which was recently used as a store-house for militia stores, and which has been converted into a railway station, has been sold, or what is its position at present ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The arrangement with Mr. Booth is that he has undertaken to put up a building precisely similar, on the opposite side of the canal, or pay its value in money.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Has the site been selected ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Will the selection of this site be left to the Department of Militia ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. LOUNT. I would like to know if that sum of $125,000 covers those contracts which were rescinded recently—the three year's contract ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It covers the clothing to be delivered the first year, under the three year's contract.

Mr. BRITTON. Large as this item is, I would have very much preferred its being considerably larger because the Minister of Militia has to face a difficulty, and it might as well be faced now as later. The policy pursued by the late Government was a very bad one with reference to the different properties all over the Dominion. I speak with actual knowledge of some of them and by report of others. The fortifications in different places have been allowed to get out of repair, under a penny wise and pound foolish policy. They are either worth maintaining or they are not. If they are, they ought to be attended to in time ; if they are not, much better to raze them to the ground. It has been suggested to the department by those better skilled than I, that it would be a matter of economy to have a permanent corps of engineers, composed of about twenty-five men, whose work it would be to go from place to place and make the necessary repairs. I am sure this would effect a considerable saving. The walls of the fort at Kingston, the barrack buildings, the towers about the harbour, are all in such a bad state of repair, that unless money is expended on them almost immediately they will be gone beyond repair. I regret also that the Militia Department has not thought proper to put in an estimate for the Drill Shed at Kingston. The late Government had an estimate of $15,000 last year for this work, which is very much needed, because the property that was formerly used for that purpose was sold by the late Government, and its value, some $5,000, received by the Dominion. I fain would hope that in the Supplementary Estimates provision will be made for this. If not, I sincerely hope that another session will not be allowed to pass by the Government without their doing justice to the city of Kingston, and using, at all events, for the new drill shed, the money they received for the old one.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I concur in a good deal that has been said by the hon. member for Kingston, excepting of course what he said about the late Government. I know that the late Government spent a good deal of money in Quebec in repairing the fortification walls, but a good deal still is needed. I may say that a great many promises were made in the last election that a good deal would be expended on the fortifications in Quebec. The walls around the city are badly in want of repair ; and if not soon repaired, will tumble to pieces. Not only the walls, but a good deal of other property belonging to the Militia Department in Quebec, has been for some years badly in need of repair. I understand that the city have agreed to take over the Esplanade, which belongs to the Militia Department, and I would ask if any steps have been taken to that end. I would ask also if, in the amounts which have been voted, any sum will be devoted to the repairs of the walls in that city or on the military property there ? Everybody who has seen the condition in which the walls of the city and these properties are, must admit that a great deal more money will in a short time be needed to put them in good order. Of course the question is a difficult one to deal with. These walls and fortifications in Quebec are more ornamental than useful, but still they belong to the Federal Government and it seems to me that Government is bound to maintain them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I can only say that no very large amount can be used this year for the purposes to which he refers. There is a general vote, out of which urgent repairs may be made, but, as I understand from him and from the hon. member for Kingston and others, to take up and do justice to the repairs of these fortifications and walls would require a very considerable amount of money, and at the present session it was impossible to ask Parliament to vote that money. I intend, at the earliest moment, to visit Quebec and Kingston and see for myself, accompanied by competent persons who are able to advise me, the condition of affairs : and I hope that, when Parliament meets again, I shall have been able to advise the Government as to the course to be pursued, and also shall be ready to make some statement to Parliament with reference to these matters. There is no provision in the present Estimates for the Esplanade, nor can I promise that there will be any this session.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I believe there was some agreement between the mayor of Quebec and the Militia Department, or the Government, that the city should take over the Esplanade and maintain it. If this were done, the Esplanade, no doubt, would be made something for the city to be proud of. I understand that in the present state of affairs it is impossible to repair at once all the Government property in Quebec, but the city would maintain this portion, if it were given over. That, I believe, is the arrangement that was about to be come to between the city and the Government.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It has not been brought to my attention. Hon. members will understand that, owing to the tremendous expenditure of late for clothing and arms, it was impossible to ask the House this session for any sum for expenditures on these works. With reference to the drill shed for Kingston, the same answer may be given. That is a matter, however, for the Department of Public Works. I am personally anxious that the drill shed should be built, but I do not think I can promise the hon. gentleman that it can be done this year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not believe that any Minister of Militia, upon the appropriation voted by Parliament for repair, can keep up the military works we have in Quebec or Kingston, and I agree with the Minister that, at this moment, when the country is making a heavy expenditure for new arms and better accoutrements for the force, it would be very difficult indeed to ask Parliament to vote the amount of money that would be required for keeping up the military property. But I would suggest that, outside of the amount voted by Parliament for ordinary repairs, an amount of money should be voted to keep up the fortifications at Quebec. It is true that for defensive purposes these works are of no importance, but their historic value is incalculable. Moreover, in a ruinous condition, they are likely to be a danger to the citizens in a place like Quebec. In one of the highways, St. John Street, a portion of the wall was bulging out and tumbling down. Out of the small amount voted for military repairs, it is quite impossible to keep up these works. There are works in Kingston, also, that have cost the Imperial Government a very large amount of money. Fort George there, if repaired, would be a very valuable property for military purposes. Still, I think, to keep the historical position of the country, a certain amount should be voted every year to be expended on works of this kind.

Mr. LANGELIER. The fortifications of Quebec are in the division of the city which I have the honour to represent; and I must say that what has been stated by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), is perfectly true. These fortifications are in a disgraceful condition, and have been so for several years. Some years ago, a portion of the main wall of the city, near St. Louis Gate, crumbled down and remained in that condition for I do not know how long. It was only when a by-election happened to take place, that we succeeded in obtaining the repairs to that wall. Some years ago, a good deal of work was done on the walls, but it was so wretchedly done that, in about six or seven years, grass was growing where the cement ought to be. One of the martello towers is quite close to my own residence, and I know that it is in very bad condition. I am very much afraid that it will crumble next spring. I regret very much, although I do not blame, the course followed by the present Minister, because I do not think he could do otherwise. I think it is too late now, even if the money were voted this session, to make these repairs for next winter. They could not be done properly before the winter sets in, and I think the course proposed by the Minister is the only right one. The officers of his department should come down to Quebec and visit these fortifications, and see what repairs need to be done. Now, I may be perhaps allowed to give a piece of advice to the Minister. Some years ago under the Mackenzie Administration, the Dominion Government got rid of a large portion of these military properties and handed them over to the city corporation. I will mention amongst other properties the Esplanade, which was spoken of a few moments ago. A few years after the Mackenzie Government went out of power, the Esplanade was taken back from the city corporation It had been granted on a lease for a nominal rent every year. I think the rent was one dollar a year; but the lease was conditional upon the Government being allowed to resume possession of the property in question whenever they chose to do so. A few years after the Mackenzie Government went out of power the Dominion Government resumed possession of the Esplanade. I happened to be mayor of the city then. I do not know what the real reason was, but the reason given was that the Esplanade was then wanted for military purposes. But we never could see what military purposes were served by it. The Esplanade is and has been since in the possession of the Dominion Government. They spent a sum of money on it, they allowed the grass to grow on the property, and it has been ever since in a most disgraceful condition. I pass alongside of it every day when at home, and every citizen of Quebec knows that it is a disgrace to the Dominion Government to allow their military properties to remain in such a state. I think the best course for the Government would be to do what the Mackenzie Government did eighteen years ago, and hand over that property to the city of Que-

bec for a nominal rent. It might be used for military purposes; one of the purposes to which that property can be used is for reviews. We have not large reviews now, the large reviews take place on the historic Plains of Abraham, and this is only used for small reviews. The Esplanade was frequently used when we had a large garrison, for the daily review of the city garrison, which was composed of several thousand men, because the Plains of Abraham were too far away. But since we have had no permanent garrison, the Esplanade is of no use whatever. I remember only one occasion within the last twenty years when a review has taken place on that Esplanade. But for military purposes it is of no use whatever. It is only a kind of public square and might be used for that purpose, but I do not know to what military purpose the Dominion Government could use it. It is only a source of expense, and not of revenue to the Government. Then there is another property which had been handed over by the Mackenzie Government to the city of Quebec, and which was resumed by the late Government, that is the property known as the Cove fields. These Cove fields are between the city and the Plains of Abraham. They could be converted into a very fine park. A portion of this land was granted by the Mackenzie Government for building lots, which were sold at auction bought by the citizens and have been built upon to a large extent. But the greater portion of these fields could be made into a splendid park, one of the finest parks, perhaps, in America. But nothing can be done with the property, it is simply kept now for grazing purposes. The city cannot do anything with it, because we do not own it, and the Dominion Government does not do anything with it because they have no use for it. The late Government have been simply playing with the city corporation the role of the dog in the manger. They have had no use for that property, and because, I suppose, the city had the misfortune to elect Liberal representatives, the property was withdrawn from the city. The Government did not want the property at all for military purposes. I think the best course for the Militia Department would be to hand over that property to the city for a nominal rent, and to be kept in a proper state, on condition that it would not be built upon, so that in case of need it could be used at any time for military purposes.

Now, there is a large number of other properties to which I call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence. There are a great many houses, some of which are now uninhabited, and have been unoccupied for several years. There is the old military hospital which was used for many years as a temporary court-house. I do not know who lives in the hospital now, but I know it is of no use at all for military purposes. Then there are other houses which are used as residences for the officers who live in Quebec. I think it is a great injustice to the city that these properties should be kept by the Dominion Government. They should be sold at auction and disposed of, so that they would yield a revenue in taxes to the city, and be held like other properties. Let the Government increase the salaries of the officers in question, I think that would be much cheaper to the Government. I know, as a fact, that on some of those properties in St. Louis Street, large sums of money have been spent of late in repairs. If the Government were to add three or four hundred dollars a year to the salary of the officers who have been living in these houses, it would be a great saving of money to the Government. These properties are too expensive to repair. I think the best plan would be to sell them by auction, to make them private properties, and yield taxes to the city. That plan would be a great saving to the Government, because what they would have to pay in increased salaries to the officers—I do not want to deprive the officers of their vested rights, they have had a certain salary coupled with free rent of their houses—but let the Government pay them an increase of salary such as would allow them to lease residences in the city as other citizens do, and I think it would be much better for the Government. But I say by all means let the Government see in what state their city properties are, because I can predict, without being a great prophet——

Mr. CASGRAIN. Could these properties be sold by the Government or do they belong to a certain class of properties which cannot be sold by the Government?

Mr. LANGELIER. They can be sold, a large portion of them has already been sold.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Which has been sold?

Mr. LANGELIER. In 1876 a large block of these properties was sold at public auction, and yielded a pretty large sum of money to the Government. I say what has been done for a portion of these properties can be done for all of them, as they are of no use to the Government. I say it is a waste of money for the Government to keep this property, and the state it is now in is a blot on the progress of the city of Quebec. One-half of all the property in the upper town of Quebec yields no revenue whatsoever to the city corporation. I say it is most unjust to compel the city in that way to pay a large part of the expenditure which should be borne by the whole country.

Now, coming to what was said by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) he is not entirely correct when he said that it was promised during the last election that these properties would be pro-

perly repaired. For my part, I did not promise anything, but I expressed the hope, and I express the same hope in this House, that the future Government would do better than their predecessors have been doing. The state in which those properties are constitute an eye-sore for the whole city of Quebec, and I say that it is a disgrace to any Government to keep them in such a state. I hope that the present Government will see to it that these properties are put in a decent state, which will be a credit and not a disgrace to the Government of Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the Imperial Government handed over the military properties to Canada they were divided into two classes. One description of properties classified under letter "A" were reserved for defensive purposes and these properties cannot be disposed of. The others were classified under letter "B" and these were properties which could be sold by auction and no other way. What is proposed by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) it would be impossible to do. The Cove fields are reserved for defensive purposes, and no commanding officer will say that they can be sold, except that strip which was handed over to the city and which was divided into building lots. I mention this to show that there are certain military properties which it is not in the power of the Canadian Government to dispose of.

Mr. HUGHES. I would endorse the statement of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) in reference to the repairs of military properties. A discussion on this matter goes on from year to year in the House, but yet the properties are not repaired. Some years ago I made a suggestion that there should be attached to each of the permanent corps a few carpenters, a few masons, and a blacksmith or two, whose duty it would be to look after the repairing of those properties. If we turn to the Auditor General's report we find large sums of money paid out every year for day labourers who are employed in the large cities but who have no connection whatever with the military force. Yet nothing seems to be done towards keeping these buildings in repair, while a few men belonging to the militia employed a month or two every year would be sufficient for the purpose. The inner walls of old Fort Henry are crumbling to the ground and tons of stone have fallen down within the last year. This might have been prevented by a little necessary outlay at the proper time. There is another item in this vote which we have not come to yet, but which I desire to speak on now. I refer to the cartridge factory at Quebec. I presume that the new cordite cartridges for the Lee-Enfield rifle used in the various camps are manufactured in our Quebec factory, and I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that six out of every ten of them hang fire. I would like the Minister to inquire what the cause of this is.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I presume that the members from the city and district of Quebec are not going to quarrel over this matter. Why, these walls and fortifications are crumbling, and the Minister must now be convinced that they are in a very bad state of repair. I may add to what my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) has said, by stating, that a very short time ago a part of the wall along the ramparts in Quebec fell on two or three houses, and the Government was obliged to pay a large sum for damages. The Minister will remember that part of the citadel cliff which is military property, also fell down. If these works were looked after in proper time probably such accidents would not happen. I understand that it is a very difficult question to know whether or not the Government of Canada is obliged to maintain these works, which as I have said are more ornamental than useful. On the other hand, is the city of Quebec which derives no benefit whatever from them, obliged to maintain them? I do not agree with the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that a small sum of money expended each year would be sufficient to maintain these walls and fortifications in good repair. They have been built for seventy or eighty years and quite a large sum of money would be necessary to maintain them properly. I would like the Minister to decide upon some fixed policy in this matter. I should like to know from him whether or not the Government is going to maintain these walls, or whether they have decided they are not going to maintain them but to remove them. I take it that as these are Government properties, the Government would be responsible for any accident that may happen. The hon. the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) has said that he will come to Quebec. I was most happy to hear him make that statement, and I hope that on the occasion of his visit the city of Quebec will maintain its proverbial reputation for hospitality.

Grant for a roadway connecting the drill shed at Charlottetown, P.E.I., with Fort Edward $4,000

Mr. HACKETT. I do not intend to oppose this vote, as I believe it to be necessary in the interests of the country. This roadway forms a very important part of the military defences of Charlottetown. I would ask the hon. Minister, however, whether it is his intention that the road should provide a means for the men to advance or retreat in case of emergency. The enemy might send a detachment to Souris Bridge, and therefore have command of the whole situation. In that case, I would beg to ask what provision the Minister has made or intends making to protect the militia force. Our men never run away in the presence of the enemy, and I think it only right that if such a contin-

gency should arise the retreat should be made as safe as possible. This roadway, it is true, connects the drill shed with Fort Edward, but it is possible the men might be separated from the base of supplies. I would beg to suggest, from a military point of view, that in addition to building this roadway there should also be a few of the best guns mounted and made ready for use on the front of Government House farm, in order that our brave volunteers should be so protected that it would be impossible for the enemy to decimate their ranks. I make those suggestions as an old militia man, and trust the hon. Minister will act on them.

Mr. WALLACE. I am informed that this roadway is not required for military purposes at all. There is a roadway at the present time from the drill shed to Fort Edward, and this proposed roadway is simply to enable the citizens of Charlottetown to have a pleasant boulevard or drive to their public park.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If we are going to discuss this item out of its place, I will answer the hon. gentleman. He has been altogether misinformed about this roadway. There is no roadway from the drill shed to Fort Edward at all. There was a foot-path along the bank, and the year before last, I think it was, the local legislature made a free grant of this roadway to the city, on condition that the city would build a breakwater along the front to protect it from being washed away by the sea. At the end of this roadway is Fort Edward and the ordnance land where the magazine stands, and this part has to be protected from the sea, as well as the other parts of the road. When the city took this grant from the provincial legislature, they said they would agree to the conditions, provided the Dominion Government bore part of the expense. An estimate was made of the cost, and it amounted to $12,000. The city corporation came to Ottawa and entered into negotiations with the Dominion Government, and an agreement was come to between the Dominion Government and the corporation of Charlottetown last April that, if the city would build this roadway all the way, the Dominion Government would pay the cost of that portion of it which was opposite the Dominion ordnance land. On the 23rd of April, the then Minister of Militia wrote to the then mayor of Charlottetown, who was then in Ottawa, the following letter :—

H. E. Dawson, Esq.,
Mayor of Charlottetown, P.E.I.

My Dear Sir,—I am sorry in having to inform you that it has been found impossible to secure parliamentary sanction to the appropriation which the Government proposed to make towards the construction of the roadway along the front of the Government farm, from the west end of Kent Street to Fort Edward in the city of Charlottetown. On my recommendation to Council the sum of $4,000 was placed in the supplementary estimates for the next fiscal year, but it was impossible to reach them.

The main estimates for the next year were for nearly three months before Parliament, but not one item was agreed to, and of course the supplementaries would not be voted until the main estimates were disposed of ; therefore it was useless to submit the supplementary estimates to Parliament. I have to inform you, however, that it is the intention of the Government to obtain at the first opportunity paliamentary authority to enable them to contribute the amount above mentioned towards this much needed public improvement.

I am, sincerely yours,
A. DESJARDINS.

On the faith of this contract, the mayor went back to the city and submitted it to the city, and the city entered into a contract for the construction of the whole work, in the faith that the Government would keep their part of the contract ; and this Government, coming in and finding the contract made, implemented it and carried it out.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask whether anything is provided in this estimate towards meeting the claims of those who suffered from the landslide in Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT. This year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not this year ; the landslide that occurred some years ago. I may say that a promise was made that a commission would be appointed to inquire into the claims of those who had suffered from the landslide from the Citadel Hill. I believe it is the policy of this Government to carry out that promise It is only to see whether these people have suffered any damage, and whether this Government is liable. I understand that the Government is not strictly liable in law, but, from an equitable point of view, I think something should be done. This promise was made by the late Government, and I understand that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) has made some promise in this direction. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to carry out this promise.

Mr. DOBELL. The member for Quebec West has learned a lesson in being careful of promises. He is trying to take a lesson from the gentlemen opposite, who made many promises, but did not fulfil them. I hope the hon. gentleman will see that the Government will be more careful in making promises, and what they make, they will fulfil.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is not quite an answer to my question. If I cannot get an answer directly, I would like one by telegram.

Mr. DOBELL. Well, the hon. gentleman shall have it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think an answer might be given to the question, which I put in parliamentary language. It is a fair question, and calls for a fair answer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I might say to the hon. gentleman that there is no sum in the Main Estimates, or in these Estimates, for the particular matter to which he refers; but I know he will be glad to hear that the matter is being considered by the department.

Mr. DOBELL. I would like to have one word. I thought I was pretty explicit that I made no promise whatever. I carefully guarded myself against making any promise about the landslide.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did I understand the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) to say that the late Government had promised a grant?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No. What the late Government promised to do was to appoint a commission to inquire into the claims. Such a commission had been appointed after a judgment rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada in a case which came from Prince Edward Island, in which an accident had occurred on one of the Government railways. What was promised was that the claims would be investigated by a commission, and, if they were found to be founded in equity, some relief would be given to those who established their claims. That was the only promise made, and certainly it would have been carried out, if the landslide had not occurred.

Mr. DOBELL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how long it would take to get that commission appointed; because I think it is about seven years since the landslide occurred.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sorry to see that the hon. gentleman's memory is not very good. The promise was not made seven years ago but in the month of April, 1896.

Mr. DOBELL. That is much more likely, because it was near election time, but these poor unfortunate people lost their property seven years ago.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Now that the hon. gentleman represents those poor people, it seems to me that it was his duty to have something put in the Estimates this session for their relief.

Mr. LANGELIER. At every election we have had promises, not from the late Government but the late Governments, that something would be done for those unfortunate sufferers, and at last, during the last election the present leader of the Opposition went down to Quebec, and promised everything in the world to the people of that city if they would only return Tory members. Unfortunately for the hon. gentleman the people knew what value to attach to his promises. They had had from him another promise, during the election of 1891, when he told them that they might consider the bridge as an accomplished fact.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I was at that meeting and the hon. gentleman was not, and nothing of the kind was promised.

Mr. LANGELIER. I read in the House, without being contradicted by any one, the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition as published by the "Morning Chronicle," the organ of the then Government. I read the very words put into the mouth of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and those words were that the citizens of Quebec might consider the bridge as an accomplished fact, and that was what I was told by every one whom I met who had been at the meeting. Well, the hon. gentleman went down last spring to that city and said to the sufferers of the landslide in 1889—we must not forget that it took place in 1889—that they would get justice. The citizens of Quebec, however, looked upon that promise in the same light as that in which they had been compelled to consider his promise made in 1891 to give them a bridge, when nothing was done towards the completion of such promise, except to bring down, during the election, the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals. When the hon. gentleman promised the people of Quebec a commission of investigation, they looked upon it as a huge joke. A commission of investigation to ascertain what? To ascertain that people had been killed? Why, the whole city of Quebec attended the funerals of fifty-two people, who lost their lives by this landslide. The people know very well that this was simply an election promise by the hon. gentleman, and that the only hope of the sufferers was in the present Government. I must say that the late Government have changed their opinions very much on the subject. When first application for compensation was made to the Government of Sir John Macdonald, he said: Go before the courts of justice, get judgment against the Government, and you will be paid. An action was taken out by the city corporation, and was dismissed on a technical point. The technical point was this: that no officer of the Government was blameable in particular, and therefore there was no legal claim in a technical sense against the Government, but the court held that the Government was morally responsible for the terrible calamity. Hopes were held out, from time to time, to the poor sufferers, who, at last, thought they were going to obtain justice, when, in another case arising out of another calamity in which there had been given a judgment equally against the sufferers, I speak of the accident on the Intercolonial at St. Joseph de Lévis in 1890, at which several persons lost their lives and others were severely

injured—the Government paid the claims of the victims.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What date ?

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not remember.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. gentleman will excuse me, but these claims were only paid one year ago, just about the time——

Mr. LANGELIER. Of an election.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not an election at all. The hon. gentleman is afflicted with the same malady as his colleague from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell)—loss of memory. It was just about two or three months before this promise was made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. LANGELIER. Why such a distinction was made by the late Government, I am at a loss to know. There was the same legal decision in both cases, that the Government was not liable, but still, in the St. Joseph de Lévis case, the claimants were paid, whereas in the case of the landslide at Quebec, they have not yet been paid, although they have been promised payment by hon. gentlemen opposite, not only at every general but every by election. We have had two by elections at Quebec West —one after the late member was expelled and came forward for re-election. On that occasion, the promise was held out to the sufferers that their claims would be entertained by the Government, and at the last election the promise was made by the leader of the Opposition that a commission of inquiry would be appointed to investigate the claims of the sufferers—that is to say, to ascertain whether some had been killed or injured. That is all the unfortunate victims have been able to obtain. It is an insult to them to talk to them of what was done by the late Government. The late Government never intended doing anything.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I only want to reply very briefly to the hon. gentleman who has made a most aggressive speech against this side of the House on this question. I say that the justification for the late Government in this matter was this, that the question was taken through the courts and went through the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court. I was one of the counsel for the city of Quebec in the case. The case could not be brought before the Government for settlement until judgment was obtained, and I distinctly repeat that the hon. gentleman was mistaken when he said that any promise was held out, were McGreevy to be returned, to the electors of Quebec West. I distinctly deny also that any promise was held out to the electors of Quebec West when the late Hon. John Hearn sat for that constituency. The fact of the matter is that no decision could be taken by the Government before the judgment of the Supreme Court was given on the action brought by the city. The first public utterance made in Quebec on this question was when the leader of the Opposition went down to that city and addressed the electors. What did he say ? Did he hold out any promises which were dependent upon the question whether or not supporters of the Government were nominated ? Not at all. He simply said this. He gave a parallel case which arose in Prince Edward Island, and he said that, in his opinion, the same measure of justice should be accorded to these people in Quebec West which was accorded to the people in Prince Edward Island. Nothing was further from the mind of the hon. gentleman than the ridiculous pretension from the centre that a commission was to be appointed to see whether any people had been killed by the accident. The hon. gentleman has been a Minister of the Crown in his own province ; will he say that this House is now prepared to vote what amount should be paid to the several individual sufferers. What should be done is to pursue the same course as that taken in relation to the case in Prince Edward Island—a commission should be appointed, not for the ridiculous object of ascertaining the amount of damages caused to each individual sufferer in this catastrophe. The promises held out and accepted by the people of Quebec were that this should be done. What my hon. friend says is nothing but a reproach to the present Government. If the late Government is to be found fault with for having done nothing, the present Government, advised by my hon. friend, who, all at once, has become a very ardent defender of the Government, for what reason I do not know, is to be found fault with on the same ground. However, I did not rise in any reproachful mood, but to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to this matter, which is entirely outside of any question of party politics. Now that the Supreme Court has rendered judgment, and now that the Government have the matter before them, they should take some steps to come to the relief of these people. I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman in his new role of defender of the present Government should be so hostile to this side of the House. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will take this case into his serious consideration, and that at the latest, by next session, we may have something proposed on this question.

Monuments, battlefield of Canada—claims unpaid 30th June, 1896 ..... $1,000

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the intention of the Government to continue this building of monuments ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that that matter has yet been considered.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This item is for claims incurred in the erection of monuments at Lundy's Lane, Chrysler's Farm and Chateauguay, which have already been built.

Annual drill 1895-6 ..... $692.20

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is to pay for the annual drill for 1895-96 of the Manitoba dragoons which was authorized, but funds for which, for some reason or other, were not provided, and also the Winnipeg Field Battery.

Dominion Rifle Association grant towards erection of permanent quarters for the Canadian teams at Bisley $5,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The estimate cost of these permanent quarters is $10,000 of which the Government has been asked to provide one-half. In view of the excellent work our volunteers have done in these rifle matches, I think it is only fair to make this grant.

Mr. HUGHES. I congratulate the hon. Minister on this vote. I take the liberty of suggesting that in the construction of the building that Canadian wood should be used. I suppose that the plans will be submitted to the Militia Department. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia about the rifle ranges at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Investigations have been made with a view to selecting a rifle range, but no conclusion has been arrived at, and I do not think the Government will ask any vote this year. But I hope that at an early date, a rifle range suitable for our volunteers will be provided near Ottawa.

Militia—Chargeable to capital—

To pay for arms, ammunition and stores purchased in March and April, 1896	$844,466
Artillery, guns, &c., for armaments of forts	100,000
To provide for the construction of implacements and the mounting of heavy guns ordered from the Imperial authorities	10,000
	$954,466

Mr. BERGERON. I am sorry that my hon. friend from St. James Division, Montreal (Mr. Desmarais) is not present. But I am glad the Government has brought this item down, and glad that the House will vote it. We struggled on this for a long time last session, and we heard a great deal about it in the last election. We heard it declared that this was the amount paid to Great Britain to bring out guns to shoot our children with, even though there was no money to maintain the Manitoba schools. I see my hon. friend from St. James Division is present, and I hope he will vote for this. The people will now be more likely to realize that if we are to have a militia force it is necessary to provide them with the best arms and equipment in order that they may be an efficient force. I speak of this because I have suffered in relation to it in the ten or twelve counties in which I spoke in the last election. We were not allowed to talk about anything else—fiscal policy, school policy, or any other. We were told that this was something most terrible and indefensible, that we were spending money to send our children to war to fight for the British Empire. That was said in the remotest French parts of the province of Quebec. Where there were a few English voters they would not mention it. I hope this vote will be carried unanimously and that my hon. friend from St. James, who is such an eloquent speaker, will vote for it without saying one word.

Railways and Canals—Wharf improvements at Dalhousie $3,000

Mr. McALISTER. To what wharf does that particularly refer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not able to describe the wharf to my hon. friend. I suppose it will be at the terminus of the Dalhousie Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, and I am advised that it requires this expenditure upon it in order to afford the necessary facilities to the patrons of that road.

Mr. McALISTER. The reason I ask the question is that the wharf extends east and west of the railway track. Last fall, they started to make some improvements on the western side, which were abandoned. I understood that the great necessity for repair was on the eastern end. I would like to know whether this is intended to be applied to the eastern end or the western end. I think the amount is not sufficient to make all the repairs required.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The improvements are on the eastern extension, and are more particularly for the purpose of affording accommodation for the loading of timber.

Mr. McALISTER. I know that the western end badly needs improvements, but I do not know if the western wharf belongs to the Intercolonial Railway.

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accomodation at Halifax $45,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If hon. members will turn to page 43 of the Main Estimates, they will find there was an appropriation of $105,000 for increased accommodation at Halifax. That amount has been supplemented so as to make it $150,000. The $150,000 is to be expended on the following items:—Wharf for merchandise, $55,000; freight sheds on the wharf, $12,000; coal trestle, ditto, $17,000; crib-work and filling tracks, $25,000; dredging, $15,000; coal wharf, $26,000. The additional $45,000 is to carry out the contemplated improvements which were proposed by the late Government, and are to be found in the Estimates which were prepared by my predecessor.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of this work has already been done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not much, if any, of the work included in these items has been done. There has been a good deal of money expended upon the freight and wharf extensions at Halifax covered by expenditures of previous years. Very little of this sum has been laid out.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that $150,000 covers the expenditure for that increased accommodation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said there was $150,000 proposed to be laid out this year in completion of the extension of these works, and that $105,000 of that amount had already been provided for in the Main Estimates, and that this $45,000 would be the balance making up the sum of $150,000 required to complete the work. I pointed out that there had been expended in connection with these works during the previous year, I think, at all events one or two years preceding, a further sum, just what amount I have not now in my memory.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this vote complete the accommodation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This vote completes the estimate for providing the accommodation now proposed, and all that is proposed up to the present moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this make the accommodation at Halifax sufficient for the business at present.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am advised that this vote will complete all that has been proposed to the department as being necessary. I have not heard of anything further being required; but I would not like to say there might not be something more.

Mr. GILLIES. I remember that some years ago quite a discussion was raised in the House with regard to this increased accommodation at Halifax. The sum of $150,000 was placed in the Estimates then, and the late Minister of Railways told us that the cost of the land required for this increased accommodation would be some $40,000. I recollect that the House was quite unwilling that such a sum should be appropriated for land at Halifax, some hon. gentlemen arguing, very cogently I thought, that the land for this purpose should be placed at the disposal of the Government by the city of Halifax. I wish to ask the Minister what was the cost of the land?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware that any portion of the money expended last year or the sum now asked for, is intended to be devoted to paying for any land which has been expropriated.

Mr. FOSTER. The property was expropriated and it must have been paid for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes; years ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be glad to find out for the hon. gentleman the cost of the land, but I really do not know now.

Mr. GILLIES. The town of North Sydney and several other places gave the land to the Government for a similar purpose to this, and it was the opinion of the House some years ago that the least thing the city of Halifax should do would be to give a free grant of the land needed for this purpose.

Extension of the Halifax Cotton branch.. $40,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item is intended to supply a very urgent and pressing demand as I am informed, for an extension of the system on the high level in the neighbourhood of, and beyond the Halifax Cotton Factory, chiefly for the purpose of freight. About a year ago what is called the extension to the cotton factory was constructed. That piece of the Intercolonial Railway has been found to be very profitable, and I am told that a great deal of business has been stimulated by its construction. It is claimed to be very necessary that this piece of road should be extended beyond the factory and in the direction of the water. When I took up the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates as they were prepared in the department, I found that this sum was included. Upon inquiring as fully as it was possible for me to do under the circumstances, I was led to believe that it was a useful purpose which was to be served by this extension, and I have therefore retained the amount in the Supplementary Estimates. As nearly as we can judge from the value of the land in the locality, it will take probably $30,000 to acquire the land, and the balance of the $40,000 will be necessary for grading, tracklaying and ballasting.

Mr. FOSTER. The $30,000 comes out of this $40,000 vote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was the expectation.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not taking any objection to the vote, but I wish to understand it. The first extension was, I suppose, to get the traffic of the cotton factory. If the extension already made gives access to the factory what is expected to be accomplished by this other extension?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The extension was by no means designed simply for the purpose of reaching the cotton factory. That was probably in contemplation as one of the expectations

of the scheme, and no doubt it does contribute quite largely to the freight carried on the line. This line has been carried on the higher level, and in such a direction that it affords accommodation for the transfer of a very considerable amount of other freight into a populous part of the city, and the railway has been in the habit of charging additional sums from the ordinary station to this point. The demand for the carriage of general freight has been so considerable that the department has concluded that it would be a paying enterprise to extend the road still further through that populous district, so as to meet the business demands of the city.

Mr. FOSTER. What would be the length of the whole extension ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Something over a mile.

To provide snow fences on Oxford and New Glasgow, Cape Breton, and St. Charles Branch Railway..... $12,000

Mr. FOSTER. Are these new fences, or is this to repair old ones ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These are new.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman builds these fences by contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would certainly endeavour to do so, if it were at all practicable and in the interest of the public service.

Mr. FOSTER. It is certainly practicable.

To provide increased accommodation at Lévis $48,500

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would ask the hon. Minister to explain this item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am led to believe that there has been a great deal of complaint made at Lévis, not only by the general public, but by the corporation of the town, in its public capacity, against the continuance of the inconvenience and danger resulting from the want of the accommodation proposed. The mayor and corporation have complained that the approach to the station is very much blocked, when trains are shunting or standing at the station. It is said this cannot possibly be avoided, under existing arrangements, and it is proposed to purchase additional property and lay additional sidings, in order that the danger may be removed and the public convenience served.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you going to remove the station ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not attack this item, and I do not intend to criticise it in an unfriendly spirit ; but I would like to have some details about it. No more sidings can be put down at the spot in question, because the river is on one side and the cliff on the other, and there is a street between the two. I cannot understand where the sidings will be put, unless it is intended to extend the yard to the east or to the west. You cannot extend it south or north, so far as I can see.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is proposed, I understand, to extend it west.

To grade a space in rear of Rivière du Loup Station for carriages $1,600

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is an item on which I would like to have some explanation. I cannot really see that there is any necessity for this vote. I happen to know the place very well, and I think there is enough space there for all the cabmen in the town of Fraserville and all the adjoining parishes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The officers of the department are of opinion that it is necessary to enlarge the yard for carriages at that station. In order to enlarge it, the rock will have to be cut back.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the rock is to be cut away, it seems to me that some expropriation will have to be made there. If so, this sum is not sufficient.

North Channel—Deepening, widening and straightening $100,000

Mr. REID. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with this work at an early date ? The water in the river St. Lawrence is very low and vessels are having a great deal of trouble. As I understand, this North Channel is a short distance below the town of Prescott, between Prescott and Cardinal, and there are places there where at present there is only about eight feet of water, so that vessels can come down as far as Prescott drawing about 17 feet of water, and after there is only about eight at certain places between Prescott and the head of Galops Canal. This is on account of the shallow part where this North Channel should be built, and it is necessary this work should be proceeded with at an early day. There is a great deal of complaint about it. The hon. member for Kingston, where many marine men live, can bear me out, so far as these complaints are concerned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the intention of the department to proceed with all despatch with this work. I realize, from the information I have received, the importance of taking this up without unnecessary delay, in order that we may have the channel deepened, so that there may be a proper and continuous channel. I know of no reason why the hon. member may not look for an entrance upon this work at once.

Cornwall Canal—Enlargement $100,000

Mr. SPROULE. What has been done with this canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This canal has been deepened from 9 to 14 feet, and this is only a very small portion of a very large expenditure. My information is that its enlargement, up to 30th June, 1895, cost no less than $3,900,000, and during the year ending 30th June last there was an addition of $420,000. It is estimated that $285,000 will complete the work, and the $100,000 now asked for is the final sum. There was an appropriation in the main Estimates, and this will make the final appropriation required to complete the work. When it is completed, the cost will be something over four and a quarter million dollars.

Galops Canal—Enlargement $50,000

Mr. QUINN. Is it the intention of the Government to remove the obstruction at the mouth of the Galops Canal and deepen the water, so that we may have 9 feet of water there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand that the difficulties in that canal do not arise so much from the existence of any obstructions as from the fact that the water is low, and the mitre sill now has, I believe, a depth of only 8 feet of water. There is no obstruction at either end of the canal which shows a less depth of water than that, so that the main difficulty is that the water has been falling permanently. Unless the canal were lowered generally, we could not look for any greater amount of water there than we have now, at all events at this season of the year.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. Minister should make an investigation into the cause of the low water in the River St. Lawrence and the canals. My opinion is that there have been so many obstructions removed that the water passes down more rapidly than ever before, and the Government will have, at an early date to place obstructions by building wing walls, to prevent the water escaping so rapidly. In the last three of four years, the water has been lower, than it ever was before. It is down now 3 to 4 feet lower than we have had it in the last twenty years up to the year before last.

Mr. REID. With reference to that obstruction at the head of the Galops Canal, perhaps I can give a little explanation. The trouble there is at what is called the Old Lock, the lock that is being removed. The bottom of that lock is rocky, and the contractors have been busy removing it. It is rather difficult to remove, and the mitre sill is right on that rock. The barges and steamers load down to 9 feet, which is supposed to be what they can go safely to, through all the canals to Montreal. But when we have a heavy east wind, it lowers the water two feet, so that when they come to the head of the canal to go through the new lock, and there is an east wind, they cannot get over this mitre sill, and are blocked until the water rises again. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed at once with the enlargement of the canal from Iroquois to the head of the canal. The whole canal system from Montreal to Morrisburg has been under contract, and I believe has been nearly completed, with the exception of this part of the St. Lawrence Canal, that is the Galops Canal from Iroquois to the head of the canal, a distance of about five miles. There have been two new locks built, and the upper entrance has been under contract for dredging, and is about completed. But from that to Iroquois nothing has been done, and at present there is only about 7 feet of water in that canal from Cardinal to the head of the canal. It is almost impossible at times for boats to go from Cardinal to the head of the canal. Therefore, it is most important that the work should be begun at an early day. I see an amount of $250,000 in the Main Estimates for this canal and this $50,000 is also for enlargement. I do not know whether they are both for the same work or not. Is this vote to be applied for new work on this canal from Iroquois to the head of the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; this is for completing the work on the upper entrance, which is estimated to cost $300,000. We have already appropriated $250,000, and this vote is for the balance.

Mr. REID. Is this $250,000 for the completion of the upper entrance?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. REID. Tenders were called for in May or June last for the work at Iroquois which is the part of the canal I mean. Does the Government intend to abandon that part of the work or go ahead with it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. member is aware that the tenders he refers to were withdrawn, and I have not yet had the opportunity of considering whether these sections should be proceeded with at an early day or not.

Mr. REID. If this part of the canal is left as it is, the canal system will not be complete. Marine men understand that the work is to be proceeded with at once, and they would like to have some idea whether the Government intend to abandon it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be very sorry to have the hon. gentleman assume that it was the intention of the Government to abandon the work. I have endeavoured to state to him that I am not in a position at present to say what the intention of the Government is in the matter.

Mr. McNEILL. I think it would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of the matter referred to by my hon. friend beside me—the very remarkable fall in the water of the St. Lawrence and the great lakes. This has become a very serious matter in the interest of navigation, and if the Government could inaugurate some inquiry into the cause, it might be of the very greatest possible value to the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is to be considered by the deep water ways commission.

Mr. REID. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to open that outside lock for the balance of the season as is usually done. The special reason for doing it now is that a vessel may come on Sunday when the water may be high and when it would be easy for her to get through. But if she is compelled to wait, an east wind may spring up lowering the depth of the water and causing, perhaps, long delay. Seeing that St. Mary's lock is kept open the whole season, I think it would not be a much greater sin to allow this lock to be open until the close of navigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What the hon. gentleman has stated will receive careful consideration.

Sault St. Mary Canal—Construction and equipment $129,000

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask if this completes the work? I would like to state what I learned while on a trip, which I think will be useful information to a good many of the members here. We have heard a great deal about the St. Mary's Canal. I happened to be on the steamer "Alberta" and when we came to the canal we took the American side. I was very much interested as a Canadian and as a member of Parliament, knowing the immense amount of money we have paid for the lock. I asked the captain why we did not go by the Canadian side. He said: We will not go that way if it is possible to avoid it. There were many boats waiting to get through, as it was Monday morning. After a time the captain said: You will be gratified as we must pass on the Canadian side. I asked him why he did not always pass on the Canadian side. He told me—and this I would like to call to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals and the members of this House, because I think it is important—He said: There is no place for us to stop on the Canadian side. There are no docks where we can stop. The only thing we can do is to pass through the lock. He said this: I may say to you that the Canadian lock between the American side and the Canadian side is a great deal better than the other one; but we have no docks there, we have got to go straight into the lock or come out of it. More than that, he said, it is at Sault Ste. Marie that we buy everything we want, there is nothing at all on the Canadian side but a factory. I said: Well, this is a very serious matter. Then it would not cost a great deal to Canada to build a lock there, and he said, No. Moreover, he said, It is not of much use to build that lock with the obstruction they have left in the canal. I said, What obstruction? He said, The piece of a bridge or the abutment of a bridge, which takes half of the canal. I may say that the work itself is probably the finest work of the kind that has ever been constructed in these times. The lock itself is purely and simply a jewel. My hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Gibson) will substantiate that, because he knows these works well. But as soon as we leave the lock there is a piece of bridge belonging to the railway company that takes one-half of the canal, and it looks very bad. The captain of the "Alberta" told me it was a most dangerous piece of work. He said: I do not know why this piece of bridge has been left there, but every time I pass I am afraid that the wheel of my boat will be broken, and I have to make a round-about turn to pass that abutment; but when it is windy it is almost impossible to pass there. Now, Mr. Chairman, I bring these things to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals. We have spent nearly three million dollars there, we have built a lock which is a great credit to this country, but which is, according to the captain of the "Alberta," very nearly useless, unless this piece of bridge is taken out, and unless some docks are built down below where the boats can stop.

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has brought this matter before the committee. He will remember that this question was under discussion a great many times in this House, and the attention of the Government of which he was a loyal supporter, was called to it by myself, and I stated then, as I am prepared to state now, that it was an engineering monstrosity. It was a most thoughtless piece of work to place an obstruction in so valuable a canal as the Sault Ste Marie Canal. So far as the work is concerned, that has been criticised in the committee and in the House. I agree with many of the remarks of the hon. member for Beauharnois, but I am sorry that the hon. gentleman did not have an opportunity previous to this summer of going up and seeing this work as we saw it. The fact of the matter was that it was in order to save the railway company from making a longer span, a larger draw bridge, that this pier was put practically 56 feet from the side of the canal. The vessels in passing up and down have to go out of their way, have to hug the north side of the bank, in order to clear this obstruction; and I predict that it will come to pass some day that a vessel will lose her moorings, the men will lose

control of her, and undoubtedly this obstruction will be carried away, and the result will be that the country will be made to pay over again for building a new bridge, or a new span, which in my opinion should never have been placed there at all. I may say here that if the late Government had taken the advice that was offered to them after we returned from Sault Ste. Marie two years ago, this obstruction would have been removed. I was in company with the contractor; I have no fault to find with the work; and I can assure this committee that the contractors, for their own credit, would rather have been without the profits they made out of this work, than to have built this pier. When I approached the work I thought it was really a temporary arrangement simply for the purpose of carrying the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, for the time being; but to my surprise, when I came up I found a beautiful piece of masonry and a permanent pier built there. I believe, if the Government insisted on it at the time this work was being completed, the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been obliged to provide a longer draw bridge. But in order to save them—I may as well say what I think, for that was the only conclusion I could come to—the Government was put to the expense of building this obstruction in the middle of a fine piece of work, and it stands to-day as an eyesore to every man who passes up and down that lock. I want to say to the hon. gentleman who brought this matter before the committee, that it is the fault of his own political friends that this monstrosity was placed in the centre of that canal. No doubt if it were removed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would very properly demand from this Government the extra expense of putting up a new draw-bridge. When the line was opened it was pointed out by Mr. Page that the canal would have priority of the passage up and down because they had expropriated the land, and the canal was then under construction. If the railway bridge had been built and the railway had been located prior to the location of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal on the Canadian side, then of course the Canadian Pacific Railway would have had the right of way, and all the cost of the drawbridge would have been borne by the Government. Now, alongside of what my hon. friend speaks of are two draw-bridges, spanning almost identically the same opening on the American canal; so that there was no engineering difficulty at all. I think, if I remember correctly, that if the bridge had been extended from the centre, because it radiates from the centre, the structure could have been increased in size, for only one or two extra panels would have been required to make this bridge sufficiently long enough for the purpose of carrying the cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much of a span?

Mr. BERGERON. About 120 feet.

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps a couple of hundred feet. We have draw-bridges that are 450 feet from end to end. So that as far as the engineering difficulties are concerned, they are mere matters of detail. There was no difficulty in making a bridge sufficiently long enough. It was a matter of common talk in Sault Ste. Marie that it was, and will be for all time to come—I was going to say a standing disgrace, but at all events it will be an eyesore to the Canadian people who use it in passing up and down the St. Mary's channel. Now, with reference to using the American side instead of the Canadian side, it was pointed out by the hon. member for West Lambton that only 2 per cent of the carrying trade of our inland waters was done through the Canadian locks, and that statement is confirmed to-night by the hon. member for Beauharnois. One of the principal reasons why Canadian steamers do not use the Canadian locks is simply because they tie up at the end of the American wharf, where they receive their coal, and being good loyal subjects, wherever they can get it they take it, without paying duty, and avoid coming over to the Canadian shore, and pass through the American locks.

Mr. BENNETT. Take the duty off coal now.

Mr. GIBSON. Then we will be able to use our Canadian lock in a canal upon which we spent three million dollars. Then if the lock is of any use at all, you will have the advantage of all the locks being used together, and stop the very blockade my hon. friend spoke about. If the American and Canadian vessels were not compelled to pay a duty upon coal, I venture to say there would be no stoppage in the Sault Ste. Marie Canal at all, because with the old American and the new American lock, and with out Canadian lock, they have more than ample accommodation for inland navigation for fifty years to come. I have no fault to find with the work, but I agree with every word that my hon. friend has said. It is now too late to make the complaint. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), together with the other members who were supporting the then Government, had listened to the criticisms offered by this side of the House, which were made at the proper time, there would be no need for his remarks to-night.

Mr. REID. Can a Canadian steamer coming in at Sault Ste. Marie, on the American side, take coal without paying duty?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. REID. Well, they cannot do it at Ogdensburg, when going to Kingston.

Mr. GIBSON. Of course not, because the vessel is coasting.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) is wrong in saying that the matter could be rectified at the time his friends offered the criticism on this pier. The bridge was already constructed then.

Mr. GIBSON. We offered the criticism at the proper time, because the water had not been let into the canal, and the cribs could have been removed, and the stone pier could have been removed, and the additional spans could have been added to the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think it is yet too late to redress this grievance. I passed there the other day, and I saw a bridge which was made to cover the whole canal for another railway. If they make one, they can make another. The whole width of the bridge is between 120 and 150 feet. This piece of work, which I have seen, and which is really a disgrace to the place, covers half the canal. A vessel has to make a sharp turn there to get around it. I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will take steps to have this thing removed. It is a matter of national importance that it should be done.

Mr. GIBSON. What I want to point out is, that the difficulty in getting the work done now will be to obtain the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway to make their bridge long enough to span the whole banks. It was quite within the power of the late Government to have got that done, because they need have put up only temporary trestles until such time as the Canadian Pacific Railway had made provision for the extension of their bridge.

The Lachine Canal enlargement $25,000

Mr. QUINN. Is a portion of this vote, or is the whole of it, for the purpose of building one or two new locks at the foot of the canal? If so, is it the intention to build the locks this winter, and whether will they be built by contract or by day labour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This appropriation is for the purpose of deepening the canal to 15 feet.

Mr. QUINN. As I understand, there is no item here for the purpose of building locks No. 1 and No. 2.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not provided for in this vote.

Mr. QUINN. Is it the intention to build locks Nos. 1 and 2 this year? In the Main Estimates, a sum of $238,000 was voted for the Lachine Canal, and now there is a further sum of $25,000 asked for the enlargement of the canal. Under which of these votes would the building of the locks come in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It certainly would not come under this item.

Mr. QUINN. Might I ask the hon. Minister if it is the intention to build these two locks?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The department have not, so far, concluded to build the locks this year. We have not asked for any appropriation, up to this moment, for that purpose.

To pay judgment of Supreme Court in St. Louis vs. the Crown $76,500

Mr. BERGERON. I understand, there is a case of the Crown against St. Louis for a certain amount of money, and this judgment of St. Louis versus the Crown will settle the other case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, it does not.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see how that can be. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the other case against St. Louis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the opinion of the Government that the judgment recovered in this case does not dispose of the counter claim which the Government has against Mr. St. Louis, in any respect whatever. The counter claim might have been raised as a set-off in the suit of St. Louis against the Crown, but it was not so raised. A good deal of facility was afforded this gentleman to get his case before the court, and in consequence of that, judgment was recovered aginst the Crown. The same facility, apparently, was not afforded in the action pending against Mr. St. Louis by the Crown. That is still going on.

Mr. BERGERON. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has not got the facts very well.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAS AND CANALS. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. St. Louis sued the Government for $70,000, and he lost before the Exchequer Court. Then the Department of Justice, for what reason I do not know, sued Mr. St. Louis for $80,000. It the meantime Mr. St. Louis appealed to the Supreme Court which unanimously gave judgment in has favour. The other case of the Crown vs. St. Louis was still going on. I remember hearing the lawyers in the case state that the case of St. Louis against the Crown would settle the other one. When that case was taken by the Government to the Privy Council, the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was confirmed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, but they refused to give leave to appeal.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, the effect was just the same. That is why I ask if the Government intend to drop their action, or if they intend to appeal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) could have assumed that my statement was not correct, because it does not differ materially from the statement of the hon. gentleman, although he went somewhat more fully into one branch of the case. I repeat that the Government does not consider the recovery of the judgment in this case as settling the case of the Crown against Mr. St. Louis. That case is still pending, and it is the intention of the Government to prosecute it to a final result. It is therefore in that position. In the meantime this judgment has been finally recovered. An attempt was made to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada by an appeal to the Privy Council, but the Privy Council refused to give leave to prosecute the appeal, and as a result we are called upon to pay the amount of the judgment. Therefore, this appropriation is now asked.

Rideau Canal $11,200

Mr. SPROULE. I saw a rumour some time ago that a superintendent of this canal was to be appointed. Has he been appointed yet, and if so, who is he ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been no superintendent of the canal appointed by us.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint one soon, and if so, whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure my hon. friend that I am quite unable to tell him who may be appointed.

Resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 30th September, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STATIONERY SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS.

Mr. GIBSON moved that the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, be adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. Before that is adopted, I would like to say a few words to emphasize what I said the other night. It seems to me that the selection of stationery which is distributed to us, is a very bad one. We have a large quantity of very small note paper, with a lot of small envelopes, that are of very little use to business men, and a small quantity of a kind of paper which every business man can use, with the envelopes. Then we have a lot of other things that may be of some value to some persons, but of very little value to the great majority of the members. I think if a good selection of stationery in the way of paper and envelopes suitable for business purposes, was made, instead of a small quantity of what is suitable, and a large quantity of what is unsuitable, it would be better for those who receive it. I merely make the suggestion, because I have heard complaints frequently made by members, and I think the parties who make the selection ought to know it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Not only is there something to be said of the quality of the stationery which is supplied to us, but a good deal is also to be said of the quantity. I think I would meet the views of the House in proposing that the supply of trunks and boxes of stationery which have hitherto been given us, be dispensed with in future ; and therefore I beg to move that the following words be added to the report of the said committee :—

That the practice of supplying each senator and member of the House of Commons with a leather trunk and a box of stationery, be discontinued in future, and the order of the House sanctioning the same dated 5th May, 1892, be rescinded.

If this motion carries, members of the House will receive all the stationery they want, and of the quality suggested by the hon. member for Grey, and that, I think, will amply meet the case.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. BAIN moved that the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, be concurred in. He said : Perhaps I may draw the attention of the House for a moment to the contents of the report, which will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the House, No. 29. Tuesday. I may say that there are only two items upon which the committee make any recommendation. One is with respect to a relaxation of the American regulations as promulgated by the Secretary of State at Washington, respecting the admission of Canadian thoroughbred animals, without registration, in the American Stock Book. Our people in Canada feel that the registration in the Canadian herd and stock books, is a guarantee of the purity of breeding and the qua-

lity of the stock, and we simply ask,—as the action of the American breeding association has been thus endorsed by the official action of the Secretary of State for the United States—that our Minister of Agriculture be requested to open negotiations with that gentleman to ascertain whether we cannot secure some modification of these regulations, so as to place our breeders in a better position in exchanging stock with the breeders to the south of the line.

The only other recommendation is with respect to securing to the dairymen and farmers and fruit growers of the Dominion better facilities for placing their surplus products on the English markets in first-class condition, and avoiding as much as possible depreciation in transit. The committee after a careful consideration were disposed to ask the Government to consider some principle of securing cold storage for transit by rail and by ocean steamship to the English market, with such additional facilities as may commend themselves to the judgment of the Government to secure its preservation of these perishable products in the best condition before and during transit. I would like to draw the attention of the House to one difficulty which will surround the action of the Government in this matter. It will involve considerable expense on the part of the ocean steampship-owners to furnish the necessary cold storage for the transit of these products, and the fitting up of necessary machinery to provide either cold air or other such appliances to preserve these articles in good form. It is unnecessary to say to any business men that steamship-owners will not go to the expense involved in fitting up this accommodation unless they have a reasonable guarantee that there will be business for them for some years, so as to recoup them for the first expenditure. I think the House will object, and very properly object, to the country bearing the first cost of these fittings and then be at the mercy of the owners of the vessels in which they are placed. If the Government take a favourable view of this question, the House will have to consider whether it would not be wisdom to authorize the Minister to cover a period of four or five years in the contract with these lines which fit up the necessary cold storage. This would give them a certain guarantee that they would have a return of the capital invested in furnishing these equipments. I believe it will be found in practice that it will require continuous care for four or five years to establish the business and place it on a successful footing. I need not say that parallel with that the greatest care will be required on the part of the Government to see that the contracts and terms of arrangements are of a nature to protect the public interest from being unduly imposed upon by the steamship companies, while at the same time giving every facility to secure the development of the cold storage system. It is to these two points that I draw the attention of the House in moving the adoption of the report, so that if the Government should favourably consider the situation, then the House will be seized of the fact when we come to discuss the Estimates in which will be included provision for the carrying out of the suggestions of this committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words with reference to this report, as I regard it of great importance to the country. The question engaged the attention of the last Parliament, but unfortunately it was at a time in its life when it was impossible to make any adequate provision for the carrying out of the principles involved in it. It was brought to the notice of the present Government through the Agricultural Committee, at an early stage of this Parliament. There are three things which this report deals with which might very well be taken up at an early date by the present Government, and which, if they take up in earnest and successfully carry out will redound to the interests and benefit of the farmers of Canada.

The first is with regard to the necessity for cold storage to transport our perishable food products to the markets of the world. That is strongly advocated by the resolution which accompanies this report. At this period of the year it would, I apprehend, be impossible to do anything that would result in any great advantage for the present season; but there will be sufficient time between now and next spring to provide for that cold storage for transportation which is now so much needed by the country. The attention of the Government being drawn to the matter so early, gives them an opportunity of carefully considering it and of making the provision which is required.

The question of the relaxation of the quarantine regulations is also referred to in this report. It is believed by a great many that our quarantine regulations, which compel every importer of thoroughbred stock to have his cattle quarantined for ninety days at the frontier, are a serious drawback, because they enhance the cost to the importer, cause him great inconvenience and necessitate the expenditure of a great deal of time and money. It is held that our herds are not kept up as well as they otherwise would be if there was a relaxation in this respect. In other words, it is felt that if importers of thoroughbred stock were allowed to bring them in after a careful veterinary examination, before the cattle were shipped to Canada, and also a re-examination here, it would be a great improvement. A certificate should accompany the imported stock stating that they were selected from herds and from parts of the country where diseases of an infectious and contagious na-

ture did not exist. This would enable the importers to bring in their stock without the ninety days' quarantine, and it would be a great saving to them. This suggestion is made for the purpose of securing greater freedom in the importation of stock, and it is believed that as a result there would be a great improvement in the stock of the country, which some believe to be rather deteriorating in consequence of the existing quarantine restrictions.

It was brought to the attention of the committee as to whether it would be advisable to invite the present Government of Canada to make representations to the government of the United States for reciprocal relaxation in quarantine regulations, so that grade stock as well as thoroughbred stock might be included in the privilege. A great many objected to that, and I think they very properly did so. It is therefore not included in the report. While we thought it might be desirable to relax quarantine regulations to the extent suggested in the report, we scarcely thought that it would be desirable to go so far as some of the buyers and importers wished.

The next question dealt with in the report was with reference to the privilege which was partially secured a few years ago, of exporting cattle to Europe from some American ports. The concession was granted to Canada some years ago of exporting cattle to the English markets through Portland, Me., and at that time this was the only United States port so opened to us. That privilege was lately extended to us in connection with the port of Boston. The advantage in this is that it affords competition for our exports, and the opportunity of availing themselves of the low freight rates which sometimes may be obtained for the shipment of stock from Boston and Portland. It is believed that this would result in a general reduction of freight rates for exports from this country. The last subject the committee dealt with was a suggestion that the Government might look into the question of railway freight rates, which are believed to be much higher today than they ought to be, and also into the system of discrimination between large shippers and small shippers, and between one part of the country and another part, against localities where there is no railway competition, and localities where competition does exist. These are the principal subjects dealt with in that report. They are questions of great importance to the agriculturists of the country, and questions that demand early consideration and the very best attention the Government can give to them. I draw attention to them now, in the hope that the Government may be able to deal with them at an early day.

Mr. McMILLAN. I highly approve of the suggestions made in the report in reference to cold storage. The encouragement which the Government is giving to both cheese factories and creameries in different parts of the country, will be incomplete, and the full benefit of the money that is being spent will not be realized, unless cold storage is provided, in order that the goods may be taken in first-class condition to the old country market. I approve of the suggestion made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that an arrangement should be made with the steamship companies for five years, because it is within my knowledge that both the Allan Line and the Dominion Line did provide some vessels with cold storage compartments, but did not receive a sufficient amount of trade to warrant them in continuing those compartments and they had to take them out. So I believe it will be necessary, until these facilities are fully established, to make an arrangement with the steamship companies. I believe it would be money well invested. With regard to the trade in cattle for breeding purposes between the United States and Canada, there is a strong desire in the west to get our cattle; but, owing to the arrangements that exist at present between the several live-stock associations in the Western States and the similar associations in Canada, our animals are not allowed to enter the United States unless they are registered in the registration books there. I hold that there is something wrong here, because our system of registration is more strict and our standard is higher than that of the United States. I, therefore, hope the Government will do everything they can to get these restrictions relaxed, by making the proper representations to the Department of Agriculture at Washington. In Kentucky, there is some of the best-blooded stock, both of cattle and horses, to be found on the continent of America; and many of our breeders would go there to purchase animals and bring them to Canada but for the restriction of the ninety days' quarantine. But for the same reason, many of our animals would be sent to the Western States for breeding purposes. So that it would be to the mutual advantage of both countries to have these restrictions removed, so far as breeding animals are concerned. The same is true with respect to bringing animals from the old country. We want an infusion of fresh blood into our stock. Being largely engaged in purchasing animals, I find it very difficult to get animals of the right stock; and, if we want our animals to maintain the position they hold in the British market, that can only be done by importing animals and mixing them with our stock. With respect to shipping our stock through United States ports, that will be a great advantage to every shipper. During the short time the regulations have been in existence, it has been possible to put cattle on the cars and send them to Boston for shipment to England at 27 shillings, as against 47 shillings by way of Montreal; and, although the regulations have been

suspended for a short time, until proper accommodation can be provided for taking the animals from the cars to have them watered and fed, they will be continued again as soon as the proper accommodation is provided. With respect to freight rates, the farmers of the province of Ontario suffer severely. We are paying this year $60 for a car from Seaforth to Montreal, and the time has been when we could get it for 29 or 30 shillings. At the present time, a carload of cattle will be taken from Chicago to Montreal, a distance of 1,000 miles, as cheaply as from Seaforth to Montreal, a distance of a little over 300 miles. I hold that that is not just to the Canadian farmers, especially in view of the fact that we have spent large sums of public money in building railroads. Although the Grand Trunk Railway was subsidized by the Government, the municipalities through which it passes, contributed very large sums of money towards its construction. I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration, and see whether something cannot be done to obtain fair carrying rates from the different parts of the country to the seaboard, in the interest, not only of farmers, but millers, breeders and the public generally.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to say a word, and only a word, with regard to the subject-matter of this report, which I confess I have read with a good deal of pleasure. I rise chiefly for the purpose of saying to the Minister of Agriculture, and to the gentlemen who now control the Government of Canada, that they will find—I think I can speak for all our friends on this side—very earnest and anxious helpers in any efforts they may make to provide cold storage accommodation for the farmers of Canada. We were in favour of that when we were upon the other side of the House, and I can, I think, with the full concurrence of members on this side, promise to any scheme which may be brought down, while reserving to ourselves the right to offer fair criticism as to the nature and details of that scheme, as enthusiastic support, provided it be for the advancement of the interests of the agriculturists of Canada, as we should have given it had it been introduced by ourselves. With regard to the quarantine regulations in the case of thoroughbred animals coming in from the United States, these regulations were regarded as necessary, in the first place, in order to protect the health of our own herds, and, in the second place, in order that we might retain as long as we had them, and regain when we lost them, those special privileges which, for some time, we enjoyed in the market of Great Britain. With all due respect to the statement made a short time ago by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), when addressing a second audience of farmers, my opinion is that the reason for keeping strictly these quarantine regulations has been practically removed. The hon. Minister declared to an audience of farmers that he has not altogether given up hope of yet securing a removal of the restrictions in Great Britain upon Canadian cattle. I hope he is correct, but from conferences which I had personally with the President of the Board of Agriculture and other members of the British government, I am convinced that his hope is not well founded, and I am so convinced by the very reason that they are not able to give any tangible reason for the action they have taken. Public opinion in the great majority of districts in England is in favour of the Act which was recently passed, taking out of the hands of the Government the power of even relaxing these relations; but that public opinion is formed, not by the belief that Canadian herds are unhealthy, but because the people over there do not desire the importation of Canadian cattle into Great Britain to compete with the cattle produced in that country. I am convinced that that opinion is growing stronger. I know, from conversations with people in different parts of the United Kingdom, that they support the Government, not on account of the want of faith in the health of Canadian cattle, but because of the reason I have given, and which has been often suggested to this House. Then the question narrows itself down to what is required to protect the health of our cattle, and I take it for granted that should the Minister of Agriculture follow out the suggestion of the committee and relax the regulations, he will not relax them in such a way as will at all injure or endanger the health of our herds. This being guarded, I do not see any reason why those who want to purchase thoroughbred cattle on the other side, as well as those on our side who desire to sell their thoroughbred cattle to American breeders, should not be relieved of the restrictions which exist now provided the hon. gentleman formulates a plan—and I believe it can be done—by which the health of our cattle will not be interfered with.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to say but very few words on this matter because my views have been expressed already pretty well by those who have preceded me. But I wish, in this connection, to say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that the views which he has received so sympathetically have, for some time, occupied the attention of Parliament and of his predecessors. There is a subject that I may appropriately mention in connection with this report of the committee, and which I pressed upon the Minister's attention early in the session, and that is the extending of help to the creameries in the North-west. I hope that he will this session be able to carry out what I urged on him, and put a sum in the Estimates which are yet to come down to aid creameries in the way I have suggested. On the occasion when I proposed such aid before, it was suggested by a gen-

tleman in this House, who professes to speak with a sort of aggressive authority for the North-west people, that I did not express the sentiments of the North-west. He got up and rather opposed my motion, but when the report of his remarks went up to the North-west Territories, the newspapers, which express the opinion of the Territories, did not support his view but mine. I do not bring this forward for the purpose of any controversy, but merely for the information of the hon. Minister, who, I think, has done everything he could and seems desirous of doing everything he can, to meet any proposals for the advantage of the people with which his department has to deal. I want to show him that I was expressing the opinion of the North-west, when I made the motion I did, and to which I cannot further refer. The papers of the North-west, some of them opposed to me, have endorsed my views. There is a paper almost bitterly opposed to me in the North-west Territories, namely, the "Regina Leader." There is no man in the North-west so opposed to me as the gentleman who now edits that paper which he purchased from me, with a strong clause in the contract that he would support me. Hon. gentlemen laugh, but it is one of the most dishonourable transactions in the history of human infamy. This is what this man says, in the "Leader" of the 17th September, 1896:

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). How about an immoral consideration invalidating the contract?

Mr. DAVIN. There was no consideration invalidating it. If it went into a court of justice I could get damages, but there would not be much in getting damages if you could not collect them. This is what the writer says, and I quote his article for the purpose of informing the hon. Minister. It is in defence of Mr. Oliver, and is headed:

OLIVER AND THE DAIRY INTEREST.

Several contemporaries have animadverted severely on the tone of Mr. Oliver's remarks in the House last week on Mr. Davin's resolution advising the voting of $20,000 to establish creameries in the North-west, and have interpreted his speech to mean that he opposes the idea of the Government aiding creameries.

No such meaning can possibly be attached to his words.

Now, this is what the editor of the "Leader" said. And then he quotes what Mr. Oliver said. And, having made some further excuses, he goes on—and this is what I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to, for my object, as I say, is not to refer to anything the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) may have said, because what he said was of very little importance to me personally:

It is, however, language which reveals that Mr. Oliver is not agreed with the majority of the advocates of creamery development upon a plan of action. And with all our admiration for Mr. Oliver and our confidence in him, we think he is mistaken in his views upon this matter. We are convinced that cows will follow the creamery just as people will follow the railroad. It is sometimes not a mistake to build a railway line to induce population, and, with proper caution, there can be no mistake in establishing creameries to induce dairy development. In Prof. Robertson's plan the proper caution is duly embodied, and by it Mr. Oliver's fear that factories might be started where patronage is impossible is fully met. The first stipulation in the plan is, when application is made for the loan, the ability to make a stated number of cows contributory to the proposed creamery must be shown.

Now, this is a paper published in the capital of the North-west Territories. It is a paper bitterly opposed to myself and very friendly to the hon. member for Alberta. That it should differ from that hon. gentleman at all and in any way support my contention shows that the public opinion amongst the readers of this paper forces the editor to do unwilling justice to the person, namely, myself, who moved that motion in regard to creameries. So I just bring it forward so that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the department may know that the views I expressed on that occasion were the views at least of the Territories as understood by the writer in that paper, which is the leading paper of the North-west Territories.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I should be dragged in as a party to taking up the time of the House at this late stage of the session, that I should assist the hon. gentleman in what he has been so busy at since he came here. It is really too bad that when he has talked to this House, and at this House, and to empty benches of this House, as often and as long as he has, that he should not be content with that but must read extracts from newspapers and apply his remarks to me in order to compel me to take up some of the time of the House, and thus make me guilty with him. I therefore apologize to the House for being put in that position, and I hope hon. members will justify me on the ground that it is not my fault but my misfortune—my misfortune, I suppose, to have the hon. gentleman as a colleague in the representation of the North-west, as it is a misfortune to the North-west to be represented by the hon. gentleman. As to the opinions of the newspaper, he says that the newspaper is bitterly opposed to him. I can only say that that is evidence of sound judgment on the part of the newspaper, a statement which will be accepted by gentlemen on both sides of the House. The newspaper understands to what extent he has represented public opinion in the North-west Territories in the past. If the fact that that newspaper differs from me to a slight extent is a proof that I have not represented the opinions of the North-west, the fact that it differs from him

very widely is surely proof that he still more than myself does not represent the opinions of that region. However, in one way I am very thankful to the hon. gentleman for bringing this question up at the present time as it gives me an opportunity of removing any misapprehension that might exist as to the remarks I made in the House on the occasion referred to. If my remarks were interpreted as being in opposition to the Government assisting the creamery industry of the North-west Territories, I certainly failed utterly to express my idea. I think the first words I said when I spoke on that occasion should have set that matter right, as I then declared, if my memory is correct, that I supported assistance to the creamery industry in the North-west, but that I did not agree with the particular form of the assistance proposed by the hon. gentleman. His scheme was one, to my mind at least, that would not suit the part of the country that I represented, and, being in duty bound to represent the interests of that part of the country, I was bound to oppose the proposition. I do not claim to represent Western Assiniboia ; I do not claim to represent any part of the Territories but Alberta. I do claim to represent Alberta, and I deny to any other hon. gentleman the right to speak for that section of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I understand I am here for.

Mr. MILLS. Better get a better understanding.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose the hon. gentlemen who "ha, ha," do not understand that they are here for the purpose of representing their constituencies—that is a matter they can settle with their constituents. We do not know upon what principle these gentlemen were elected, and it does not concern us. I understand that I represent the district of Alberta, and I deny the right of any hon. gentleman to represent that district. I speak for that district because I know, other hon. gentlemen do not know.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. Again, the hon. gentlemen laugh. I hope they enjoy the joke ; I hope they understand it ; I confess I do not.

An hon. MEMBER. You can't see it.

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly cannot. Their laughter reminds me of the——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Don't. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER—reminds me of the statement made by a noted Englishman that it required a surgical operation to get a joke into a Scotchman's head ; and the reply was that that only applied to English jokes. Now, if hon. gentlemen will kindly allow me to proceed, if they will allow me to exercise the rights I have in this House, I will explain exactly where I stand on this question of assistance to creameries. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) made a proposition that would have absorbed $20,000 of the money of this country in establishing new creameries throughout the country. I say, from the knowledge I possess, that creameries have been established in the Territories that require a share of that assistance ; and I am here to declare that principle and to maintain it in opposition to the "ha, ha," and lack of knowledge of gentlemen opposite. I maintain that where enterprising men have put their money into a creamery industry, and where, owing to the circumstances of the country, that industry has not been profitable, the enterprise that they have shown entitles them to as much consideration at the hands of the Government as should be shown to gentlemen who have shown no enterprise except to come here and ask for favours. But I do not agree to a proposition whereby $20,000 of the money of this country shall be taken to erect buildings and establish creamery industries here and there in the Territories, ignoring other sections which have spent more than $20,000 of their money in establishing these industries.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen will be good enough not to interrupt the debate, because the hon. member who has the floor is a new member of this House. I do not think it is quite courteous in hon. gentlemen to do so.

Mr. OLIVER. I say that where gentlemen have put in their money into these enterprises, if the enterprise has failed, it is owing to no fault of their own, but owing to the conditions of the country being unfavourable at the moment, and owing to the scarcity of patronage for these creameries. Therefore, in opposing the hon. member's motion, I asked for assistance to these enterprises already established, so that they may be able to tide over the present difficulty until there is sufficient patronage in the country to keep them going. That is what I ask, and that is what I understand the Minister of Agriculture has agreed to. It is in support of that proposition that I opposed the hon. gentleman's motion, that would have prevented that, and would have given all the money that we propose to vote to another section of the country, and ignore that particular part of the country. In the district I represent there are six or seven creameries in operation, and there is a larger investment in the creamery industry than in all the rest of the Territories put together. It is not an experiment there to the same extent as it is in other places ; people know what they are talking about in that country ; they know where the shoe pinches them ; and when I speak, I speak from knowledge, knowledge that we have acquired at our own expense. The hon. gentleman proposed that 400 cows shall be

necessary to starting a creamery. Let me tell the hon. gentleman and the House that certain of these creameries have been started on a patronage of less than 400 cows, with 250 or 200 cows. In very few cases has it been possible to get 400 cows tributary to one creamery, or to one separating station. A scheme that requires the patronage of 400 cows before assistance will be given to a creamery, is one that is, to a large extent, impracticable in the part of the country where I live, as proved by experience, and is a scheme that will not be effectual. In reply to the charge that I have in any way opposed assistance to creameries in the North-west Territories, I want to say that I have not done so, but I have only demanded a fair division of the assistance that is to be offered by this Government to those creameries, an assistance which we expect from this Government, and which I believe will be received.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not rise to offer any great objection to this report, but merely to express my surprise that it does not recommend the establishment of abattoirs. In 1894 the Committee on Agriculture reported as follows :—

> That it is advisable that substantial aid be granted to any company or companies who may undertake to establish and operate abattoirs and refrigerators in connection therewith, for the purpose of slaughtering, and the preservation of meats in a fresh condition for exportation.

I regret not to find in this report, with which I agree in the main, some such recommendation to the Government. I do not object to the Government giving aid to cold storage, but I think it would be better to add a sum of money to establish abattoirs, for in establishing abattoirs, cold storage will follow of itself. I know some objections have been made to such a proposal. I do not care who the parties are who take up this abattoir scheme, but I think the Government should grant them some assistance. One of the recommendations of this committee is :

> The committee would recommend that the Government be requested to make provision in the Estimates for a sum of money sufficient to secure an efficient system of cold storage and transportation.

I should like to add that "and for abattoirs," because I say that unless you have a strong company to buy up cattle and sheep, and to buy up perishable articles of the farmer, a company that is able to transport them to cold storage, and unless you have also somebody on the other side of the water to dispose of these things, I think cold storage would be of little benefit to this country. I know that in Quebec and Montreal they have tried this cold storage system, that the farmers who have cattle and sheep, or turkeys to sell, are not to go to Quebec or Montreal to carry these goods to these cold storage houses, and to wait until they are sold. If a company is formed able to build an abattoir, it will be in the interest of that company to go around among the farmers and take up their cattle, their sheep, their butter, their eggs, &c., and bring them to the cold storage, and ship them to the other side, and have somebody there to dispose of it. I do not care who the men are who take up such a scheme, I do not care to whom the subsidy is given, but I think that unless an abattoir scheme is established in connection with this cold storage and transportation scheme, the country will not derive much benefit from it. I do not object strongly to the report, I think the recommendations are good, but I think the recommendation made by the preceding committee was better.

An hon. MEMBER. Next session.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Well, there are a great many things to be done next session. In the appendix to this report I am glad to find the following :—

> A matter of no inconsiderable moment has been under consideration by the committee, viz., the establishment of abattoirs in different parts of the Dominion. The benefits which would accrue from them would be the utilization of every part of the animal when slaughtered, some of which now goes to waste, the canning of meats, which in parts of the United States has become a great industry, and the encouragement this would give the farmer to increase his herds, and to abandon a practice, now too prevalent, of killing his young stock because found unprofitable to bring to maturity. The committee has been impressed by the great value that such enterprises would be to the community, but thinking it wiser in seeking Government aid to err on the side of safety.

I do not think the committee would have erred in adding to that report that a certain sum should be granted to a company who would be willing to undertake the construction of abattoirs in connection with the cold storage business. I know parties who would be quite willing, for a reasonable subsidy, to establish an abattoir in connection with cold storage, or to establish each separately, and when we have both abattoir and cold storage, it will be necessary to start a fast freight line of steamers, and the whole country will be benefited by it. But although my views have not been adopted so far, I am not going to abandon them. I think next year I shall bring the matter up again, and although I believe that cold storage and transportation will be a benefit to the farmers, they would be benefited still more by the establishment of abattoirs.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, although I do not share in the views given expression to by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), who states that if abattoirs were not established, cold storage would serve no purpose——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I did not say that.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I did not say that the refrigerators without the abattoirs would be useless, but I stated that they would not be as useful to the country.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) At all events, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the recommendation made by the Committee on Agriculture with a view of securing cold storage on ocean steamships is of great importance, not only for the province which the hon. member for Montmagny comes from, but also for all the provinces of the Dominion. That is about the only means of transporting with profit our perishable agricultural products to the markets of the world. On that ground, I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Government should take into their most earnest consideration the scheme propounded and so strongly advocated by my hon. friend from Montmagny. The farming community would be greatly benefited by the establishment of abbatoirs, because it would enable the farmers to sell to the owners of those abattoirs their young stock now found unprofitable, as often stated, and which could be slaughtered at an age at which their meat cannot now be profitably sold on our market, owing to the small number of consumers in this country. Moreover, we have not got in Canada a sufficient number of consumers to buy all the meat which we could produce, and it is of importance that we should, by means of abattoirs or refrigerators, take the necessary steps to transport those products, preserved in good form, to the markets of the world.

I trust that the hon. Minister of Agriculture should he not see his way to come to a decision on the matter during this session, will take the matter into his most serious consideration and carry out the scheme advocated by my hon. friend from Montmagny. I hope that he will take the scheme into his most serious consideration with a view of bringing to maturity, efficacious measures and see whether it will not be within his power, at the next session of Parliament, to seize the House with a scheme calculated to carry out the recommendation of the Agriculture Committee to transport part of the perishable products of the farming community, which in the actual state of our market, cannot be profitably disposed of.

I hope that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will take into his earnest consideration the scheme propounded by the hon. member for Montmagny for the establishment of abattoirs in any part of the province of Quebec, whether at Quebec, at Lévis, or at any other place; I hope, I say, that the hon. gentleman, while fully awake to the importance of the question for the farming community of this country, will take all necessary steps to ascertain whether the scheme can be carried out; and I hope that the conclusion may be reached that not only is the scheme practicable, but that it can be successfully carried out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, not wishing at all to delay the adoption of this report, I will only say a few words on this occasion. The recommendations of the report strongly accord with my own desires, and I may say, also, with the desires of my colleagues in the Government. I can assure the House that the report and the recommendations in it are entirely in harmony with what the Government wish to carry out. I think I may say that the House will find that the Government is ready to propose such means as may be necessary to accomplish the ends herein indicated. I shall not now go into the details of the matter. My remarks in this regard apply to the question of cold storage.

Now, with reference to the quarantine regulations which are referred to in the report. I understand that the anxious desire of our people is that we should obtain entry into the American market for our thoroughbred animals, and that in that, and along with that, we should obtain recognition of our own records from the American Government and the American association. This is indeed a very important item, and one without the other would be of comparatively little value to our breeders of thoroughbred stock. I would point out, however, that this is a matter of negotiation with a foreign country, and one in which our Government has not complete control. I have reason to believe that the American authorities are ready to meet us on common ground in this matter, and, this being the case, I trust we may be able to accomplish what this report aims at. I need not say that in that matter I will be only too glad to do my best to carry out these recommendations.

The reference in the report to quarantine is of great importance, but it is not dealt with to the same extent as the other questions. I refer to the regulations for carrying our animals through the United States for European export. I must warn hon. gentlemen that this is somewhat complicated by the fact of reciprocal demands on the other side, that American cattle may be carried through Canada for shipment from Canadian to European ports. The question has, therefore, to be considered and dealt with in the light of such reciprocal arrangements. This involves a little more than the recommendation that this report points to. It is possible, after careful consideration and while guarding the interests of our own people, that it may be advisable to negotiate for such reciprocal advantages as I have indicated. I do not pledge myself to it until I have had every opportunity of investigating what it might lead to, but I wish to point out that the privileges that

our people are asking for in the United States will probably have to be offset by similar privileges extended by us to United States shippers of cattle.

Now, with regard to the abattoir scheme which has been suggested. I wish to point out this, that, while the report does not make any recommendations distinctly in favour of assistance being given to abattoir companies, cold storage is a necessary part of any scheme for abattoirs, and any assistance given to cold storage is so far an assistance to anybody who wishes to undertake abattoir work in the country. It, therefore, is practically an assistance to abattoirs indirectly, if not directly. At the same time, the assistance to cold storage includes the greater assistance to the other industries which are concerned, and does not make a special mark for the one particular industry. In reply to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I may say that, while, probably, the remarks made about creameries in the North-west are out of order in discussing this report, which does not refer to the matter, yet I will say that the hon. gentleman may be sure that I have not forgotten the promise I made to the House the other evening with reference to this question, and that the assistance to creameries in the North-west is under the serious consideration of the Government, and I trust may be carried out.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

CAPE CROKER INDIAN BAND—MEDICAL ATTENDANCE.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to call the attention of my hon. friend the Prime Minister to a circumstance which has occurred in connection with the Cape Croker band of Indians. The services of Dr. Fisher, who has been the medical attendant upon that band—and who is a gentleman of the very highest standing in his profession, being coroner, and being examiner of the Toronto College of Dentistry—have been dispensed with. A Dr. Jimby, of Wiarton, is, I understand, about to be appointed in his place. I wish to say that I am not making any kind of a charge aginst the Department, or the acting Minister, or any of the officials concerned, but I want to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) to the fact that I have been informed, upon authority which I deem to be very reliable, that there are some very grave charges in connection with Dr. Jimby, and, if my information is correct, I think he is really not such a person as should be appointed to a position of this kind. Before the matter goes further, I would beg that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) would be kind enough to have some investigation made as to the charges to which I have referred. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) so desires, I will communicate and specify those charges to him.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the information just given by my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) is of a serious nature, but he will himself realize that it is of such a general character that no departmental action could be taken on it. If the hon. gentleman is so kind, as he has just intimated, as to particularize the charges which are brought to bear against the new appointee, I will be very glad to take action in the matter.

SUPPLY—TARIFF LEGISLATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, to make the following motion :—

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following added instead thereof :—"having regard to the promises of the leaders of the Liberal party while in Opposition, and the consequent expectations raised ; That in 1893 the leading members of the present Government and the Liberal party, including Messrs. Laurier, Mulock, Davies, Sutherland and others, to the number of 51 supporters, voted for the proposition 'That it is expedient to place binding twine on the free list' ; That candidates of the Hon. the Prime Minister in Manitoba and the North-west promised that should he get into power he would place binder twine and agricultural implements and coal oil on the free list ; That hopes to this effect have consequently been excited ; witness that, at a representative meeting of the Rockwood Liberal Association, held on the 15th August, 1896, at Stonewall, a resolution of confidence in the Hon. Wilfred Laurier and his Government having passed, a resolution was passed in favour of placing binder twine, coal oil, barbed wire and nails on the free list ; that, therefore, in the opinion of this House, when revision of the tariff is made the Government is bound in honour to place agricultural implements, binder twine and coal oil on the free list."

I move this, seconded by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). It is unnecessary that I should take up the time of the House with any lengthy remarks in support of this motion, because we have had the opinions of leading members of the Government in regard to the matters set forth in it. In moving this, I am endorsed by my constituents, and am fulfilling their desires and wishes in the matter. It is unnecessary that I should do more, in proposing the motion, than to refer to the earnest advocacy of the matter referred to in it, by members of the Government, and by their supporters, especially the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson).

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a protest in Western Assiniboia, and that in the near future there are certain probabilities, especially as my hon. friend's majority is not large. We have, therefore, the explanation of this motion. Whatever

may be the merits of the proposition to place agricultural implements, coal oil, binder twine, etc., on the free list—and it is a question which is debatable, and upon which parties on either side may have views—I want to ask my hon. friend if he seriously thinks that the House is to give notice, six months in advance, of what changes should be made in a revision of the tariff. The proposition is so preposterous that the hon. gentleman cannot expect that his motion will be carried.

Mr. DAVIN. The same thing would apply to the speeches of the hon. Postmaster General when he made those motions.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman having mentioned my name, I wish to say that I am with him heartily in the desire to secure the placing of binder twine, coal oil and agricultural implements on the free list. I believe it is desirable, in the interests of the North-west, that these articles should be placed on the free list, as well as other important commodities required by the farmers of that country. But I can see the object the hon. gentleman has in bringing in this motion at this particular time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As the hon. First Minister has said, there is a by-election pending in Western Assiniboia, and the hon. gentleman hopes to be able to retain his majority of one. In fact, it is scarcely a majority of one, because the majority is the casting vote of the returning officer. Now, I do not propose to yield to any member of this House in my desire to have these articles placed on the free list; but I am here to say that I think a motion introduced at this time, is introduced for no other purpose than that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not finished my sentence yet, and if it should be out of order, perhaps I had better not finish it. However, the introduction of this resolution at this time looks to me to be a mere matter of annoyance; and, while I propose to use my very best endeavours to see that the pledges I have made to the electors of the rural constituency of Lisgar are carried out, I do not think I would be voting in the interest either of my constituents or the country if I voted for that resolution, because if I did so, I might assist the hon. gentleman's return to this House in the next by-election, and I am sure the country would never forgive me if I did that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House more than a moment; but inasmuch as my name has been mentioned by my hon. friend who moved this amendment, I wish to congratulate the House and the country upon the progress the hon. gentleman is making in matters affecting the economics of Canada. In 1891 I did present to the House for its consideration the following motion:—

That binding twine be placed upon the free list.

And I endeavoured, unsuccessfully, to secure a majority in the House in favour of that proposition. Eighty gentlemen did vote in favour of it; 100 voted against it. One of the noble hundred was the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. I should not detain the House at this moment on this resolution but for the fact that in the town where I live there is a binding twine factory; and I want to say, in case the yeas and nays are not taken on this resolution, and it might be thought that I would vote in favour of it, that I should vote against it. I do not want the Government to imagine for one moment that I think they are bound, either in honour or in any other way, to make binding twine free. I do not want binding twine made free. I think that would be an unfortunate thing for the country. I do not think it would at all reduce the price to the farmers, and I think it would have the effect of closing up the factories of this country.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bennett,	Marcotte,
Bergeron,	Martin,
Boyd,	Mills,
Carscallen,	Pettet,
Casgrain,	Powell,
Chauvin,	Prior,
Cochrane,	Quinn,
Davin,	Roche,
Dupont,	Rogers,
Gillies,	Tolmie,
Henderson,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville).—26.
McAlister,	
McDougall,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Haley,
Bain,	Harwood,
Bazinet,	Henry,
Beattie,	Hurley,
Beausoleil,	Hutchison,
Beith,	Joly de Lotbinière,
Belcourt,	(Sir Henri),
Bell (Pictou),	Kendry,
Bernier,	Kloepfer,
Bethune,	Landerkin,
Blair,	Lang,
Blanchard,	Langelier,
Boisvert,	Laurier,
Borden (King's),	Legris,
Bostock,	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Lewis,
Bourbonnais,	Livingston,
Britton,	Logan,
Broder,	Macdonald (Huron),

Brodeur,	Macdonald (King's),
Brown,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Bruneau,	Mackie,
Burnett,	MacLaren,
Cameron,	MacPherson,
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Cargill,	McCormick,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McGugan,
Carroll,	McHugh,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McInnes,
Casey,	McIsaac,
Christie,	McLennan (Inverness),
Clancy,	McMillan,
Clarke,	McMullen,
Corby,	Madore,
Costigan,	Maxwell,
Craig,	Meigs,
Davies,	Migneault,
Desmarais,	Montague,
Dobell,	Moore,
Domville,	Morin,
Douglas,	Morrison,
Dyment,	Mulock,
Earle,	Oliver,
Ellis,	Osler,
Erb,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Préfontaine,
Fauvel,	Proulx,
Featherston,	Reid,
Ferguson,	Richardson,
Fielding,	Savard,
Fisher,	Scriver,
Fitzpatrick,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Fortin,	Stenson,
Foster,	Stubbs,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Sutherland,
Fraser (Lambton),	Talbot,
Frost,	Tarte,
Gauthier,	Taylor,
Geoffrion,	Tisdale,
Gibson,	Turcot,
Gilmour,	Wilson,
Guillet,	Wood (Hamilton),
Hackett,	Yeo.—128.
Hale,	

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. member in the House when the question was put ?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. On which side does the hon. gentleman desire to have his vote recorded ?

Mr. ROGERS. For the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for West Bruce (Mr. Tolmie) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. gentleman in the House when the question was put ?

Mr. TOLMIE. I was.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the hon. gentleman must declare whether he votes for or against the amendment.

Mr. TOLMIE. For the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Pettet) has not voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Was the hon. gentleman in the House when the question was put ?

Mr. PETTET. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman vote for or against the amendment ?

Mr. PETTET. For the amendment.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. member for Halifax has not voted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am paired with my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden), otherwise I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Russell has not voted.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am paired with the hon. member for St. Antoine Division, Montreal (Mr. Roddick).

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has not voted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was paired with Sir Charles Tupper. Had I voted, I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In this connection I should say to the House that pairs made are made on Government questions and do not count on a question like this unless made between the two members on the particular question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course I have to take the member's statement.

THE SHORTIS CASE.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we go into Supply, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter which is of some importance. Last year papers were asked for and granted in the very important case of Valentine Shortis. Those that came down were printed in English, naturally. Afterwards I asked that they should be translated from English into French, and in the French translation, I find that one of the most important letters, a letter from the then Minister of Justice, was not properly translated. The letter is as follows :—

Department of Justice,
Ottawa, 24th Dec., 1895.

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

The undersigned has the honour to submit the report of Mr. Justice Mathieu upon the case of Francis Valentine Cuthbert Shortis, recently convicted at Beauharnois of murder and sentenced to be executed on Friday the third day of January next, together with the record of the proceedings had and the evidence given at the trial ; also several petitions, letters and other communications urging the commutation of the death sentence, and generally all the correspondence touching the case.

Upon careful consideration of the whole, the undersigned has the honour to recommend that the law be allowed to take its course.

Humbly submitted,
CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER,
Minister of Justice.

In the French translation, the last paragraph of the letter is omitted. I bring to the attention of the House, therefore, this fact,

that the French translation is not a faithful reproduction of the original. I may say that I do not attach any blame to anybody for that, because I have no doubt that the translator made this omission purely and simply without intention to do so. Although, as every hon. gentleman will understand, it is of the greatest importance, as far as I was concerned, during my election, because, I may say, the election in my county was fought simply upon that case. Another thing to which I would like to call the attention of Parliament, and particularly of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), is a remark which was made, and at the time, and which I think was unjust towards that hon. gentleman, and it is this, which appears in this letter in English :

> Upon careful consideration of the whole, the undersigned has the honour to recommend that the law be allowed to take its course.

Which was omitted from the French translation. Another document brought down reads like this :

> The Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.
>
> I have been expressly requested by the Minister of Justice to ask opinion on following position :—
>
> Valentine Shortis was sentenced to death for murder. Cabinet was equally divided upon consideration of petitions on Tuesday. No advice was, therefore, forthcoming to Governor General, without which, according to instructions, he cannot act. If no intervention were to take place, execution would be carried into effect January third. In view, however,——

That is the part which, I think, throws a shadow, if I may use the word, upon the report of the ex-Minister of Justice :

> In view, however, of equal vote he recognizes now that his course might be liable to objection. I may add that the judge's confidential report on the whole favours commutation. I concur.
>
> ABERDEEN.

I have communicated with the authorities of the House, and the Clerk has taken upon himself to have the translation of the English portion put into the French book, at least in those that remain, because a great many are distributed. This is a most important matter considering the consequences it might have had ; and I hope that in the future, in any case of that sort the greatest possible care will be taken, for any one will understand the consequences that might flow from such a bad translation. As far as my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice is concerned, I think it only an act of justice to give him the opportunity to say whether this letter is correct or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was good enough to tell me that he intended to refer to this subject. There is only one portion of his observations that makes it necessary for me to say a word or two. The account which he gives of the subject places me in rather an awkward position, and I recognized that such a thing might follow when this blue-book was brought down. I was not a member of the Government when these papers were prepared and laid upon the Table, and I had never seen until I saw it in print, the telegram from His Excellency to the Colonial Office. Not agreeing with the statement of the case as it appeared, I took the opportunity of asking the Governor General for permission to make a statement should the subject come up in Parliament at any time ; and, so that there should be no misunderstanding in the matter, I submitted a draft statement to His Excellency, and when the hon. member for Beauharnois told me that he intended to refer to this subject to-day, I looked up this memorandum. If any one who has followed the matter cares to examine the correspondence, he will see that while I recommended that the law should take its course as Minister of Justice, I am almost made to appear to have hastened to Government House with some other view ; and that is so far from being a full representation of the facts that I desire to read a statement which places the matter in a better light. In order to prevent any misconception regarding my own position, in relation especially to the telegram from His Excellency to the Colonial Secretary, I wish to say (I have obtained the necessary assent to the making of a statement of this nature) that, although in the first instance, I considered that in view of the fact that the Cabinet had not tendered advice to the Governor General, it would be open to His Excellency to use his discretion in the matter, yet after examining the royal instructions as amended, I came to the conclusion, and so informed His Excellency, that in my opinion the proper course under the circumstances would be that the Governor General should allow the law to take its course, and recommended His Excellency if he had any doubt in the matter, to communicate with Her Majesty's Government. To some the difference between this statement and the record may appear slight, but, at all events, it exculpates me from the position in which to one closely reading the papers I would appear to stand, of tendering one opinion in Council for His Excellency, and tendering another to His Excellency. No one in the House, I think, would think that was characteristic of me, and I think the statement I have made would put an end to any doubt of that character that might arise in the minds of hon. gentleman.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask the indulgence of the committee

while the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is present. While I was not in the House reference was made to the case of St. Louis and the Queen, and the Minister of Railways is reported to have said that a good deal of facility was afforded to this gentleman to get his case before the court, it being inferred that as a consequence, judgment was secured against the Crown. The hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) is also present, I am glad to see. I have simply to make this statement in regard to the matter, which, I am sure, the Minister of Railways will accept: I was Minister of Justice at that time, and so far from my department or myself individually offering any facility to Mr. St. Louis, nothing was further from the fact. The then Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) was instructing us, and his instructions permitted of no indulgence being considered so far as Mr. St. Louis was concerned. I did take this responsibility—and it is probably to something of the kind that the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) had reference—the hon. member for Verchères was councel for Mr. St. Louis. He had contested a by-election, and about the time the papers for the appeal from the judgment of the Exchequer Court should have been made out, meeting me, he asked me, as Minister of Justice, not to take advantage of any delay of a few days that had occurred in that connection, and mentioned, what was, of course, apparent, that the responsibility of that delay was his. Without hesitation I agreed to that, and undertook that responsibility as one barrister, or counsel, acting with another. I think my position was not in any sense changed by being Minister of Justice, but I extended to him that courtesy which one counsel at the bar would extend to another. That is the only fact that would warrant any statement being made that facilities had been given to Mr. St. Louis. Otherwise, we pressed the case as earnestly as possible, and the judge of the Exchequer Court, so I was informed,—I was not acting immediately before that court, but the learned and hon. member was acting there—and I was informed by counsel for the Crown that the judge of the Exchequer Court declined to go on with the case of the Crown against St. Louis until the case of St. Louis, which had been first conducted before him, had been finally settled and determined, as incidentally it bore upon the case of the Crown against St. Louis. So that the case is free from any entanglement or any difficulty of the kind suggested by the language that was brought to my attention to-day; and I spoke of it, both to the Minister of Railways and the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) before making this statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I do not profess any particular familiarity with the circumstances connected with this litigation. I have not made any inquiry into them; but I was stating what I believed,—at all events until the hon. member made this statement—and there was a general impression on this side of the House, at least, to that effect, that facilities had been offered to the plaintiff in that suit which had not been offered to the Crown in the other suit brought by the Crown against St. Louis. I had not in my mind at all the idea that the ex-Minister of Justice had any improper understanding at all with the plaintiff. I had not associated him in my mind with the proceedings in the remarks I made to the committee; and I have now no hesitation whatever in accepting unreservedly the statement the hon. gentleman has made.

Lachine Canal—To complete the electric light station $3,500

Mr. REID. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that all the canals, the Lachine, the Beauharnois and the Grenville, I understand, have electric lights, but we have no electric lights on the Galops Canal. I think it is necessary, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see his way to give a few electric lights along that canal. It is only ten miles long.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I would not like to give the hon. member an assurance to the effect that he desires, at all events, until I have been able to give some personal attention to the state of matters, and to the reasonableness of the request. I have been myself unable, perhaps it may be due to absence of knowledge on my part, to see the propriety of incurring so large an amount of expense in establishing these plants for lighting the canals by electricity. Possibly there can be no doubt of the propriety of that expenditure. My view may be the outcome of the want of knowledge on the subject, but I should be very sorry to enter into any undertaking for a further expenditure in this direction, beyond completing pending works, without satisfying myself that the expenditure is justifiable. I shall be glad to look into the case of the Galops Canal, but the fact that it had been found necessary to make these large outlays for the purpose of lighting the other canals would constitute a strong reason why it should be done in the case the hon. member has named.

Beauharnois Canal—To improve channel at upper and lower entrance $3,000

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the Minister what kind of works are contemplated at the entrance of the channel?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is a report, which I have no doubt is correct, that there are shoals, both at the upper and lower entrances, which require to be removed, and it is for that purpose this appropriation is asked.

Mr. BERGERON. Last winter some work was done at the foot of the canal, for which the then Minister asked $700 last session, which was not voted. I hope that amount is comprised in this $3,000. The work was done at that time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am under the impression that the particular work that the hon. gentleman alludes to, was covered by an appropriation in the main Estimates. This is an appropriation for work which has not yet been commenced, but which, I am advised, is very necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad of that, because there is no question that there is an obstruction particularly at the foot of the canal, which impedes navigation. There is a good deal of work to be done there. Not only are there boulders to be removed, but I think that even the piers on which the vessels have to throw their lines when they are waiting at the lock, are in a very dilapidated condition.

Trent Canal—To build a fishway at Lindsay $500

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure that to the many constituencies interested along the route of the Trent Valley Canal, the absence of a tangible appropriation will be greatly regretted; and I cannot but think that the absence of a large amount with which to proceed with the construction of that canal, is not due to the hon. members for South Victoria (Mr. Hughes), East Peterborough (Mr. Lang), and East Hastings (Mr. Hurley), because, as they are all supporters of the Administration, I have no doubt that they have pressed upon the Minister of Railways, as well as upon the whole Government, the necessity for a very substantial appropriation in this regard. It is quite true that in the general Estimates for the year, a fairly considerable amount is appropriated, but when it is borne in mind that this is in respect to work already undertaken, and work the contracts for which have already been let, it is disappointing to find that the policy of the Government is different from that of the late Administration. The Minister of Railways and Canals may not, perhaps, be aware of the fact that within the past five years, year in and year out, large deputations have waited upon the Government of the day, pressing upon them the advisability of the construction at an early day of the Trent Valley Canal. That work has been pressed on, not as one of local interest, but as a work of great national importance, because the construction of this canal means a cheap and direct transport for the grain from the North-west and from the Western States to the port of Montreal. As there are other gentlemen who are interested in the early completion of this canal, I do not propose to discuss the whole route now, but I will ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), even at this late stage, even after hon. gentlemen who live along the route of the canal and represent constituencies along that route, have failed to secure from him an appropriation—I must assume that they have pressed to the very best of their ability that a large appropriation should be made—even at this late stage I would ask the Minister to place in the Supplementary Estimates which are yet to be brought down, an amount of money sufficient to complete the section between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe. There is now in course of construction between these two points some five miles, and nine miles further are required to complete that most important section. While we may not hope to see a vote asked for this year to complete the portion between Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe, it will certainly be an intense disappointment to those interested in the canal if that large section which will be in part completed early in the coming year, between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe, is to be permitted to remain in a useless condition for the want of communication to connect it with the waters of Lake Simcoe. There is also a large portion of the work under construction between Lakefield and Peterborough, the expenditure in respect to which will, I understand, approximate some four or five hundred thousand dollars. I press upon the Minister of Railways and Canals my request, and the request of my constituents, that even at this late date the further Supplementarly Estimates will contain a sufficient sum to complete the division between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe. It is true that a vote of $500 is asked for some trivial work at Lindsay, but that does not interest those who are concerned in the construction of the canal. After all these large expenditures that have been made in the past, and notwithstanding that a million dollars' worth of work is now under contract, if we are to be told now by the Ministry that the whole work is to be abandoned, it will be a matter of great regret to the people of that section of the country. It cannot be said that it is because of lack of money that the balance of that division is not now placed under contract, because, if my memory serves me right, the sum necessary to complete the work between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe would be only $300,000. Further, I notice in these Supplementary Estimates which we are now considering, that thousands and tens of thousands of dollars are being voted for improvements to docks, and piers, which can only be regarded as local works. Are we to be told by the Government, with these works under contract on the canal, and a great portion of the canal constructed—because nature has done a great deal in that regard—that this whole scheme is to be dropped? I trust that the efforts of hon. gentlemen who may not be in political accord with the Government, but who have interested themselves

successfully with past Governments—I trust that their efforts, united with the efforts of hon. gentlemen who support the Government, and whose constituencies adjoin this canal, may have sufficient weight to cause the Minister of Railways and Canals to place in the Estimates this year an appropriation sufficient to complete the canal from Balsam Lake to Lake Simcoe. I hope that this fall, if time will permit, the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) may be pleased to give some personal supervision to this great work, by going over the route himself. If the Minister will do so—and I have no doubt he will, owing to the importance of the project—I feel confident that next session he will come here convinced that the work should be carried on even at a faster rate than it has been carried on in the past. It has been the opinion of past Governments that this work should be carried to a speedy consummation, and I trust that the absence of a large amount in the present estimate may not be regarded as an intimation on the part of the present Government that the work is to be abandoned. I hope to hear the Minister state that it is the intention of the Government, for the next two, or even three years, to place such sufficiently large sums in the Estimates as to complete the work in its entirety, and to make that canal what it was destined to be, and what it will be when completed, an important national waterway from Lake Huron to Lake Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Minister replies to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I would like to ask him: is section No. 2 of the Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe division to be proceeded with at once, or is it to remain in abeyance another year? I would respectfully draw the attention of the Minister to a very important item which I regret the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) has not insured would be placed in the Estimates. I refer to a sum of $5,000 which was in last year's Estimates, for the purpose of clearing the River Scugog between Lindsay and Sturgeon Lake. If the Minister visits that locality—and I trust he will—he will find that occasionally hardwood logs have sunk in that river and have materially interfered with its navigation. There was also an item of $11,500 placed in the Estimates by the late Government, which has been removed from these Estimates. It was for a log-slide at Fenelon Falls, in order to facilitate the navigation of the Fenelon River between Cameron Lake and Sturgeon Lake. This river, about three-quarters of a mile long, is rendered completely useless for the greater part of the season, owing to the fact of a large number of logs jamming it, and preventing steamers from passing up and down. There is a report in the Canals Department, stating that a log-slide should be constructed there at a small cost, and which would facilitate the passage of the logs through that river. It is not my intention to say anything further with regard to the canal, but I wish to know from the Minister if the second section of Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe division is to be completed this year. The land is all purchased, surveys all made, and everything is ready for the work to be proceeded with. It will not cost $300,000, as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), and, if completed, it would give us communication from the head of the Lake Couchiching right down to Campbellford. That would leave but a few miles between Campbellford and Trenton on Bay of Quinté to be completed. I express the hope that, during this fall, the Minister will be pleased to visit that country, and I am satisfied that the members along the route, whether they are of his political complexion or not, will be glad to offer him every facility in their power.

Mr. McHUGH. I may say, in reference to the construction of the Trent Canal, and the improvements of navigation along that route, that I have had the pleasure of interviewing the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) in reference to that particular work. I am pleased to find, in regard to these improvements in that section of the country, that I am going to have the assistance of hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposition side of the House. I know that they are just as much interested as I am in the progress of the country in general. The improvement of the means of navigation is a matter in which the whole country is interested, and in which we should all agree. I entirely approve of the course which the hon. Minister told me he was going to take in this matter, namely, to pay a visit to that section of the country at as early a day as possible, look over the ground, examine into the advantages of this system of navigation, and see where the public money can be expended to the best advantage. I told the hon. Minister, when he made that statement to me, that I was perfectly satisfied with it; and I would leave the matter in his hands; all I would ask him to do, until he had that opportunity, was to appropriate what was necessary for such work as could not wait until that time.

Mr. KENDRY. I am very glad to be able to speak to-day on behalf of the work that has been undertaken in connection with the Trent Valley Canal. Up to the present time there has been, as hon. gentlemen are aware, a great deal of money spent on that canal, and I am very glad to be able to support the hon. gentleman who has spoken (Mr. McHugh), in the view that unless the Government appropriate a sufficient amount to complete the works already undertaken, the country will get no benefit from the expenditure. I am very glad the matter has been brought up, and I hope the hon. Min-

ister of Railways and Canals will see his way clear to putting a sufficient amount in the Supplementary Estimates to continue those works. As suggested by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, I would be very glad if the hon. Minister would visit the work, and see for himself the necessity that exists of continuing it. I would like to ask him how much money has been spent upon the canal up to the present time. I would be glad to do what I can to support the Government in any appropriation they may make to further this canal. When the Minister goes over the ground, I am sure he will find that the money expended on this work has been well spent, and that a further amount should be appropriated to continue it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I ought to allow the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who first called attention to this subject, to entertain the belief, or expectation, that there would be any further grant asked for, in the Supplementary Estimates yet to be brought down, for the prosecution of this work. He is quite correct in assuming that the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Lang), and other hon. members interested in that section of the country, have very strongly urged the claims of this work upon my consideration; but I did not feel, when preparing the Estimates for presentation to this House, that I would be free to ask the House to enter upon any very large expenditures upon public works in respect to the wisdom or prudence of which I had not an opportunity of exercising my own judgment. The amounts in the main Estimates were for the execution of contracts already entered into. I had no other alternative than to ask Parliament for the means of completing those works which had been contracted for. But the question of entering upon any undertakings, even if those undertakings might be in continuation of works partially carried out, would be a question on which we would have to take responsibility. I felt that if I recommended to Council the approval of appropriations for the prosecution of work on other portions of this canal, I would be expected by the members of this House to say that I had applied my own judgment to the expenditure, and approved of them. Now, I am not prepared at this moment to say that the continuation or the prosecution of this work, to the extent to which the hon. member for East Simcoe has urged, could not very properly be approved. I am in no position to say whether the hon. gentleman's judgment on that point would harmonize with mine or not; but I am prepared to say that I shall take the earliest opportunity, before Parliament shall meet again, to look over the whole matter. I am not unaware of the fact that there is a very great difference of opinion as to the wisdom of Parliament in having embarked upon this undertaking; and if it has been an unwise action on the part of Parliament, surely it is the part of prudence for us to stop at the earliest possible moment at which we can stop. If the work cannot be justified on its merits, if it was unwisely initiated, then I think the public judgment would approve of the Government taking the responsibility of telling Parliament that we would withhold any further appropriation in prosecution of it. I am not prejudiced on the subject; I have not formed any judgment one way or the other, nor has the Government. I say, speaking for myself personally, that I can bring an open mind to its consideration; and if, upon a careful examination of the work and a careful consideration of its claims and merits, I should be satisfied that I ought to ask Council to further prosecute the undertaking, the hon. gentleman will doubtless find in the Estimates submitted in another year a sum for that purpose. But I cannot, as I said at the outset, hold out any assurance to him at the present time that it will be done. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the committee asked to be informed as to the amount that had been already expended on the Trent Valley Canal. I am informed that down to the 30th of June, 1895, there had been expended in round figures, $54,000; at the end of June, 1896, that amount had been increased by $393,000; making about $450,000 in all. In the main Estimates which have already been adopted, we have been authorized to expend a further sum of $500,000 on the work. That is in execution of contracts which have been already agreed to. Beyond that we have not asked any authority from Parliament.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister to kindly give his attention to the suggestion I made to appropriate about $5,000 for clearing the River Scugog from Lindsay to Sturgeon Lake. It is absolutely necessary, for steamers cannot pass up and down with safety.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) has in his mind the work which has been undertaken by the provincial government of Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES. Not at all. I understand it thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a small item which we are going to present to the House with respect to some further work on the Scugog River.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 35) for the relief of Albert Nordheimer.—(Mr. Lount.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Trent Canal—To build a fishway at Lindsay $500

Mr. BENNETT. I heard with regret the announcement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that it was not the intention of the Government to carry out what they had for years advocated while in opposition, or, at any rate, what they had certainly acquiesced in, and that was the adoption of the principle that this Trent Valley Canal should be carried to a completion at an early date. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the debates of last year, he will find that, when the large contracts which were then announced to be let—two contracts, each approximating half a million dollars, namely, the section between Lakefield and Peterborough, and the portion between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake—hon. gentlemen opposite then offered no resistance or demur to such grants being made or contracts being entered into. Not only that, but, from time to time, it was openly advocated in this House by supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this work should be carried out, and, in this connection, I particularly refer to Mr. Barron, who had the honour of representing North Victoria in this House some five years ago. If I understood the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals rightly, his position in the matter was this, that he brought to the subject an unbiassed and unprejudiced opinion, that he had not looked into the matter until recently, and was not conversant with the proposition of constructing this canal, but that, being affected by reports which he heard, opposed to the construction of this canal, he was at present, while not impressed against it, by no means in favour of it. Let me say, in reply, in the first place, that the construction of this work has been before Parliament for a great many years, that on all occasions it has had no opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite, that, moreover, within the past ten years large deputations have from time to time, irrespective of politics, pressed upon the Government the early completion of this work. Even at the risk of wearying the House, I shall go briefly into a description of the enterprise, as it has in the past been depicted, and on which representations the Government have been pleased, from time to time, to make large appropriations, which have always been endorsed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The canal is not by any means wholly an artificial way, because there are large stretches of natural waterways utilized in its construction. There is, first Lake Simcoe, which is a very considerable sheet of water. Then, there is Cameron Lake, a lake of very considerable extent. When you pass Cameron Lake and Rice Lake, you find a waterway infinitely superior to the Erie Canal, with which this canal has often been contrasted. If it is borne in mind that at present all grain carried from the northern lakes, from Port Arthur and Chicago, is carried either to Kingston or Buffalo, then it must be seen that the completion of this work would mean a much shorter route than either of the other two. By passing down this chain of lakes and rivers, through central Ontario, one arrives at the town of Trenton, and from there grain would be carried on further to the port of Montreal. The interchange of grain would be made at some point on the Georgian Bay. On the other hand, if the other route be pursued, the route by way of Lake Erie and St. Clair, then there is a change at Buffalo into canal boats of even smaller dimensions than the boats which would ply this proposed route. The hon. gentleman, being open to conviction as to the feasibility or desirability of the canal, and the hon. gentleman knowing, as he will by reference to his colleagues, that they have in the past approved of the large expenditure that has been made, surely it cannot be anticipated that, after this large expenditure of a million dollars has been made, after mile upon mile of waterways have been brought together by the construction of the locks, he will allow the whole thing to be thrown back on the country and abandoned. If he objects on the plea of expenditure, then I can only say that the Estimates which have been brought down, certainly contain large expenditures in respect of works which are of a purely local character, such as the improvement of harbours by dredging, the construction and improvement of docks at different points, and it would be better public policy and manifestly better in the public interests that a large grant should be given to go on with this canal, especially as so large an amount has been expended on it already. May I, therefore, ask that the hon. Minister of Railways, who brings to this question an unprejudiced opinion, will consult with his colleagues, and even now, in the remaining days of the session, be pleased to recommend in the extra supplementary Estimates a grant of at least $200,000 to complete the section between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe, which has not yet been let for tender? The approaching season of the year is one that will be particularly adapted for work of this nature. I may tell the hon. gentleman also that in that portion of the country, owing to the fact that very little business is being done in the lumber woods this year, there is a large number of unemployed men who could be utilized in a work of this kind. If this portion of the work is let under contract between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe, the result will be the completion of the work in its entirety from all points on Lake Simcoe to the town of Peterborough, and, while that will not

have the effect of promoting or stimulating the grain traffic from the upper to the lower lake, it will have the effect of opening up through the back townships a large portion of country that at present is served by one railway company alone. At Peterborough, Barrie and Orillia and other towns along the route there are large tanneries; and if access can be had to the back townships, the work of taking out tanbark and timber will be greatly stimulated. I trust that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, seeing that his colleagues have in past acquiesced in and approved this expenditure, and seeing that such a large amount has already been spent, will not drop the work at this time, but that a sufficient amount will be placed in the Estimates for this year to ensure the completion of the work through to Lake Simcoe. I trust that hon. gentlemen who are politically in accord with the hon. Minister will press this matter to a speedy completion, and not be content with trifling grants for mere intermediate and local matters, such as the only estimate relating to this work that we now have before us.

Mr. ROGERS. I have no personal knowledge about the matter, but I desire to communicate to the House a view of this matter that was given to me on pretty good authority. The history of the Trent Valley Canal is pretty well known throughout the country, and the general feeling is that it involves a nearly worthless expenditure of public money. I was speaking with a gentleman who had taken a prominent part in the political contests in one of the counties on the route of this canal, but whose name I will not mention unless I am obliged to do so. It was felt that the constituency would go against the Government, and a number of the leading gentlemen gathered at Peterborough to consider what scheme they could put forward to carry that constituency. It struck them that if they could bring some influence to bear upon the Government and induce them to promise a certain amount of money for this canal, they might carry the riding. They themselves laughed at the idea of the scheme being of any use, but they thought they would try the effect of it politically. They formed a deputation and came to Ottawa and secured a grant of money; and, on the strength of the great boom that was to come to that section of the country and the amount of money that was to be spent, they carried the constituency.

Mr. BENNETT. Which constituency does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. ROGERS. The constituency in the vicinity of Peterborough. The gentleman who told me was a reliable and responsible man, I can assure you?

Mr. WALLACE. What was the name of the constituency?

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. ROGERS. It was back of Peterborough. This gentleman said that the canal never could me made workable.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us by which party this was done, as both parties favoured this expenditure?

Mr. KENDRY. I am very much surprised that any hon. member of the House should speak as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has spoken. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the Peterboroughs were not carried by this canal. This work was done with the approval of both sides of the House, and both Conservatives and Reformers came here by the hundreds in deputation to press upon the Government the necessity of this work. I may inform the hon. gentleman that the amount expended on this canal, including the amount now appropriated, is nearly $1,000,000. Gentlemen on the other side have advocated this scheme as strongly as we have on this side of the House, and I am surprised that any hon. gentleman should make the charge that this expenditure is merely for political purposes. The scheme has been for the public benefit, and I hope the Minister of Railways will see his way clear to proposing in the Estimates in the future a sufficient amount to complete the canal. The work is under construction between Lakefield and Peterborough. We have spent so much money that we ought to go on and complete this canal. It is absurd to say that this work is carried on for political purposes, for both sides were represented in the deputations which came here and members on both sides favour the scheme. I believe the hon. member who represents North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is an advocate of this scheme, as are other gentlemen who represent constituencies along the line. What we want is the connection with the lake. I consider that when completed this canal will be as important to the province of Ontario as is the Erie Canal to the state of New York. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) who last spoke is a farmer, and is supposed to be the special representative of the farmers. If any class is to be more benefited by this canal than another it is the farming community. I simply rose to express my surprise at such utterances as those of the hon. gentleman, and to impress upon the Minister of Railways and Canals the importance of placing in the Estimates a sufficient sum to continue this work.

Mr. McHUGH. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendry) might well have been satisfied with the statement made before dinner by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). That gentleman said that he would go over the route and would judge for himself where expenditure could be made to the best advantage. This canal is a gigantic work, and will be of great im-

portance to the country through which it passes. The scheme became discredited throughout the country because it came to be looked upon—as I heard a candidate in one of these constituencies say—as a political barometer; it was said that people knew when the elections were coming on by the increased activity in connection with this scheme. I feel satisfied that the hon. gentlemen who have this matter in hand will not make political use of it, but will proceed with the construction if found advisable, having in view only the best interests of the country at large.

Farran's Point Canal $27,500

Mr. REID. What depth of water is there now at Point Avoyon?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I believe the depth is seven feet.

Mr. REID. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister again to the necessity of proceeding with the Galops Canal. Vessels going westward from Montreal, and drawing nine feet of water, can reach Iroquois when this point is dredged to nine feet, but after they get to Iroquois, with the low water we have had for some time, it will be impossible to get up through that canal. At the present time there is only about seven or seven and a half feet of water between the Cardinal lock and the head of the canal; therefore, if this work is not proceeded with, vessels cannot go any further westward than that canal drawing over seven feet of water. I understood from the Minister last night that the Government have not decided yet whether they will go on with that work. They withdrew the tenders that were called for in June last, and if this work is not proceeded with at an early date, there will be a delay of another year. This winter is likely to be a hard one, and there is not much prospect of good times, there is likely to be a lot of men out of work, and I think it would be well at present to start this work. I would like the hon. Minister to say definitely whether he intends doing anything at this work during the coming winter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I have stated the general principle by which I felt I ought to be guided in the matter of all these extensions. So far as this particular work is concerned, we do not propose to ask any further appropriation this session; I am speaking now particularly of this part of the system, Farran's Point Canal. We do not propose to ask for any further appropriation than has already been given by the House, or is now in the Estimates.

Rapide Plat Canal $23,000

Mr. REID. Is this the Morrisburg lock, the lock in the old canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is.

Galops Canal $14,000

Mr. REID. This is the canal to which I drew the Minister's attention. If none of the amounts that are in the general Estimates or in the supplementaries are to be applied to the new work to be proceeded with, I would like to urge upon the hon. gentleman the necessity of placing an amount in the additional supplementaries for that purpose. Tenders were called for this work by the late Government. It is very necessary that it should be proceeded with. It is well known that the St. Lawrence route is the natural route for all grain that comes from Chicago and other western points. If this work is not at once proceeded with there will be a delay of another year. A great quantity of grain from western points now goes through the Erie Canal, whereas if we had fourteen feet of water through to Montreal, there is no question that a great deal of that grain would go through the St. Lawrence route. Now, when we consider how small is the piece of work that is yet to be done, every year of delay is a very serious matter to the people throughout the Dominion. I earnestly hope that the Minister will consider this matter, and place an amount in the additional supplementaries.

Iroquois Canal $5,000

Mr. BRODER. I would like to ask the Minister if we are to understand that the work on the Iroquois Canal enlargement is not to be proceeded with this year. The late Government asked for tenders, but I understand they were afterwards withdrawn. The water in the river last season, and this season, is so low as to make the enlargement almost an absolute necessity. I regret to see that it is apparently proposed to drop the enlargement for the present.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certain works will be prosecuted under grants that were obtained in the main Estimates. The hon. member, by referring to them, will see what expenditures we propose under those estimates for the several divisions of these canals. The present vote is simply being asked for to make certain repairs, which will be paid out of income, forming no part of the general expenditure upon capital account.

Mr. REID. I asked the Minister that question a few moments ago. Now, that work is part of the canal I am speaking about, and I understood the hon. gentleman to say there was nothing in the main Estimates for that work. Now I understand him to say that there is something for it in the main Estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member misunderstood me, for I did not say that. I was not speaking of any grant that had been procured under the main Estimates at all. I do not propose to withhold the prosecution of any

work which we have had authority under those grants to carry on. I presumed that it was in the mind of the hon. member that we had obtained, in respect to the Galops Canal, a large sum of $150,000 for the further enlargement of the canal. I thought he was urging that in addition to the sums which we have already procured, we should bring down further Estimates. I have said over and over again that I do not feel we are in a position to do that, and I cannot hold out any prospect to hon. members that there will be any sums included in the further Supplementary Estimates for such a purpose. We have gone as far as I feel we are able to do in the appropriations we have already asked for.

Welland Canal $11,500

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if the policy of the Government is the same as the policy of the late Government with reference to the building and repairs of bridges. As an example of the policy of the late Government in this respect, I may cite the building of the railway bridge across the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. When I took charge of the department, I found that the plans for that bridge had been approved by the engineer in charge of the works, submitted to the Canadian Pacific Railway whose railway crossed the bridge, reported on by the department, approved by the chief engineer of the department, and sanctiond by an Order in Council of my predecessor. Under these circumstances I thought it was my duty to let the contract, and so the bridge over the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was built. I was not aware that that was an obstruction to navigation until I went up there, and saw the bridge after it was built. As political head of the department I took the report of my officers as to the proper manner in which the bridge should be built, and it was built according to their plans and specifications. The responsibility is on the head of the department, but the Minister in charge was obliged to take the recommendations his officers made to him, and on those recommendations the work was carried out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where is this raceway that is to be renewed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is at Welland.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman desire to increase the water power there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No ; this money is for the purpose of repairing the raceway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have any new leases been recently given there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recall that there have been any granted, but I can procure that information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. HACKETT. The Government has asked the House to vote large sums of money for building canals, and I would ask the Minister of Railways whether it is his intention to carry out the building of the tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. It is a most important work to the whole Dominion, and it would to a great extent facilitate travel between the mainland and the Island. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) place an amount in the Estimates to carry out this work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sure that the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) does not harbour any personal feeling of enmity against me, and I would entreat him to ask me something easier than that.

Mr. HACKETT. That is a pretty poor answer. This is an important work. It is a work that has been entered upon by the Government of this country and borings have gone on there for some years. I ask the hon. gentleman seriously if it is the intention to prosecute this work ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the Minister propose to do any work this year at Port Maitland ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not at all certain, but possibly that work may be included in some of the Estimates. If it is not, then it is not in contemplation to do any work there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It might come under the general vote for canals. I might say, for information of the Minister, that it is at the mouth of the Grand River to which the branch of a feeder of the Welland Canal runs. Has the hon. gentleman any information with regard to the construction of a new bridge or the renewal of the old bridge across the Grand River at Dunnville? The brdge is in very bad condition, being patched up in every possible way, and the construction of a new bridge there is absolutely necessary. Last year the very high water damaged the bridge very much. I am positive that it was the intention of the Government to construct a new bridge there. If the hon. gentleman visits that section he will see that the work is badly needed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no general vote for canals, and the appropriations that have been granted have all been specific. There was a small grant of $5,000 for improvements on the Welland Canal, and that is the only vote which would apply to the Welland on capital account. I have not been advised that the bridge is in the condition which the hon. member states, and I think I am safe in saying that in the Estimates prepared by the gentleman who preceded me in the department, there was no sum allotted for that work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We need not discuss that, because the point I desire to make is to call the attention of the Minister to it. I suppose we are not far from another session of Parliament, and I hope the hon. gentleman will secure a report with reference to the bridge. If he finds it in the condition I have represented, I am sure he will take the necessary steps to renew it.

Harbours and Rivers, Ontario—Improvement of Collingwood Harbour..... $20,000

Mr. BENNETT. About two weeks ago, when an item of $2,500 in the main Estimates was being considered, for improvement of the piers at Collingwood harbour, the Minister of Public Works, in answer to an inquiry, stated that works were contemplated at Collingwood which would involve an expenditure of $200,000, but that it was not intended to undertake that expenditure this year. I now beg to ask whether this $20,000 is in respect of the contemplated works, to cost $200,000, and, if so, have contracts been let for the expenditure of the $200,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This sum of $20,000 is asked for to begin work in the important harbour of Collingwood. The estimated cost of the work, as my hon. friend says, is about $200,000. We intend beginning the work as soon as possible. In the month of January last, the late Government asked for tenders, and two tenders were received; but nothing was done in regard to them, and I thought it best to send the two tenderers their cheques.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be interesting to know whether this expenditure is to be undertaken on the general plan outlined by the Government engineer for the improvement of this harbour, so as to afford the proper width and depth of water for carrying on the necessary navigation there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The note I have is to the effect that this amount is required to carry out works of improvement, consisting of dredging a twenty-foot channel into the harbour from the twenty-foot line outside to the wharf. Before asking for new tenders, I think I shall have to have a new survey made. I will look into the question carefully before incurring any expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand the hon. Minister, he contemplates making this expenditure along that line.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that the town of Collingwood proposed to contribute a certain sum of money, and the Grand Trunk Railway a certain sum, on condition that the Government would make certain expenditures. Do I understand that this $20,000 is with a view to accepting the larger proposition ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. This expenditure will be made, of course, subject to all the conditions. If I remember rightly, the town of Collingwood has offered $25,000, and the Northern Railway the sum of $28,000.

Mr. REID. Is this $20,000 for any other work than dredging—any wharfs or anything of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has not yet answered my question. Perhaps he misunderstood me. Are tenders to be called for $200,000 worth of work at once, or is this $20,000 to be expended for a work independent of that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. What I said was that tenders have already been called for and received. Of course, these tenders were made on certain plans. We do not pledge ourselves to spend $200,000, or any other sum of money. We have plans before us for certain works, but I say again, before going into these works, I will carefully revise the plans, and then ask for tenders.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. Minister is wrong in saying that the Northern Railway has offered $20,000. The offer that has been made is that the Grand Trunk Railway and the town of Collingwood, between them, will contribute $25,000. The last Government accepted that offer, and agreed with the town of Collingwood that, if the town would pay the $25,000, this large Government work, which the Government engineer estimated would cost $200,000, but which I believe has been tendered for at a much less sum, would be done. In pursuance of that agreement, the town of Collingwood, having raised the $25,000, last spring proceeded to expend a portion of that money in removing boulders and other obstructions in the harbour. What I understand the Minister to say is, that he will either accept one of the tenders in now, or have a new survey made and call for new tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What depth of water has the harbour now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could really not tell, as my chief engineer is not here now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand it is down to rock bottom.

Mr. McCARTHY. The rock bottom does not extend very far. The principal part of the bottom is hard-pan, and not rock.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not object to this vote because I know that the important town

of Collingwood is a great centre, but I would ask whether there will be any estimate in the further supplementals for the town of Owen Sound, or is that to be given to what the Hon. Mr. Hardy called "cold justice?"

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a very large sum for that town voted in the main Estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. If the statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe is correct, the town of Collingwood is spending at present some of the money which it offered to give the Government, and upon their spending the money, there would be no conditions at all attached to the contract afterwards that the town or railway should contribute any part of the expenditure.

Mr. McCARTHY. This money, which is being now expended and which is not a very large sum, is on account of the $25,000, and the Order in Council which was passed when the hon. gentleman was a member of the Administration, provided that whatever was expended during this summer was to be credited to the town of Collingwood on account of that $25,000. But the arrangement still stands.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that the arrangement which was finally adopted was that in the meantime the Government should do some dredging, and that for the removal of boulders, &c., the town should go on and spend money, and the Government should go on to a certain extent with dredging.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the Government were doing nothing. The town has been going on.

Mr. BENNETT. We are as far from understanding this as we were at the outset. What the Minister of Finance said a couple of weeks ago was this, that the department proposed to undertake to expend an amount of $200,000 at Collingwood harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We cannot pledge ourselves to spend $200,000. We pledge ourselves to do the work necessary and will do it for less if we can.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it proposed to undertake the work in this fashion? $20,000 will now be voted by Parliament. When that is expended, you will ask for a further grant. If that is to be the case, I contend that where the expenditure is to be so large as contemplated, $200,000, it would be a business-like arrangement to have the specifications placed before Parliament and ask for so much money and have that money allowed and the work proceeded with. Is the $20,000 part and parcel of the $200,000 contemplated to be spent on the work, or is it for something else?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is intended to form part of the $200,000, and my hon. friend knows that the late Ministry asked for tenders. I presume the specifications and plans were then before Parliament.

Mr. REID. According to the tenders, you expect that this work will cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000 and the $20,000 will only go on account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have stated, over and over again, that I do not know what the cost of the work will be. We are going to call for tenders, unless we accept the tenders that have already been sent in.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount tendered for the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that it would be in the public interest to give the prices tendered.

Mr. REID. Was there any security taken from the town or railway that the amounts they are to pay will be paid?

Mr. McCARTHY. The town will be prepared to put up its amount before the work is commenced, and so will the railway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand, from the answer the Minister of Railways gave, that no further sums are to be voted this year for Owen Sound harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I can give away state secrets.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I took it the hon. Minister of Railways spoke for all the departments when he said the Government could not go any further this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He spoke for himself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not for you, and you may go a little further.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may, but I cannot tell.

River St. Lawrence ship channel $3,101 39

Mr. REID. What is the depth of the water there now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twenty-seven feet at the lowest.

Mr. REID. What will this expenditure make it up to?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay old accounts.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that money to be spent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has already been spent between Sorel and Montreal, and this is to pay the old account.

Nanaimo Harbour, B.C.—Improvement of south channel $10,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. It will be within the recollection of the Minister of Public Works that the present leader of the Government

made a very pleasant and, as it turned out, rather profitable trip to the Pacific Coast, and when he was addressing a meeting in that province, I think he called very decidedly the attention of his auditors to the very serious obstructions that there were at the entrance of Vancouver harbour. I do not see any vote here for the removal of these obstructions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what the leader of the Government may have said, but I am sure he made good speeches out there. This is a very useful work. We are going to dredge the harbour, which, as my hon. friend knows, is an important one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like an answer with regard to Vancouver harbour, because it is stated by the leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) when he was leader of the Opposition that the obstruction there was very dangerous to the shipping, and in his glowing periods he held up the late Government to ridicule as not being alive to the public needs because they did not remove this obstruction. Has the hon. Minister of Public Works taken steps to inquire into the correctness of his leader's statements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has not been called to my attention in this connection. When I have more leisure, I will read it carefully and will try to profit by any good lessons that it contains.

Mr. REID. Does the hon. gentleman intend to ask for tenders for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have already a dredge there and we think it is more profitable to do the work with our own dredge.

Public works and buildings chargeable to income—Quebec Post Office $155 35

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask if this is all that is to be expended this year on the Quebec post office. As I stated the other day, that post office is in a bad state of repair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay an amount due for work already done.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Can the hon. Minister tell me whether anything further is to be done, or is that a state secret also ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not a state secret. I am glad to be able to say that there is an amount of $2,500 to make the repairs to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. REID. Does the hon. gentleman intend to ask for tenders for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Coaticook Public Building $1,287

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I am requested by an hon. member who is not able to be present to ask for an explanation with reference to this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the 25th of June, 1896, an order was given by the late Minister of Public Works for certain repairs to the public building at Coaticook. These repairs were made and we are bound to pay for them. The late hon. Minister gave this order on a telegram from the late Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) asking that the repairs be made.

Public works and buildings chargeable to Income—Ontario—Dominion Public Buildings—Improvements, renewals, repairs, &c..... $6,096 48

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister tell us for what buildings this amount is asked ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for work done at Belleville, Brockville, Brampton, Cayuga, Chatham, Gananoque, Goderich, Galt, Hamilton, London, Lindsay, Napanee, Pembroke, Smith's Falls, Stratford, St. Thomas, Toronto—a pretty large amount in Toronto—Walkerton and Windsor.

Public works and buildings chargeable to income—North-west Territories, Regina Government House, to pay for site..... $1,590

Mr. SPROULE. Is it probable that the site for this Government House has not been paid for until this late day ? I thought we had an item a year or two ago to pay this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site was bought from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but never was paid for, and we are bound to pay it.

Mr. SPROULE. If it has not been paid for, of course this amount must be voted. My recollection is that we had an item in the Estimates one or two years ago to pay for this site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No ; there has never been such an item.

Public buildings, Ottawa, including ventilation and lighting, repairs, materials, furniture, &c.. .. .. $12,252 19

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us more particularly what this vote is for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). First, it is to cover the amount of a special warrant obtained from His Excellency on the 18th of August, 1896, to pay the wages up to the 1st of July, of certain employees in the Public Works Department, the Government shops, whose services were dispensed with at the end of July, 1896, the appropriation for the year

1895-96 having proved to be insufficient. The warrant was for $2,333. When I took office, I asked my officers to make a report to me of the employees who were wanted and the employees who were not wanted, and I found there was a certain number of men, seventy-five all told, who were not wanted, and I dispensed with their services, of course, before doing so, I had to pay them their wages. The second item is for outstanding accounts for work done, material supplied, &c., in connection with the public buildings at Ottawa, in 1895-96, together with the wages due the workmen retained after the 1st of July, 1896, for services rendered previous to that date, amounting to $9,919. I have here a long list of accounts in my hand, which I will read if the committee desires.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman speak of the first item, or is he mixing it up with subsequent items? Because the first item has nothing to do with wages, but with ventilation, lighting, repairs, &c.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The item covers that.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that an officer in his department reported that these parties were not wanted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it the same officer who reported to the preceding Minister that these men were necessary?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have under my hand a list of the men.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not want a list of the men. I suppose these parties were not employed by the preceding Minister unless upon a report by the officer in his department that they were necessary. I wish to know if it is the same officer who reported subsequently that this large number of employees were not necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that so far as I have been able to ascertain, a great number of men had been employed in the Department of Public Works against the will of my officers. Not only this amount I have asked for, but another amount of $1,700, were spent during the last election upon work for which there was no appropriation, and, I say, against the will of my officers, so far as I have been able to ascertain, and without any recommendation from certain of my officers. I cannot say more than that, I have not been long in the department; but I can say this, that the men who were discharged were not wanted at the time their services were dispensed with.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman knows that it is only on a report of the officer that these men are necessary that the amount is paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot vouch for what took place when my hon. friend was in the office, I vouch only for what I have done myself. What I have done is this: I asked for a statement and a report from the heads of each branch in my department of all the men that were employed, and of those whose services were not needed.

Mr. HAGGART. We don't want to hear that, it is only the principle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know on what principle they were employed.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman states that his officer told him that there were many parties employed for whom there was no necessity, and that he advised the Minister to discharge them. But the hon. gentleman knows that not one of these men could be paid until the officer had signed a certificate that they were necessary, and that the amount had been earned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that these men were under the supervision of Mr. Ewart, in the architect's department.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must withdraw his statement. He says that his predecessor employed men who were unnecessary, that the head of his department reported to him that they were unnecessary. I want to know if it was the same officer who was responsible for their employment in the first place, and who certified that the amount paid them was due.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I have said, and what I repeat, is this, and it is true: when I took office I asked for a statement from my officers, and they informed me that the men, a list of whose names I hold in my hand, were no longer necessary. I did not state anything further than that.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask my hon. friend at what time was that statement made by his officer upon which he dispensed with the services of these men?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it was at the end of July, a few days after we came into office.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, then, does not my hon. friend make the whole statement? He is involved in one of two contradictions. Either he is stating something to the House which conveys a wrong representation of the facts of the case, simply because it is not all; or he has an officer who is willing to certify at one time that certain men are necessary and at other times that they are not necessary. It is impossible to get pay for a single man until the pay sheets are pro-

perly certified to by the responsible officer of the hon. gentleman's department. Now, if these are in the architect's branch, I suppose it is the chief architect who has to certify that these men are necessary, and have performed their work. Now, with respect to these men, and under equal conditions, will my hon. friend say that the very same officer at one time reported that they were necessary and at another time reported that they were not? Or is not this the fact? That as no estimates were voted last year, and on the 1st July, 1896, as there was no money to pay these men, and no money to buy material upon which these men had to work; therefore at that particular time the officer might say that these men had no work to do and were not necessary; simply because the appropriation not having been made the material was not there for them to work upon. I remember the Minister of the department at that time having consulted myself with reference to some of the workmen, and he told me he had no money to buy material and consequently there was nothing for them to do. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) say to the House, whether this very same officer, under equal conditions, in one month said that these were necessary, and in the next month said that they were surplus men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not responsible for what the officer may have said before I took office. I am responsible only for what he told me, and for what I have ascertained since to be the truth. The truth is, that a great many men were employed who were not necessary. I will not say more than that, and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should not push me too far.

Mr. FOSTER. Take out all you have in your sleeve. Let us have the whole of it. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) must not play the trick in this House of holding cards up his sleeve that he can let fall whenever he likes to. Let them all out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) keep cool. He has lost his temper many times since the session commenced. I suppose he does not like the atmosphere on the Opposition side of the House. He should set a better example to us new members. I will keep cool he may be sure. Now, about his remark as to letting little things fall, my hon. friend should be more manly. If he has something more definite to say about the matter, he should say it. We are here face to face, and I ask him has he anything to say about me. Has he got any accusation to bring against me. If he has let him say so like a man.

Mr. FOSTER. Keep cool.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will keep very cool.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) misunderstood me, and I will tell him a little more plainly what I meant. In the press and on the public platform, for the last three or four years my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), beside making certain disclosures has always kept a sort of reserve arsenal partly open, and he has told his audience: I have made a partial disclosure and I can tell lots more, but I won't just now. What I meant by saying that my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) may have cards up his sleeve now was, that he may have that threat holding over the House. Don't hold it over us, please. Let us know all that you know.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have managed to do the best I could in the press in the past, and my friend did not find out that I was such a bad newspaper man after all. I am about the same as I was; improved a little perhaps. I will try to say everything I can for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) because he has forgotten a great many things; Orders in Council, for instance, to which he was a party. I repeat, when I took office I asked for a statement from the officers, and the chief architect gave me the names which I hold in my hand, of seventy-five men who were not wanted. I dispensed with their services, I paid them, and everything is going on well without them. I cannot say more than that.

Mr. REID. Were these 75 men whom the Minister discharged all the men on the repair staff, or are there still some remaining on the repair staff?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have still 55 or so men who are now doing the work.

Mr. REID. Have you taken on any since you discharged these 75 men?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I did not take on any of them.

Mr. REID. But, did you take on any new men?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not one new man.

Mr. REID. Does the Minister expect that these 75 men will be able to do the repairs for the next year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope even to be able to dispense with a greater number of men. I cannot say where precisely, but the reports that have come in are to the effect that I can safely dispense with the services of some other men.

Mr. REID. If the Minister finds that he will require more help, will he give a first chance to some of those he has laid off?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a fair question and I am prepared to answer it fairly. Among the men who

were dismissed, there are very good men against whom there is not the shadow of an accusation, and I will certainly make it my duty to take these men back if I want any men. I will do it with pleasure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it out of this vote that these men are paid? I understood they were paid out of contingencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These men were employed in the public buildings here, and that is a reason we have put the item under that head.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the Governor General's warrant which was used to pay these men is included in the first item?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. HAGGART. On concurrence on this item, I would like to have the report of the officer upon which these men were paid, and also the report on which the Minister acted in dismissing these men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down the report with pleasure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know when the men came into the service who are considered not to be now required, but in view of the statement made by the Minister as to the services of men being dispensed with in the architect's branch, I want to call attention to the state of affairs in 1892 when the chief architect was examined under oath before the Civil Service Commission. He was asked this question:

Q. Have you any suggestion to make whereby the expenditure of your branch of the department could be reduced without impairing its efficiency?

A. I think our branch of the department is about as economical a department as any in the Government. I submit a statement which I prepared for the Minister showing the cost of employing outside architects to do the work as compared with the cost of doing it by the staff. I have on my actual drawing staff only two more clerks than there were on the staff in 1871, when there was not one-third, certainly not one-half the work there is now.

The further evidence seems to show that at any rate in 1892, that branch of the Minister's department was not overmanned. I think that important in view of the misapprehension that at first was caused by the statement of the Minister, that there were a great many men in that department whose services were not required. It is quite consistent with the interests of the public, that men have been on who were required, and men have been discharged who are no longer required.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) should not lose sight of the fact that he has quoted part of a report in which the chief architect was dealing with his own staff.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the chief architect's branch.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes; but the men whose services have been dispensed with were employed in the workshops. They were under the care of the chief architect, but cannot be classified as being on his staff.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope my hon. friend will be able to tell me now that he has reinstated Mr. J. K. Lambert.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I told my hon. friend that when I had a little time I would look into the case of his friend, in whom he takes so much interest, and I will do it.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say that it is not in the interest of my friend alone that I am speaking. I am also looking after the interest of the court-house. What I want to point out to my hon. friend, and what his architect will tell him, is this, that no experience of public buildings in the east will enable a man to judge what is necessary to be done in regard to a public building in the Territories. The least neglect in regard to frost at the beginning of the winter may ruin a building completely, because if the frost gets under the building it will lift it like a match box. This man was an experienced man, there is nothing against him, and my hon. friend has been really deceived in regard to him. I have no complaint to make of the way in which my hon. friend has received my representations, and I hope he will reinstate this man.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to be kind enough to give the names of those who have been dismissed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will do so.

LIST OF EMPLOYEES DISCHARGED, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

CHIEF ENGINEER'S BRANCH.

J.A.Chabot, Ottawa,	$	2.00	per d.	31st	July.
N. Moffet	do	2.75	do	31st	do
E. Smith	do	3.00	do	31st	do
J. H. Roy	do	2.75	do	31st	do
H. J. Friel	do	3.00	do	31st	do
Joseph Aubé	do	3.00	do	31st	August.
Israel Marion	do	2.75	do	31st	do
H. F. Perley	do	215.00	per m.	31st	do
J. A. Tremblay, below Quebec		4.00	per. d.	31st	do
M. Lamontagne, Levis, (dock)		83.33	per m.	31st	do
John Connell, Sorel		60.00	do	31st	do
L. T. Dorais	do	125.00	do	31st	do

SECRETARY'S BRANCH.

G. Marsan, Ottawa,	$1.50 per d.	31st August.
J.B.H. Benard, Ottawa,	1.00 do	31st July.
J. Delaney do	1.50 do	31st August.
E. Aubé do	2.00 do	31st July.
H. Girard do	1.50 do	31st August.

ACCOUNTANT'S BRANCH.

H. Lyon. Ottawa,	$ 1.75 per d.	31st do
J. Woolsely do	2.50 do	31st do
Chas. Leduc, Ottawa River Works,	100.00 per m.	31st July.

ARCHITECT'S BRANCH.

E. A. Mara, Ottawa,	$95.00 per m.	31st August.
T. P. Morin do	55.00 do	31st do
J U. Bray do	1.50 per d.	31st do
E. Pelletier	45.00 per m.	31st do

CHIEF ENGINEER'S BRANCH, (Outside service).

P. Hurley, Kingston, (dock), $45 00 per m. 8th August.

Raph. Lajoie, St. Maurice Works, Shawenegan, $33.33 per m., 9th September.

ARCHITECT'S BRANCH, (Outside Service).

George McLeod, Three Rivers Custom House, $25.00 per m., 1st September.

A. P. Lepine, Quebec, Clerk of Works, $1,100 per annum, 5th August.

The following mechanics and labourers were discharged on the 1st August, from the workshops, Ottawa :—

	Per day.
J. Laurencelle, carpenter	$2 00
J. Ringland "	2 00
R. Shipman "	2 00
Thos. Fitzgerald "	2 00
E. Sampson "	2 00
L. Robinson "	2 00
V. Valiquette "	2 00
Thos. Collins "	2 00
A. Joubarne "	2 00
J. Leclaire "	2 00
G. Easdaile "	2 00
J. Gaulin "	2 00
J. B. G. Samson "	2 00
O. Labelle, mason	2 50
J. Brown "	2 50
J. W. Newton, painter	2 00
J. Cyr "	2 00
L. Pelletier "	2 00
A. Langlois "	2 00
J. Keays "	2 00
A. Digner "	2 00
N. Arial "	2 00
V. Auclaire "	2 00
J. B. Arial, carter	2 00
C. Lavigne, labourer	1 50
C. Cantin "	1 50
E. Blais "	1 50
P. Piché "	1 25
R. Beaumont "	1 25
P. Roy "	1 25
G. Mathieu "	1 25
A. Mathieu "	1 25
C. Rodrigue "	1 25
J. Gagnon "	1 25
E. Lapointe "	1 25
J. B. Paré "	1 25
F. Rollin "	1 25
Chas. Dufresne "	1 25
N. Larue "	1 25
E. Roy "	1 25
P. Daoust, labourer	$1 25
G. Guertin "	1 25
M. A. Laframboise, labourer	1 25
M. Morel, labourer	1 25
J. B. Boileau "	1 25
J. Byrne "	1 25
J. Millaire "	1 25
T. Sarazin "	1 25
Jas. Carty "	1 25
P. R. Valiquette "	1 25
F. St. Jacques "	1 25
A. Guindon "	1 25
A. Dumoulin "	1 25
N. Lelievre "	1 25
A. Vaillancourt "	1 25
E. G. Morin "	1 25
W. Parks "	1 25
A. Leblanc "	1 25
J. B. Trepanier "	1 25
H. Decoeur "	1 25
O. Sauvé "	1 25
A. Mainville "	1 25
N. Gammon "	1 25
E. Sigouin "	1 25
A. Delcorde "	1 25
G. Turner "	1 25
G. O'Gorman "	1 25
M. Charrier "	1 25
F. X. Dumouchelle, labourer	1 25
J. Gravel, labourer	1 25
A. Boutet "	1 25
A. Bouchard "	1 25
A. Leduc "	1 25
C. N. Poirier "	1 25

List of men discharged at Sorel during July last :

	Per day.
Arthur Langlade, fitter	$2 00
F. X. A. Paradis "	1 50
Ernest Fecteau "	1 50
Joseph Bibeau "	1 25
L. Noé Henault "	1 25
Charles Lefebvre, helper	1 00
Pierre Champagne "	1 00
Ernest Merry "	0 90
Paul Cournoyer "	1 00
Michel Antaya "	1 00
Ovide Brunette, blacksmith	1 50
Adelard Champagne "	0 90
Regis Prudhomme "	1 25
Ovide Mongeon, boiler maker	1 50
Duncan Wilkie "	2 00
Alfred Champagne "	1 25
Paul Cournoyer, helper	1 00
James Merry "	1 00
Moise Deblois "	1 00
John Robideux "	1 00
Napoleon Beloquin "	1 00
Joseph Deschamps "	1 00
Robert Wilkie, rivet heater	0 50
Hector Joly, labourer	0 80
J. B. Guevrement "	0 80
Pierre Cournoyer, fils, labourer	0 80
Adelard Lapointe, labourer	0 80
Xavier Paulet, carpenter	2 00
Colbert Paulet "	2 00
Pierre Paulet "	1 60
J. B. Gagné "	1 50
Joseph Leclair "	1 50
Hubert Champagne "	1 50
Adelart Guilbault "	1 50
Wm. Robillard "	1 50
Edouard Cournoyer "	1 40
Adelard Sivigny "	1 40
Paul Paulet "	1 40
Godias Mathieu "	1 40
Nazaire Fleury "	1 40

Alex. Gagné,	carpenter	$1 40
Frs. Cournoyer	"	1 25
Toussaint Courchène	"	1 00
Wm. Ducharme,	painter.....	1 80
Frs. Cournoyer,	borer	0 85
Arsène Fleury,	foreman.....	1 50
Nazaire Peloquin,	carpenter.....	1 40
Pierre Blette	"	1 40
Paul Gadbois	"	1 40
Thade. Cournoyer	"	1 25
Joseph Cournoyer,	labourer.....	0 80
Xavier Chevrier	"	0 80
Alex. Joly	"	0 80
Elie Champagne	"	0 80
Napoleon Bergeron	"	0 80
Noel Aubuchon	"	0 80
Dormino Peloquin	"	0 80
Pierre Laprade	"	0 80
Pierre Cournoyer	"	0 80
Pierre Millette	"	0 80
Joseph St. Pierre	"	0 80
F. X. Laviolette	"	0 80
Arsène Pelland	"	0 80
Joseph Tancrede	"	0 80
Pierre Peloquin	"	0 80
Pierre Peloquin, père	"	0 80
David Pontbriand,	pumper.....	0 80
Louis Peloquin,	carter	1 50

Mr. BERGERON. I understand these are all employed in the workshops here ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and at Sorel.

Mr. BERGERON. Can my hon. friend say altogether how many men have been dismissed since he has been in office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 75 at Sorel, and about 25 other officers, besides men employed in the workshops, such as carpenters, painters and so forth. In round numbers, there were altogether nearly 200.

Mr. BERGERON. Any one will understand that the dismissal of all these men is a reflection on the previous Ministers. I do not know what opinion my hon. friend may have of them politically, but every one here will admit that they were honest men. The late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Desjardins, and his predecessor, Mr. Ouimet, are both known to be honourable men, and this is a reflection on their administration. As my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said a moment ago, these appointments must have been made at first on the recommendation of some of the officers of the department. I do not want to cast any reflection on those officers ; they are all first-class men ; but either these men who were dismissed were doing nothing, or the hon. Minister will have to employ them when the work begins again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not want to reflect on any of the men who have been dismissed, or on any of the men who employed them. My duty was to consider whether these men were necessary or not. I must say that I found men in the department who I know were not necessary, and who were drawing very large salaries. I made up my mind that they could not be kept any longer. Among the men dismissed there were very good men indeed—men against whom there were no complaints at all. Some other men who were dismissed should never have been employed. I said on a former occasion that it was better not to ask for the names of either the good men or the men who were not good, because these men will now have to earn their living outside of these buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. What building does the second item refer to—" Geological Museum at Ottawa—fitting up building ?"

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A few days before the late Administration withdrew from office, they hired from Mr. Baskerville the balance of the building, the upper flat of which was occupied by the department before. The Order in Council for this purpose was sanctioned on the 6th of July, on a report dated the 18th of June. The rent paid is $600.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the building on Sussex street, where the geological museum is ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that the Minister says that on the report of his officers he has dismissed about 75 men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. More than that, nearly 200. I may say that I did not dispense with the services of any men included in this list without having a report from my officers. I would not take it upon myself to be the only judge. The names were brought before me, and I asked in each case why the man was not wanted, and it was only after carefully looking into the matter that I agreed to the dismissal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many written reports did the hon. gentleman obtain ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are all written reports, but I have not got them here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman bring them down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; with the excepton of a certain report, which I would not like to lay on the Table because it reflects on the conduct of a man whose services were dispensed with. I will show it, however, to the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman told a public meeting that when the House met, he would lay these reports, with regard to some 160 officers, on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be glad to lay them on the Table.

Mr. WALLACE. Why should a part of the reports be suppressed? We are entitled to them. The Minister of Public Works has been telling the whole country, over and over again, that he is dispensing with the services of hundreds of men. He told the country that in Ottawa he discharged 75 men, and he has read out the names of 70 whose salaries amount to $32,000 a year. One would suppose that that amount would be deducted from the Estimates of last year, but it is not. In the Main Estimates there is a considerable reduction, but he is now asking for an additional $36,000. $420,000 seems an enormous sum to expend for the maintenance of these buildings, but the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that and asks in the Supplementaries for $36,000 more, making in all $456,000. If he has dispensed with the services of 75 men here and 280 elsewhere, we ought to fairly look for a reduction in the Estimates. The reduction is very slight on the Estimates of the year before, and these were framed just previous to an election, and we know that immediately before an election, the Estimates are apt to go up a little. I do not see why, after the election is over, we should have the Estimates just as large, especially from men who are continually boasting of their economy. Here is an estimate for $456,000 for the maintenance of public buildings in the city of Ottawa alone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not looked a little sharper. He would then have seen that out of the amount of $100,000 which was asked for by the late Administration, the estimate this year is only $75,000, just $25,000 less. Of course, I have applied that $25,000 for a more useful purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a word with regard to what was done to the sidewalks and approaches to Parliament. I notice there has been some granolithic pavement put down, is it the intention of the Government to take up all the sidewalks and lay them with this pavement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are asking for $17,500 to lay down these sidewalks.

Mr. SPROULE. Could you give us some information as to the cost per square yard, and if the work was done by contract or day labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those that were built by the late Administration have cost $2.50 per yard. We propose to call for tenders so that I hope to obtain a cheaper price.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that this work can be done for about $1.25 per yard, and leave a fair margin for profit. It may be that when only a small portion is laid, the cost is greater, but it is very important to know whether the hon. Minister intends to let this by contract. $17,000 will hardly do the whole work. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to do only a portion or finish the whole thing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say whether $17,000 will do the whole work. The work done in the past was ordered by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not know whether the price they agreed to pay was too high or not. When I took office, the work was nearly completed.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this work go on this fall or go on again next spring?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope to begin this fall, but cannot say positively.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman propose having the centre gravel walk done in the same way?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to answer that question to-night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman knows that he has in his department an officer who has been engaged for a number of years in the public service, and who, together with another one not in the public service now, designed the buldings in which Parliament meets. It is reported that this officer is to be superannuated. I refer to Mr. Fuller. Has he decided to superannuate Mr. Fuller, and on what ground?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made up my mind that Mr. Fuller could not very much longer be retained in the service. After talking over the matter with Mr. Fuller, he agreed that the time had come for him to retire.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman has conveyed the impression that the request came from him and not from Mr. Fuller. May I ask the question directly—did Mr. Fuller ask to be superannuated, and what is his age?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fuller is 75 years of age. He has done a considerable amount of work, and I think he has proved to be a good officer. But I think also that all those who have come into contact with him lately will agree with me in saying that the time has come to superannuate him. His memory has been failing very greatly indeed. I would not like to say more about it, because he has been, as my hon. friend knows, a useful officer. I have discussed the position with him, and he agrees that the time has come for his superannuation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the facts are as stated, I regret that I brought this matter to the attention of the House. Do I under-

stand that failing memory is to be the cause of retirement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to say that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. Minister selected his successor ? I quite concur in the tribute he has paid to Mr. Fuller, as I am sure all hon. members do, and I am very sorry I referred to the matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not yet chosen Mr. Fuller's successor.

Mr. HACKETT. I entirely approve of the Minister's course in getting rid of unnecessary employees and reducing expenditure as far as possible. I would like to know if he intends getting rid of any of the officers who are employed as caretakers in any of the public buildings in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted. Carried.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HACKETT. I have asked the hon. Minister a question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite ready to answer, but several hon. gentlemen rose and I could not get the floor.

Mr. WALLACE. I may say that I rose because the Chairman is in the habit of calling "carried" before we have an opportunity to rise.

An hon. MEMBER. The Chairman has not eyes in the back of his head.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) I desire to say that as soon as I have a little more time, I will investigate the employees in Prince Edward Island, and if there is anything to be saved, the hon. gentleman may rely upon it, I wll save it.

Mr. HACKETT. The men who are employed are good, faithful men, and the hon. Minister will not get better. If he dismisses them, it will be for political reasons and not because of their inefficiency.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask with regard to another officer of the Public Works Department, a gentleman who for a long time occupied a very important position there and who had a long and unstained record, and was undoubtedly one of the ablest officers ever employed in the department. He, unfortunately, was involved in some trouble some years ago under circumstances which, I think, won for him the sympathy of the whole country, at least of those people who were acquainted with the circumstances. I wish to know from my hon. friend whether the services of Mr. Perley have been dispensed with, and if so, whether they have been dispensed with temporarily, and if there is any prospect of his obtaining employment in that department again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In answer to my hon. friend's question, I must say that I found Mr. Perley was employed in my department at a salary of $215 per month. He was preparing reports. I thought I could not consistently keep him any longer in the service of the Public Works Department.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that in the Main Estimates there is an item which reads as follows :—

Heating Public Buildings, Ottawa, including salaries of engineers, firemen, elevator attendants and caretakers.... $65,000

And also another item much to the same effect, $65,000. And now we have this item of $8,000 for the same. It seems to me that in order to give us some idea of the cost of these public officers, the amount for salaries ought to be kept separate from the amounts for fuel, lighting, &c.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One of the items of the main Estimates referred to is for the public buildings in Ottawa, while the other is for salaries for engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., all over the Dominion. The item of $8,000 now under discussion is required because the amount asked by the late Administration was not found sufficient to pay salaries for engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., all over Canada.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—To pay William Howe account rendered for painting, glazing, cleansing, &c., done by him in 1889 and 1892 ..... $5,181 61

(Approved by Order in Council, February 6, 1896, and ordered to be paid.)

Mr. WALLACE. Will the Minister of Public Works please explain. This is an account seven years' old.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the hon. gentleman can see I found that there was an Order in Council dated 6th February, 1896, approving of the account of Mr. Howe. The new Government felt they were bound to pay an account so approved by their predecessors. I can give the details of the account ; it is for painting.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You just followed the Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so. The chief architect reports as follows, in reference to that account, under date 30th October, 1895 :—Mr. Howe has frequently been requested, both verbally and by letter, to render an account covering the works authorized to be paid, but failed to do so until recently, giving as his reason that the party whose duty it was to attend to such work, had neglected to do it, without his knowledge. The accounts, as soon as received, were rendered to the clerk of

works, who reported that he had compared them with those previously rendered by Mr. Howe, and found that none of the items in the present account are included in the previous accounts. The foreman carpenter and the foreman painter also examined the accounts and the work, and their report stated that the quantities were found correct. The account for painting and glazing the House of Commons, September to December, 1889, was $1,389. And here follows a long list of the accounts for painting the public buildings.

Mr. POWELL. I notice, in the estimates passed the other day, page 49, the item referred to, in which there was a reduction from $71,000 to $65,000. On the occasion of the passing of that item, the Minister of Public Works stated that this was an instance of a remarkable saving that he had effected, that this was a judicious application of the pruning-knife, without impairing the public service. I see this item has been increased in the Supplementary Estimates by over $8,000, leaving a net increase, taking the whole thing together, of some $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. POWELL. I am not wrong, but the hon. gentleman's papers may be wrong. The item particularly referred to is that of Dominion buildings in both cases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just asking $8,000 to pay accounts for the year past, accounts rendered and due all over Canada now. For next year, I am asking only $65,000.

Mr. POWELL. That is scarcely a fair statement, because there must be back bills year after year; that is not exceptional in the administration of public affairs, and that must be taken, I presume, as a fair estimate of the amount of the delinquencies every year.

Roads and Bridges—Sappers and Dufferin Bridges, Ottawa, contributions towards asphalting of approaches by the city, as per agreement $5,956

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the date of that agreement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. June 21, 1895.

Telegraphs—For purchase from D. H. Tetu of land, buildings, furniture, fittings, &c., at the River Penticost, telegraph station, in full settlement of all claims $508 64

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Têtu was the agent of the department; he constructed a house there, and, when he left, the department took the house and paid him for it.

Salaries of engineers, draughtsmen, clerks, Engineering Branch $371 67

Mr. HAGGART. I would like the hon. gentleman to state whether he found that the engineers, draughtsmen and clerks in the engineering branch were in excess of the requirements of the service.

Th MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have dispensed in that branch with the services of a certain number. Messrs. Chabot, Moffette, Smith, Roy, Friel, Aubé, Marion, Perley, Tremblay, Lamontagne, Connell and Dorais. The two latter were employed in Sorel; Mr. Tremblay was employed below Quebec, and Mr. Lamontagne at Lévis: but Chabot, Moffette, Smith, Roy, Friel, Aubé and Marion were employed in Ottawa. I dispensed with the services of these men on the report of Mr. Coste, my chief engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. I draw the attention of the Minister to the evidence given before the Civil Service Board as to the requirements of that department, by the deputy head of that department, under oath:

Is not the list of your temporary clerks too large for the work you have for them? A. The number may not be too large, because, I believe, the number of clerks for that staff of the department will have to be increased, taking the engineers and architects together. But of those who are employed at present, we could dispense with some and replace them. For instance, in the engineering corps there is no doubt that some draughtsmen might go without impairing the efficiency of the service, but in the higher branch some other men should be taken on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whatever may have been said in the past my action is before Parliament to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not questioning your action, but the officer's.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask whether Mr. Dorais has been replaced?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Dorais of Sorel has not been replaced, and I do not intend to replace him.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Were some of the men dismissed in Sorel replaced by others?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were none of the men dismissed in Sorel who to my knowledge have been replaced. Of course my hon. friend knows we have very important works at Sorel, and there may be times when there is more work than at others. Connell and Dorais that I dismissed were not replaced.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Were these the only men dismissed in Sorel?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there were 75.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Did I understand the Minister to say that none of these 75 have been replaced?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that none of them have been

replaced since. I do not think that any new men have been taken on.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend says that probably he will have to take on some new men. Can I take it for granted that he will give a chance to some of these poor men who have been dismissed.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope my hon. friend will allow me to answer myself. A great many of these men whom my friend (Mr. Casgrain) calls poor men, have been imposed on the department during the last election. The shops at Sorel were filled with them and Mr. Howden who was the chief officer there told me that a lot of men for whom he had no work at all had been simply imposed upon him.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is not an answer to my question. I ask whether some of these dismissed men will be taken back when the Minister finds he wants new hands?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to pledge myself to take back the men that were imposed on the department by Mr. Desjardins.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is not an answer. I suppose that among the 75 men some were useful. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) does not think he is going to make us believe that some of these 75 men had not something to do at some time of the year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say more than that.

Quebec Immigration Buildings..... $5,000

Mr. REID. Does the Minister intend letting this work by contract or doing it by day's work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will certainly call for tenders for the greater part of the work. There are some small details we cannot ask tenders for.

Mr. REID. In case the Minister should receive a number of tenders, and that two of them were for the same amount, are we to understand that the Minister will refer them to the defeated candidate?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I won't be caught twice, I think.

Toronto Public Buildings, improvement, repairs, &c. $8,000

Mr. OSLER. Is this to pay old accounts for work already done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for work to be done including a vault that has to be constructed.

Mr. CLARKE. There were some accounts outstanding for repairs to public buildings in Toronto. Was provisions made in the main Estimates to pay these accounts?

Mr. TARTE. The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These accounts are covered by a sum of $6,096 voted under the head of Public Buildings, Ontario.

Harbours and Rivers, N.S..... $34,500

Mr. McDOUGALL. I called the attention of the Minister in the earlier part of the session to the Cow Bay breakwater in the county of Cape Breton. That breakwater was first built 25 or 30 years ago, and it has rendered a great deal of service to the shipping around that coast, especially to the people engaged in the coal industry there. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will bear me out in the statement that no public work on that coast has been more serviceable to the general public than has the Cow Bay breakwater. I wish to get the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) so that he may correct me in what I state if I am wrong. As an evidence of the importance of that breakwater, I believe I am within the mark when I say that the treasury of Nova Scotia, when the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Fielding) was premier of that province, received something like $100,000 as revenue from the coal that was shipped in the shelter of that breakwater. Less than two years ago, the breakwater was injured and I may state—it is within the knowledge of the officers of the department who are within my hearing now—that I communicated with the then Minister of Public Works with reference to it. I called his attention to the fact that the breakwater was in a dangerous condition, and that if it did not receive timely attention, it might after a heavy storm cost the country a great deal more to repair the injury that might be done to it. I understood from the then Minister that there was no money available at that time to do the necessary repairs. I had the impression that to save a work of that importance the Minister might very well justify an application for a Governor General's warrant. However, it was not done. At a subsequent session of the House, that is, the session of 1895, a grant of some $5,000 was made; and I understand that $4,289 was spent in the year 1895 towards repairing the injury that was done. I may say that the injury which I predicted might be done by a storm was done, and done to a much greater extent than I anticipated. I urged upon the department making a further grant to repair the balance of the injury. I was given to understand that this $4,000 was to be spent in securing the breakwater from further injury, and that Parliament would grant the further sum required during last session. I understood from the officers of the department, particularly from the Minister, that a recommendation had been made to the Government by the Minister for an appropriation of some $20 000 for the necessary repairs; but, as hon. gentlemen know, no appropriation

passed the House. My understanding was that the appropriation was to be made in the Supplementary Estimates; but they did not come down; and I was surprised to find, when the present Supplementary Estimates came down, that they did not contain a vote for that breakwater. This is a valuable property, which has cost this country a great deal of money. From the time the Dominion Government undertook it it has cost the country $150,000 or thereabouts. It is a breakwater 1,300 or 1,400 feet in length, and one which has rendered great and important services, not only to the coal industry, but to the fishing industry along that coast. A large number of vessels come from the western part of the province—from Shelburne, Guysborough, Richmond and other counties, and find shelter behind that breakwater. Besides, it is of great importance to the people who live in the neighbourhood. There is a flourishing village there, where a large number of people do business, and a large number of fishermen live in the neighbourhood; and it is of the greatest importance to these people to have that breakwater maintained as it has been for the last twenty-five or thirty years. I hope, therefore, that in the further Supplementary Estimates that work will not be forgotten. I would suggest that if the Government are not in a position to ask Parliament for as large a grant as is required to thoroughly repair the work, they would ask for such a sum as will save it from any further injury from storms. I would like to have the attention of the hon. Minister to another very important work. For some years the people of the village of Gabarouse, nearly all fishermen, have been asking the Government to take steps to build a breakwater at that place. Steps were taken towards getting surveys, and I was given to understand last winter that the late Minister had decided to ask Parliament for an appropriation for that work. The place is an open harbour, very much exposed to east and south-east winds. There is a large fishing industry carried on at the village; and it is of the greatest importance to have a breakwater constructed. I hope the hon. Minister will see his way clear to pursue the policy of his predecessor in respect to these two works, and ask Parliament for an appropriation to carry them out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister to three districts in the county of Pictou not referred to in these Estimates; and perhaps, even if they were included, the season of the year would not admit of much being done. But I hope his officers will be able to look into these matters before next session. One district is that between Cape John and Toney River, in the western part of the county of Pictou. There is a large business carried on there by small boats engaged in lobster fishing, and along that stretch of coast there is not a harbour of any description, so that of course the landing of these boats is sometimes a most difficult affair. There have been surveys conducted at my own request hitherto; but the reports of the officers have shown that to build anything like a breakwater for a harbour in the ordinary sense would involve an expenditure of far more money than even the people of that district would expect to be spent there; and so these investigations have come to nothing. But having been recently in that part of the county, the proposition has been put to me, and I promised to bring it to the attention of the authorities, that an effort should be made to give them something, not in the sense of a harbour exactly, but a comparatively cheap work which would give these boats protection as they approach the shore in rough weather. If the hon. Minister would kindly have a note made of that, and before next session have the subject looked into, it might appear that a great deal of good could be done with very little money. The other two points I would like to have looked into are the two wharfs owned and controlled by the Government on Pictou Island. This island is situated off Pictou, in the St. Lawrence, and is practically a life-saving station, inhabited by fishermen and farmers on a small scale. The inhabitants have often rendered important services to ships in distress. Two small wharfs at the west end and the east end of the island, have been built at a considerable cost of public money, and they are not now in a good condition. I think they ought to be strengthened, or else there is danger of their going to pieces, which would be a serious matter to the people of the island. I would also call attention to the Lismore wharf in the eastern part of the county of Pictou. I shall be obliged if the Minister will have reports made on these matters by his district officers in time for necessary action in regard to them at the next session of Parliament.

Boularderie, wharf at Rose Ferry..... $2,800

Mr. BETHUNE. Is that amount considered sufficient to complete this wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was let when I came into office and the work was begun.

Mr. BETHUNE. A few days ago I asked the hon. Minister if he would consider the advisability of constructing a station at Wycocomagh station. He said he required some further information, and I would like to know if he has put an item in the further Estimates for this work, and would be very much pleased to learn that he had.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question is whether the old wharf should be repaired or whether it would not

be better to have a new one. We are looking into it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with the Cow Bay breakwater? He said it was under consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This is a matter of considerable importance, but the work is no better or worse than it has been for some years past. It is a very large and important public work and will require the expenditure of a considerable sum of money. I think it was rather unfortunate that my hon. friend was not able to press his claim more successfully and at an earlier stage during last Parliament. It was only at the eleventh hour of that Parliament that he was able to impress his views on his colleagues. I do not depreciate the importance of the work, but it is one of a number which require considerable expenditure, and if we are to recommend the expenditure required on all of them, we would have to make a draft on the treasury which we do not feel warranted in doing in our present circumstances. The Estimates we are providing are somewhat liberal, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will not press us to go too far. This is an important work, but I do not think it will suffer very much if it is allowed to remain as it is a little longer.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is very much mistaken. It is only a little over a year, or a year and a half since the breakwater got into its present condition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a long time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was only one opportunity for making a grant to repair this breakwater since it was injured by the storm, and that opportunity was taken advantage of to the extent of $5,000. It was considered impossible to provide that session the money necessary to put it in thorough repair, but it was proposed at the next session to provide a large grant for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not only was there no grant made, but none proposed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I am satisfied there was a grant proposed and agreed upon by the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am speaking in the light of documents submitted to Parliament.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It was to have been provided for in the Supplementary Estimates of last session, but they did not come down.

Mr. GILLIES. During this session, I caused a question to be put to the hon. Minister of Public Works with respect to an important public work at L'Ardoise, Richmond county. I ask the hon. gentleman if it was the intention of the Government to provide for the repairs and extension requisite to be made to the breakwater there. He replied that the matter was under serious consideration, but I see no mention whatever of it in these Estimates. I am quite sure that when the hon. gentleman is longer in office he will agree that that is a work which requires to be immediately attended to. The people of L'Ardoise are a very large fishing community who draw their living entirely from the sea, and who have no shelter of any kind from the harbour of St. Peter's to Louisburg, a distance of 70 miles on that iron-bound coast. When I drew the attention of the late Government to the matter, they met my request in a very liberal spirit. The place was examined and reported upon, and the request of the people was met by the construction of a breakwater at that point. It is a very good work as far as it goes, but it was the policy of the late Government to extend it seawards and also towards the land, in order to afford as complete protection as possible to the boats. In pursuance of that policy the department sent an engineer to examine and report, and his report and plans are now on file in the department. He recommended that the breakwater should be extended and made an estimate of its cost, which he placed at about $19,000. It was the policy of the late Government to have this done, and this amount expended upon the L'Ardoise breakwater this season, had their Estimates been allowed to pass during last session, and I took it for granted that some provision would be made in this year's Estimates, and I was strengthened in that opinion by the answer of the Minister of Public Works that the matter was under serious consideration. I am aware that a great many demands are made on the Treasury, but this is one of the localities that ought not to be overlooked. The number of boats there amounts to something like 250, and every boat with its equipment is valued at something like $300, so that the Minister will see the large amount of property which is there seeking shelter. The people of L'Ardoise are an industrious, frugal and deserving class, and suffer great hardship in pursuit of their dangerous and hazardous calling, and there is no possible excuse for the present Government for not having carried out the policy of the late Government in extending this breakwater to the length required and reported upon by Mr. Bernascour, the departmental engineer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course this is one of numerous cases, and I understand the importance of it, but for the time being I am not in a position to do more.

Harbours and Rivers, N.B..... $5,500

Mr. McALISTER. I regret very much that no provision is made in the Supplemen-

taries for the purchase of the Mowat wharf in Campbellton, and for making improvements that are required for the shipping there. As the public wharf stands now, it is of no service to shippers, from the fact of its being out in the river and only connected with the land by a private wharf owned by Mr. Mowat. Campbellton is one of the most important shipping ports on the Baie des Chaleurs on either side, and the lack of needed shipping facilities makes shipping inconvenient and expensive, as well. About eighteen months ago, the late Minister of Public Works sent an engineer down with instructions to examine this place and report thereon. On the strength of the report sent in by that engineer, and on the representations made from time to time, the then Minister of Public Works recommended an item of $8,000 to be put in the Estimates last session, for this improvement. But, as the Estimates were not passed, of course this amount was not granted. I regret very much that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not included this item either in the main Estimates or in the Supplementaries. I see that there is an item of $3,000 for Little Métis, and also $2,000 for repairs to the wharf at Port Daniel. I do not find fault with these appropriations; perhaps they are required. But I do complain very much that a more important place than either has been entirely omitted. The report on Campbellton harbour is in the department, and from it the hon. Minister can learn exactly the situation. I trust that in the Supplementary Estimates that are yet to come down, an item for this wharf will be included.

Mr. POWELL. I wish to call attention to the condition of Tormentine harbour, upon which a very large amount of money has been expended. As it now stands, an expenditure of $5,000 or $6,000—$10,000 at the outside—would place the harbour in an excellent state of repair. But, if it is allowed to go much longer, it will cost from $60,000 to $100,000; in fact, the works will have to be practically rebuilt. I would press upon the Minister the desirability of making an appropriation for this work, on the principle that a stitch in time saves nine.

Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I..... $11,850

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the hon. Minister to say whether he intends to make improvements at Miminegash, as he said a few days ago it was his intention to do. This is a very important matter. You have here a vote of $2,500 for Tignish, but that is a small item for the improvement of that breakwater. Will the work at Tignish be carried on by contract or by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is some work going on at Tignish, which place is very well known in this House. As to the work at Miminegash, I am very sorry that we have not been able financially to undertake this work; but, later on, we may be in a position to do so.

Mr. YEO. It has just come to my knowledge that this work at Miminegash requires attention almost immediately, and I desire to call the hon. Minister's attention to it. I am glad the work at Tignish breakwater has been ordered. This work was much neglected by the late Government, though my late colleague (Mr. Perry) and myself drew the attention of the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) to the necessity of looking after it. The answer repeatedly given was that there was no money to undertake these repairs. Shortly after the present Government was formed, my late colleague happened to be in the city, and he and I waited upon the Minister (Mr. Tarte), who very kindly promised to attend to the work. We pointed out that, unless it was attended to this fall, the whole work, which has cost the country a large amount of money, would probably be destroyed. I am glad to know that the work is being proceeded with, and that it is in a fair way of being protected and saved. I fear that unless Miminegash is attended to this season, a larger expenditure will be necessary to put it in repair next year. While speaking of this, I may say that the public wharfs in Prince county are, with a few exceptions, in a bad state, having been much neglected by the late Government. We often called attention to their condition, and received promises that they would be attended to, but nothing more. Many years ago, the Dominion Government took over the pier at West Point, which had been built at considerable cost by the local government, that government being recouped by the Dominion. But, after taking over that work, the Dominion Government paid no attention to it, and allowed it almost entirely to disappear. I have asked the Minister to have a survey made there with a view to having that work rebuilt. The member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) pointed out a few days ago the great necessity there was for this work, and I quite agree with all he said. The people living there are 12 miles distant from any railway communication, and the wharf is almost an absolute necessity for them. As they are situated to-day, they are obliged to do all their shipping with boats, which is attended with great risk and cost. In this neighbourhood there is a very fine farming country, and is one of the best points for fishing on the whole coast, and altogether any one knowing that country, must come to the conclusion that the wharf is an absolute necessity. I may also say the same thing with regard to Broe. The work has been begun there, but it has been carried on very slowly. Two or three small grants have been made, but it still requires a larger outlay to make this work of the service which it will be when completed. I am glad to see that the Minister has put an amount in the Estimates for

harbour improvements at Summerside. This is a work which has been called for for a long time, and is one of absolute necessity. Summerside is, perhaps, the principal port we have in Prince Edward Island, and any one who has taken the trouble to make an inquiry into this matter, must be convinced that this outlay is very much needed. I wish the amount was much larger, but I am in hopes the Minister will have contracts entered into, and probably the amount which he has put in the Estimates now, may be all that is required for the present year. There are other public works all around the coast in Prince county which require attention, and I hope before this season is past the Minister will instruct his engineer at Prince Edward Island to survey and report on these works. I will say for myself that I do not want one dollar of public money to be expended unless it is going to be a benefit to the country, I do not wish to see it wasted. But we have strong claims in Prince county, because our wants have been sadly neglected in the past—I suppose it has been owing to the fact that that county has sent members who have been opposed to the Government, I know of no other reason that can be given for our wants being so neglected. Before I resume my seat I would again ask the Minister to make a note of Miminegash, and see if a small amount could not be put in the Estimates yet to come down, so as to protect the work for this season.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thank my hon. friend for the useful remarks he has made to the committee. Miminegash will not be lost sight of by me. As to the work to be done at West Point, the question was whether we should repair the old wharf or make a new one. I will order a new survey, and see what is best to be done.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I wish to direct the attention of the Minister to some of the public works in King's county. There are several wharfs there, important public works, that are much in need of repair. The farmers of the country are depending on those wharfs to ship their produce. There is one at Cardogan Bridge, called Lewis's Point Wharf, a very important wharf in that locality, and a large shipping place, which is much in need of repairs. There is also a wharf at Montague, called Stevens's Wharf, which is one of considerable importance, and the repairs of which were left over last year, because the one adjoining it was being repaired, and the other was to be taken up this year. There is also a wharf of great importance at Annandale, which is much in need of repair. There is also a public work on the north shore called Campbell's Cove breakwater, which was undertaken by the local government in the first place, and a sum of money was expended on it, but it has since been taken over by the Federal Government. It is used by a very large fishing population; a great number of toilers by the sea, and on the sea, who have to earn their living in a very precarious manner, are solely dependent upon this harbour. The breakwater is the only harbour of refuge they have for about 75 miles of coast, so I think we have strong claims on the Government. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, knows that he has many friends in that locality; but apart from that, it is a public work of great importance, and I trust that when the further Supplementaries come down, there will be an amount for repairing this work at Campbell's Cove breakwater, and doing what has been in contemplation for some time.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the piers at Mink River and Red Point, and to the Belle River breakwater. I hope that in the Supplementary Estimates yet to come down we shall find sums for those three works. We have been voting hundreds of thousands of dollars in the last two days, but you would require a very powerful glass indeed to see a few dollars for Prince Edward Island. The people of that Island were given to understand that when the Liberal party came into power, and when that Island would have a Minister in the Cabinet, as we have now—and a very able man he is, I must say, and a man who has rendered great service to the Liberal party—we were told that Prince Edward Island would be dealt with very liberally. But I find that in place of its being dealt with more liberally, it is being dealt with less liberally than before. Now, I would remind the committee that yesterday the Minister of Public Works made it a sufficient plea for giving $5,000 for the Three Rivers Exhibition, that the late Government had proposed to do the same thing, and that an Order in Council was passed to that effect. On the same ground I say there is strong reason why the sums that were proposed to be extended by the late Government on these three works at Belle River, Murray Harbour and Gosh River, should be included in these Estimates. I can tell the Minister of Public Works that the late Government proposed to expend on Belle River breakwater $2,000, on Mink River pier $1,000, and on the Red Point wharf $500. How is it that one rule is applied to Quebec in reference to these expenditures and another rule applied to Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has, I hope, strong and powerful influence with the Government. He has been over the whole of the Maritime Provinces to help them out, and we thought that he would help his native province when he got into the Ministry. I must say, Sir, that Prince Edward Island is dealt with very illiberally in this matter. I hope that the Minister of Public Works will yet consider this question. I hold in

my hand a letter which I received from the Public Works Dpartment in regard to these three works. It is dated the 18th May, 1896, and it says :

I may say that my predecessor had included in the Supplementary Estimates for the consideration of Council the following items, viz. : $2,000 for Belle Creek breakwater, $1,000 for Murray harbour pier, besides several smaller appropriations, including $500 for Red Point pier.

Why should we vote $5,000 as we did last night for an exhibition at Three Rivers, with which the Dominion Government has nothing to do, and leave these important public works, which are immeasurably more necessary and which are under the control of this Government, without any excuse whatever. I say that the province of Prince Edward Island has not been generously treated, and I am sure that the people of Prince Edward Island will receive the news with no very good grace if the present Government do not intend to proceed with the expenditure proposed by the late Government. I do not wish to detain the committee, but I could not do less, and I am sure I ought to do more if I could convince the Minister and his colleagues that it is right to give a fair share of the public moneys to Prince Edward Island. On this very page of the Estimates we have reached over $2,000,000 which is to be expended. You have been voting hundreds of thousands of dollars for railways and canals, but what share did Prince Edward Island get of that money ? It got none. When a few paltry thousand dollars is refused for breakwaters in Prince Edward Island, I say that there is no disposition on the part of the Government to treat that province with fair-play.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I have not a word to say against the arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) for the voting of certain sums of money for the repairs of these works. I question very much whether the hon. gentleman is putting his case upon the very best ground ? There is no use in his overstating the case. We are not voting $2,000,000 here to repair breakwaters in different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not say that. I said there were $2,000,000 on this page of the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of that $2,000,000 over $1,000,000 has to be paid for debts already incurred for the Militia.

Mr. MARTIN. I said nothing about the militia. I said that upon this page there were $2,000,000 asked for, and that Prince Edward Island had very little of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We might as well have the facts plainly stated. If the hon. gentleman's first statement went unchallenged, it would appear to those who read it in Prince Edward Island that we were voting $2,000,000 for the repairs of breakwaters all through the Dominion.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not make that statement. I appeal to the House to accept the statement which I did make and which I intended to make. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stands up here and says that I said what I am sure I did not say. What I said was that we have already reached on this page of the Estimates which I have in my hands over $2,000,000. Let the Minister of Marine look and he will find that I was correct, and that out of these $2,000,000, he would require a very powerful glass indeed to see very much for Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not at all want to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but I wish to point out to him that he is not putting his case upon the strongest ground. If he looks at the Estimates he will see that of these $2,000,000, over $1,000,000 is to pay debts incurred by the late Government for the militia service. I do not deny that there is some foundation for the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) that Prince Edward Island has not been treated in the past as it ought to have been, and a singular fact is that my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) has been one of the most violent supporters of the party and Government who treated Prince Edward Island so badly. I do not want to recriminate, however. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that the breakwater at Belle Creek is only three miles from the Wood Island breakwater, and within the past three years $10,000 has been expended on the latter breakwater. Now, when we are asked to expend a few thousand dollars on the Belle Creek breakwater, only three miles off, the hon. gentleman will see that Parliament must move slowly. Before we vote this other expenditure we must be satisfied that the $10,000 we have already expended has not created a good harbour at Wood Island. If it has not, we must have proper surveys made at Belle Creek. I am not saying that at the proper time this work will not be considered. I hope it will, and I shall have much pleasure in pressing it upon my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. But we must move discreetly and prudently. Now, with respect to Red Point and Mink River. We have been in power only a few months, and we have not had time to get proper reports from our engineers, so as to justify us in voting money for these works; nor from my own personal knowledge can I say that I would be justfied in recommending any immediate expenditure of public money at these two points. With respect to the wharf in Prince county there is an amount in the

Estimates for $2,500 for Tignish. I am quite sure my hon. friend is well satisfied with that. He has also referred to Miminegash. I had the pleasure of visiting Miminegash last year. I walked over that breakwater and conversed with the fishermen there, and I am quite satisfied that before we expend any more money on Miminegash we should have a proper survey made to ascertain whether we can carry that breakwater out beyond the bar which obstructs the fishing boat from coming into the breakwater. I do not think the expenditure of the money there at the present time would do any good, unless we are prepared to remove that bar, either by carrying the existing breakwater out beyond it or by dredging it. The hon. gentleman knows that the dredge cannot go there this year, but I am in hopes that it will be attended to. The former member for the county was here a few weeks ago, and he pressed that matter upon the attention of my hon. friend, and my hon. friend did me the honour to talk it over with me. I told him that I would not be justified in asking for public money to be expended on the Miminegash breakwater at the present moment. I did believe that, if a survey were made, the report of the surveyors would justify us in constructing a work which would be of permanent value for the large number of shippers and fishermen who would use that breakwater. We have appropriated a large sum of money, $7,500, for the beginning of protection works at Summerside harbour. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will join his voice with mine in recommending that expenditure to the House. He knows how thoroughly necessary it is, and he knows that this is only the beginning of large works which are required to make the second harbour in Prince Edward Island a far better harbour than it is at present. He knows that there must be give and take in these matters—that we cannot have every wharf and breakwater in the maritime provinces, important as they are, repaired in one year. We must discriminate, and I think we are doing pretty well so far. We are now dealing in these Supplementary Estimates almost entirely with debts that have already been incurred, or works for which absolute promises were made by the previous Government, and for which estimates were brought down; and whatever new votes may be recommended to Parliament will come down in further Supplementary Estimates this session. Therefore, I would urge my hon. friends to be reasonable, and not to press matters too strongly until they see exactly what is being done. I know that Prince Edward Island, in the past, has had to take the small share of public expenditures. That was inevitable. We are a small province, and our voice has not been as strong in the past as I think it ought to have been. The hon. gentleman does me the honour to refer to myself. All I can say is that I have from time to time pressed on the Government the necessity of making public improvements in the Island; but it stands to reason that I cannot hope to get all I ask for, just now at any rate. We must go along quietly. My hon. friend who represents the East Riding of Prince (Mr. Yeo), pressed very strongly for the expenditure of public money on that necessary work, the improvement of Summerside harbour, and I am glad to see that he acknowledges that this vote of $7,500 this year is a good beginning. It may amount to an expenditure of $20,000 before we are through. But we cannot do it all in a day. I am in favour, as I always have been, of an economic expenditure; and, even though I represent Prince Edward Island in the Cabinet, I will not be a party to advocating the indiscriminate expenditure of public money. We must discriminate, and we have discriminated in these appropriations. We cannot hope to get Miminegash this year; but I hope, in the near future, after a report is made upon it, we may be able to do something for that harbour also. As we are bringing down further Supplementary Estimates, the hon. gentleman may perhaps find things in them which will please them. I hope so myself. I hope some things will be done for Prince Edward Island which are essential, and which they will thoroughly approve of.

Mr. MARTIN. If the hon. gentleman wishes to prevent a grant being made for Belle River breakwater, he must present his reasons on fair grounds, and support them by fair arguments. He has stated that the distance between Belle River breakwater and Wood Island breakwater is three miles. I presume the hon. gentleman knows that part of the district very well, and if he had considered carefully, I think he would have added at least two miles more. While the hon. gentleman may say that I have not made a very strong argument, I think he has made a very weak argument.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may be five miles. The hon. gentleman knows the distance better than I do.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the hon. gentleman must have weakened his argument purposely, in order to defeat the object I had in view. In place of coming to my rescue and strengthening the arguments I used, he has come before this committee to weaken them by stating that the distance between these two breakwaters is only three miles, when it is five miles or more. The next thing the hon. gentleman says is that a large sum of money has been expended on Wood Island breakwater. I am sure that neither the hon. gentleman or the present Government need take any credit for that, and the Wood Island breakwater still is not in a very good condition for shipping, as it requires a good deal of dredging. The

hon. gentleman is going to close his heart against East Queen's, so far as the expenditure of any public money is concerned, because, he says, I am a violent political opponent. But I hope he will send a dredge there to dredge out that breakwater, in order that the people of that section may be able to ship their produce. He says, further, that it is necessary to get surveys for this Belle River breakwater; but if the hon. Minister of Public Works will search the records of his department, I think he will find that surveys of that breakwater have been made very lately—within a year, or two years at most; and the hon. gentleman is only misleading this committee under pretense of wanting a survey made. Now, I did hope that, if I made a very poor argument in favour of these breakwaters, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would help me out; but, in place of that, he has done his best to pour cold water on both. In one breath he says my arguments are too strong, in the next that they are weak—I am sure I am sure I am not asking too much—and the people of Prince Edward Island will feel disappointed at the stand the hon. gentleman has taken on these matters.

Quebec Harbours and Rivers..... $34,350

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I would like to inquire from the hon. Minister of Public Works whether he has been informed that the appropriation of $3,000 which appears in the Estimates for repairs to the works on the river Ste. Anne de la Pérade, is fully adequate? Last winter a larger sum has been expended for works in that locality, and it was found inadequate. I am of opinion that, owing to the urgency of those works for protecting the town of Ste. Anne on the east and west sides of the river, it would be desirable to vote a larger appropriation. Would the hon. gentleman be ready to take any further information as might lead to an increase in that vote?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) I believe that the sum appropriated is quite sufficient for the works we have in view. The reports which have been handed down to me are to the effect that by piling up stones and fascines around the actual works, we could prevent them being carried away by the spring flood. Of course, if we wished to build new works, a larger appropriation would be needed; but, in the present state of things I think the appropriation asked for is quite sufficient.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Was the attention of the hon. gentleman drawn to the fact that works are required on the west side of the River St. Anne?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should not overlook the fact that, properly speaking, those works are not within the province of the Dominion Government. The reason why the Public Works Department is contributing a certain amount is that those works involve a very heavy expenditure.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) This item of the Estimates covers a great many wharfs situated in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, is no doubt aware that there are certain dues received on those wharfs, which, small as they are, represent, none the less, a tax upon the people who use those wharfs. On the island of Orleans, for instance, there is a due of two cents received on each bushel of potatoes, and similar products. I would like to know whether the Government contemplate amending the law or the regulations on that matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman ought not to forget that the question he has just put does not concern my department. The department concerns itself with the building of wharfs or their repairs, and with nothing else. I am not ready to tell him what will be, for the future, the policy of the Government on that point. I am free to admit, however, that the collection of that tax up to now has been a public nuisance.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman allows me, I will take this opportunity of reminding him that a question has previously been put by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), asking that engineers be sent out to make a survey along the St. Lawrence, with a view to ascertaining the means of preventing the ice damming up in the spring, thus causing the lands to be flooded along the St. Lawrence. This is a question of great importance, owing to the fact that the lands which suffer from the flood are greatly depreciated in value. I may remind the hon. Minister that there is no appropriation made in the Supplementaries for that purpose, notwithstanding the promise made by the hon. gentleman to the hon. member for Berthier, that the Government would concern themselves about it, without delay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) The question put by the hon. gentleman has been under consideration for several years. I need hardly tell him that I fully realize its importance. There may be found in the pigeon-holes of my department, many reports on the matter. We shall make it our duty to get further information, and when all the desirable information is at hand, I will take the necessary steps to remedy that state of things.

Mr. BOISVERT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in connection with the appropriation made for the building of works on the River St. Lawrence, I deem it my duty to call the attention of the Government, and

more particularly that of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to the expediency of making an appropriation, in order to have surveys made at different points on the River St. Lawrence, with a view to ascertaining whether some means could not be devised, through the building of some works, to prevent such flooding as took place last spring, resulting in considerable damages, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Not to mention the damages sustained elsewhere, I may say that in several localities in my constituency, last spring, the ice has demolished several houses and carried away a great many other buildings. And I may say that many other localities have suffered similar damages. Now, it seems to me that the Government are in duty bound to see to it that means be provided whereby the recurrence of such disasters might be averted or reduced to a minimum, and to prevent the danger being intensified in the future. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of experts, were a pier to be built in the channel of the River St. Lawrence, at a small distance up the stream at Cape la Roche, opposite Ste. Anne de la Pérade, in order to facilitate the passage of the water, the desired result would be reached. As I quite understand that the scheme I advocate requires a few words of explanation on my part, I will try to state the case as briefly as possible. As the hon. gentlemen know, when the ice bridge takes first, opposite Quebec, and goes on forming higher up the river, up to the Richelieu, where the water is very deep and the current very swift, the ice bridge takes very slowly at that latter point, owing to the fact that that part of the ice breaks into pieces which go off and, passing underneath the ice bridge, ground in large banks on the rocks, thus obstructing the passage of the water. From that moment, the level of the river begins to rise, and it only goes down when the ice breaks up. It is within my recollection that the ice bridge having taken in that way, the river level, opposite Three Rivers, rose about ten feet during winter, and the result was that a serious inundation took place in the spring of that year. And I may add that spring floods invariably take place, when the ice bridge forms on the Richelieu, opposite Ste. Anne de la Pérade. Now, Mr. Chairman, if a pier were built at the head of the Richelieu River, the result would be that the ice bridge would form with the first hard frost of the season, and when the ice bridge takes later on, opposite Quebec, it would go on forming up to the mouth of the Richelieu. Now, as at that latter point, the stream is pretty swift, and the Richelieu does not run over a great distance, there is but little doubt that the channel of the river would be free from ice during winter. And whenever the waters, in the spring, would reach that spot, they would find an easy passage. And so, the lands in those localities situate above that point would not be flooded.

The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), a few days ago, called the attention of the Government to the urgency of building ice-breakers opposite the town of Berthier. Now, I do not wish to take away from the hon. gentleman any credit he is entitled to for his exertions on behalf of his constituents, but I hold that should the Government yield to his request, they ought also to build similar ice-breakers opposite the city of Three Rivers, which has suffered such heavy damages last spring. A large portion of the houses in St. Philip's ward were then demolished by the ice. The Government would also have to build several similar ice-breakers along the banks of the River St. Lawrence, opposite the villages, in order to protect the dwellings of the inhabitants. Now, it is easily understood that the building of all those works would involve a heavy public expenditure, without preventing the waters of the river rising to a great height, as witnessed last spring. While, through the building of a pier in the channel of the River St. Lawrence, as I just said, a two-fold benefit would be secured, that of facilitating the passage of the waters of the river and, in addition thereto, that of obviating the necessity for the Government to build ice-breakers at different points along the river. But it might, perhaps, be urged that through the building of the projected pier, in the channel of the river, the navigation of the St. Lawrence would be obstructed. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman, on the ground that the location of such a pier could be shown by means of a beacon at high water, or by a lighthouse.

In 1890, at the time when, as now, I sat in this House for the county of Nicolet, I took occasion to have resolutions passed by several municipal councils in my consituency, which were chiefly exposed to suffer damages from the recurrence of the flood. Those resolutions were to the effect that a wharf should be built at Cape la Roche. Later on, in reply to a question which I put to the then Minister of Public Works, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that after having talked the matter over with his engineer, he had come to the conclusion that the cost of the work, should it be deemed necessary to build it, would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $5,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, such an expenditure would be a wise one, were it calculated to facilitate, through the building of that wharf, the passage of the waters of the River St. Lawrence. I may say that the building of piers at different points on the river would involve a much larger expenditure.

I think the Government could also give instructions to some of those who live in the localities to the south of the river, opposite the River Richelieu, to watch the progress of the ice, next winter, and to report, next spring, to the Public Works De-

partment, which would be a means of securing valuable data by which the Government might be enabled to take action, with a thorough knowledge of the matter.

While I am on my feet, I think it worth the trouble to convey to the House the opinion of a pilot, Mr. Joseph Léveillé, who is apparently thoroughly acquainted with the progress of the ice, at the time of its breaking up in the spring, as also with the causes of the extensive inundations which have occurred at different times. With regard to those inundations, he says:

Reports have appeared in the public prints giving the details of the disasters which have befallen the flooded localities. The losses suffered by them were enormous; and the ruins resulting from the flooding of those lands will require a long time before they are made up. Eloquent wails were heard in favour of the victims of the flood; a great deal of sympathy was extended to those in distress. Very well; but is there nothing else to be done? Shall not a single voice be heard throughout the country, urging that something be done to prevent the recurrence of similar disasters in the future? Shall nobody endeavour to ascertain whether there are not any means of preventing the recurrence of those disasters, or at least minimizing the danger?

For a number of years I have acted as pilot between Montreal and Quebec. I had made myself acquainted with the River St Lawrence in its natural state, before they began dredging it. I have watched carefully all the important works carried out by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, and I have looked into and ascertained the results. Now, availing myself of the data and information treasured up in my youth and matured by many years of experience, I think it would be worth while to bring to the knowledge of the public certain facts which, unknown as they are, are very material to the question I am dealing with.

Flooding in the localities situate along the shore of the St. Lawrence, is caused by ice dams. There are certain places where the ice piles up in huge masses, as at Maisonneuve, a little lower down Montreal, and at Ste. Anne de la Pérade, about twelve leagues distant from Three Rivers.

And, further on, he says:

There is, in the river, about five leagues above Ste. Anne de la Pérade, between Champlain and Gentilly, an extensive shoal called the Gentilly shoal. That shoal is two miles wide by five miles long. In the spring of the year, when the snow thaws, and the level of the river rises, that shoal, as it were, breaks and goes off in a single bank, loaded with boulders and pebbles embedded in the ice; it floats down the river and runs against the Ste. Anne pillars. As it is too solid yet to break up, it stops there and forms a dam which goes off only a few days later; while floating down to Cape la Roche, where it breaks up, it drops the large boulders it carries along. For pretty nearly twenty years past, the Government have had the larger boulders removed, which are carried away by the ice from the Gentilly shoal to that at Ste. Anne. The larger boulders are removed, but there still remains a quantity of them which pile up in the bottom of the river and obstruct the passage of the water.

Now, it stands to reason that it is on the Gentilly shoal that piers or wharfs should be built, in order to prevent the ice breaking up too soon, and to cause it to disintegrate itself on the very spots where it forms. Now, it may be urged, how comes it that some thirty or forty years ago those boulders were not thus carried away by the ice? I give two reasons for it; first, because the currents of the river were not the same as they are now; secondly, because the rise of the waters, at that time, occurred much later in the season, about the close of May, while now it generally occurs between the 20th April and the 15th May. That is a matter of general notoriety. The ice, at Gentilly, was then kept back by the shoal itself. As to the change that has taken place in the time at which the rise of the water occurs, the reason for it is to be found in the fact that the province of Upper Canada, formerly covered with forest trees, has been cleared of trees, and is now thickly settled. It is now the most prosperous and thriving province, from an agricultural standpoint. The clearing of the lands and the system of irrigation have first brought about a change in the climatic conditions of the country, and then secured an easier and more rapid passage for the surface waters. The level of the great lakes rises and the River St. Lawrence swells up, while in Lower Canada, where spring is backward, the ice is still solid. Those are facts which cannot be disputed.

That boulders are being carried away from the Gentilly shoal to the Ste. Anne shoal is a fact which may be testified to by all the earlier inhabitants, by all the navigators who have witnessed it; it is a fact beyond dispute. It was the ice from the Gentilly shoal which, in 1865, after breaking up in a solid mass, floated down stream and caused the localities of Ste. Anne de la Pèrade, Batiscan, and other lower lands, down to the Sorel islands, to be flooded, everywhere occasioning considerable damages. Had that ice been kept back by piers it could not have floated down the stream in a solid mass.

I think I may dispense with reading any further extracts from that letter, as what I have quoted from it sufficiently illustrates the opinion of that expert.

With these few remarks, I am satisfied that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) will take my request into his most serious consideration. From the encouraging utterances fallen from the hon. gentleman, a few days ago, when he stated that he would have all necessary public works built, without taking into consideration the political colour of the gentlemen who applied to him, I am led to entertain the hope that he will implement his promises, and that he will not turn a deaf ear to the demands of the hon. gentlemen who apply to him for the construction of necessary works in their constituencies.

Burlington Channel, repairs to piers..... $10,000

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if in addition to this $10,000 for repairs, he intends deepening Burlington Channel to the same depth as Wellington Canal? It is very important to the city of Hamilton that that should be done at an early day. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware

that there is a very large smelting works recently built at Hamilton, and that we have to go to the Lake Superior country for our ores, and that in order to get the ore delivered at the cheapest rate we have to bring it in as large vessels as possible. If we could get the Burlington Channel to the same depth as the Welland Canal we would be able to bring down large barges from Lake Superior with the ores of that country. I hope it is the intention of the Government to begin that work early next spring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that I will give my best attention to the matter. Of course, I have not been long enough in the department to give a definite answer to-night, but after having heard what the hon. member has said, I shall certainly be glad to do what I can.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). This was brought to the attention of the former Government, and I understand they promised to perform this work, and I was somewhat surprised to find that they did not carry out their promise.

Mr. HENDERSON. In connection with the Burlington Channel, I would ask whether the bridge recently constructed over it for passenger traffic has yet been opened to the public? I understand it has been opened for the use of the electric railway crossing the bridge, but I am told that the approaches to the bridge are not yet completed, and the general public are deprived of the privilege of crossing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The bridge is now completed and in full working order and open to the public. The approaches are not altogether finished, but very shortly they will be.

Goderich—Reconstruction of breakwater and repairs to pier..... $28,000

Mr. REID. What is the total amount paid out by the Government on Goderich to this date?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The port of Goderich, as far as I have been able to ascertain, has cost the Dominion nearly $600,000.

Mr. REID. What is the annual expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite impossible to say.

Mr. REID. Is there not a certain amount paid out annually?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. REID. What are the total receipts?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are no receipts.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman ought to know. It is a free harbour, constructed by the Conservative Government, and started 24 years ago as a harbour of refuge. It is the only harbour of refuge from Sarnia to Cape Hurd on the east coast of Lake Huron, a distance of 150 miles. It was commenced after thorough investigation by the Government of Sir John Macdonald in 1872. A commission was issued at my request by that Government to take evidence, and it was decided that Goderich was the only point at which a harbour of refuge could be conveniently constructed. The Government expended about $250,000 on the habour, and the succeeding Government spent in the neighbourhood of $250,000, making in all $500,000. Then an additional sum of $50,000 was expended for extending the North Pier. In the neighbourhood of $600,000 was spent in all to make it a harbour of refuge. The first works were undertaken about 24 years ago, and the second about 20 years ago. From that time until now nothing has been done at all except to extend the North Pier a distance of some 50 to 100 feet.

Four years ago the engineer of the Department of Public Works reported to the Government that unless the breakwater, which was the protection to the harbour, was repaired, serious consequences would result, that the breakwater had given way, having been erected 20 years before, and that then it would cost $6,000 to repair the work. The Government of the day turned a deaf ear to the warning of their own engineer and did nothing. The next year the engineer of the department again drew the attention of the Minister to the condition of Goderich harbour, and pointed out that further damage had been done by the spring and fall freshets, and that then it would require $18,000 to repair the northern breakwater. The Government still did nothing. The town of Goderich sent delegations over and over again and pointed out that if the Government wished to preserve this great public work from absolute destruction, they must repair it at once. And still they did nothing. Next year the engineer again made a report pointing out that still further damage had been done to the northern breakwater and that unless it was repaired at once, this harbour for which $600,000 had been paid, would be destroyed, and that the cost of repairs, if undertaken then, would be over $18,000. And the Government did nothing—absolutely nothing. Last session from my place in the House I asked the Minister of Public Works what it would cost to repair the breakwater then, and the hon. gentleman replied that the report of the engineer showed that it would cost $53,000. And yet the Government did nothing. When this Government came into power, I asked the Minister of Public Works in the public interests to send his engineer up and examine the northern breakwater. The engineer went up and made a report showing, I understand, that it will cost $115,000 to re-

pair that breakwater. So that for five years the engineer of the department persistently drew attention to the condition of the work, and for five years the late Government neglected it. If they desired that a work, which cost the people of Canada $600,000 and which makes the only harbour of refuge on the east coast of Lake Huron for a distance of a hundred and fifty miles, to become useless, they could not have pursued a better course. The necessity for that harbour of refuge was shown a week ago when an equinoctial gale passed over Lake Huron, and the Government dredge and two Government tugs had to seek refuge there, and several sailing vessels besides. Yet when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side, they persistently failed to do their duty in respect of Goderich harbour. I regret that the late Minister of Public Works, who has gone to his reward, is not here that I might tell him what I think of the conduct of himself and his colleagues in relation to this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) knows, or ought to know that there is no revenue from Goderich harbour. It is a harbour of refuge and no tolls are charged. The late Government abolished the tolls, and therefore no revenue could be expected. If the present Minister of Public Works desires to do his duty in the interests of the public and in the interests of the navigators of the western lakes, this harbour must be completed and made a thorough harbour of refuge. I have no interest in the matter except as a resident of the town, and as I do not want to see $600,000 of public money wasted, as it must be, unless it is saved by the energy and pluck of the present Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, despite what the hon. gentleman says, are the docks at Goderich harbour of any commercial value, and are they rented as in past years ? I think the hon. gentleman is incorrect in this respect and that the docks are rented, But if they are of no commercial value, it is well the House should know. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the "Hansard" of 1894, he will find that a grant of $33,000 was made for this harbour.

Mr. CAMERON. I mentioned that. It was for the extension of the northern pier. And I may say, that although there are no tolls from the harbour, nor the docks proper, but the northern breakwater is rented for piling lumber, and there is a small revenue from that, but the Government get nothing from the harbour proper.

Mr. REID. What does the revenue amount to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have nothing to do with that ; that belongs to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. CRAIG. I am a little disappointed not to find anything in this estimate for the harbour at Port Hope, which, I think is the best harbour and the most important one between Toronto and Kingston. I would say nothing about the matter if it were not for the fact that some repairs are absolutely necessary and ought to be made this fall. I hope that in the Estimates that are yet to come down the hon. Minister will have the sum necessary to make these needed repairs.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that nothing is appropriated here for the harbour of Port Dover. I presume he has had time to examine the papers I submitted to him showing a case of urgency for a grant of money for that harbour, and I hope that in the further Supplementary Estimates he will be able to do something in that connection. I do not propose to go into the matter, but I may say that a large sum of money has been expended by private parties for the improvement of this harbour, one grant alone having amounted to $15,000. There has been one grant given already of $15,000. I merely wanted to ask the Minister with regard to the further sum that was promised.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friend has said, I had not time to look carefully into the question which has been submitted to me. I am sorry that I cannot extend any hope to him of a further sum of money during this session. I can only promise to give my best attention to the papers which have been brought to my notice.

Mr. GUILLET. I desire to thank the Minister for this appropriation for much-needed repairs at the Cobourg harbour of refuge. This is a most important harbour. When completed, it will contain 50 acres of harbour, of an average depth of 17 feet, with 26 feet at the entrance. It will then be certainly the most important harbour between Toronto and Kingston, if not between Port Dalhousie and Kingston. The amount appropriated for repairs is small, but they are urgently needed. A much larger sum will be required to complete the repairs in a permanent manner, and I trust that a further appropriation will be made next year. Dredging is also very necessary in the inner basin, as it has to be used until the outside harbour is completed ; 800 feet of breakwater requires to be built to complete the outside harbour. I hope the Minister will be able to send us a dredge later on, as the harbour commissioners have been promised the use of a dredge to make the inner basin more accessible in stormy weather, as the water is now so low in the lake.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the Minister of Public Works whether each of these

docks, wharfs or piers, or all of them, are private, or are they Government docks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are all public property, with the exception of L'Orignal.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an item of $1,000 for repairs to Thornbury wharf. It is very much needed, and, on behalf of the people, I thank the Minister for it. I regret that he could not see his way clear to put an item in for a little additional dredging that is very much needed there, and also in Meaford. A year ago last summer, a dredge was doing some work there, but, owing to the money running out, it was obliged to stop before the work was done. A little more work is badly needed both in Thornbury and Meaford.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to thank the Minister for the grant to Port Dover. I hope I will not be asking too much, if I suggest that, before next session, his engineers should examine and see if the papers I submitted to him are correct.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will go carefully into the whole question.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the amount of revenue collected from these public piers and wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are all free harbours.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg to draw the Minister's attention to the harbour at Oakville, the only harbour of importance between Hamilton and Toronto on Lake Ontario. A year or two ago, the late Government spent a sum of money in dredging Oakville harbour, but a further sum is needed to complete that work. The dredge had to be taken away on account of pressure elsewhere. I would ask the Minister to make inquiry with reference to this important harbour, and see if a little grant, possibly a thousand dollars, could not be made for the purpose of completing what was undertaken at that time.

Harbours and Rivers, B.C..... $19,000

Mr. PRIOR. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there is nothing in these supplementaries for Victoria harbour. There is an item in the Main Estimates, but it is altogether insufficient for the work that is required. This matter was brought to the attention of the late Government, and it was their intention to give a much larger sum. There is, as the hon. gentleman's deputy will inform him, a very fine dredge in Victoria, purchased a short time ago for, I think, $28,000. It is one of the most modern kind ; but for the sum of $10,000 it cannot be worked any considerable portion of the year, because of the large amount of money that is used up in wages, and, therefore, it is idle for the greater part of the year. I would ask the Minister, if further supplementaries are to come down, to put a further sum in for Victoria harbour. He must remember that the sea-going vessels now visiting Victoria, bring it up to the second largest port in Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item of $10,000 was put in last year, and I take it as I found it.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman will find, on looking over the correspondence, that a larger sum was promised by the late Government.

Telegraph line between Marjorie and Cheticamp, re-poling $1,000

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Has this line to be re-poled or is this money awaiting expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This is to do the work.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Is there any report in the department to show that the poling is absolutely necessary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is such a report.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). During the late political campaign there was a vast number of telegraph poles strewn along that line. As the Minister's assistants in his office must know, that line was built only a few years ago. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he sends a competent inspector to look at these poles he will find that they are afflicted with that disease which the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to the other evening as the rickets. I warn the Minister that he should send a competent person to examine these poles before he expends this $1,000. I must say that there is considerable dissatisfaction at the management of that line throughout. The repairs and maintenance of that line are entrusted to the agent of the Western Union Telegraph Company in St. John, N.B. There is a sort of partnership between that gentleman and a certain Mr. Keeley in one of the departments here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is the chief officer for that work in my department.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Yes, I think so. The agent of the Western Union Telegraph Company manages these affairs. Mr. Keeley does not appear in the matter very frequently at all, but the agent of the Western Union Company sends a detachment of his men about once a year to repair that line. Seeing that the Public Works Department is in new hands now I trust that there will be a change with regard to the management of that line. I have given these few points in order that the Mnister may see that the management is taken under his own depart-

ment, and not left under the ægis of the Western Union Telegraph Company.

Mr. ELLIS. I presume that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) refers to the agent of the Western Union Telegraph Company, he means the superintendent.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Yes.

Mr. ELLIS. There can be no question that that gentleman is a most capable and thoroughly reliable, and honest, and honourable man.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I raised no doubt whatever as to the capability of the superintendent of the Western Union Telegraph Company. But the Western Union Company is an American corporation, and I do not think that its agent should be permitted to manage this very important business for the Department of Public Works of Canada. I do not reflect in the slightest degree on the honesty or capability of the superintendent. But I do say that he is hardly the proper person to manage our business.

Mr. ELLIS. It ought to be said with regard to these employees of the Western Union Telegraph Company, that they are all Nova Scotians or New Brunswickers, and that they are all deeply interested in the work. I know nothing about this particular matter, but I can readily understand that it might be much cheaper for the Public Works Department to entrust the management of this small service to men who are engaged constantly in carrying on such work. They are men who are capable of doing it, and who have all the necessary appliances at their hands.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis) that the men in the different counties through which this line passes are perfectly capable of doing this work. I submit that it is hardly worth while to send a detachment of men from New Brunswick to replace a few telegraph poles in the county of Inverness in the province of Nova Scotia.

Resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, September 30th, 1896.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 1st October, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that the fourth report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the present session be now concurred in.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) if this is the report which recommends the appointment of certain translators in the place of those who were dismissed ?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Sir, I have to say about it, now that we know the facts, that the whole proceedings culminating in this motion is one of the most extraordinary, and I venture to say one of the most scandalous that has ever come before Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman should proceed to criticise the proceedings of a committee of this House as scandalous.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course if I have done anything out of order I will withdraw it. What I wanted to say is this, and I will try now to express myself more in language that will be within the rules of the House ; I wanted to say, that the action of those who have followed up the translators with a view of having them dismissed, is, in the light of their subsequent action, the most extraordinary proceeding, as I believe, that has ever taken place in any Parliament. Here are hon. gentlemen who come before the committee and prosecute four men with a view of having them dismissed and apply the most rigorous and inquisitorial process in their regard, and it turns out that their object in dismissing them was to appoint in one case the son of one of the judges, in the other case the partner of one of those who

were at once judges and prosecutors. The hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet) when asked in regard to the qualification of one of the candidates, said in committee——

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Order. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to what occurred in the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this occurred in committee the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) must not refer to it in the House. The hon. gentleman must get his facts outside the proceedings of the committee, if they are not contained in the report. That is the rule of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. We have the facts then, and these facts are eloquent enough. One of these gentlemen who is recommended for appointment now is the partner of the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet).

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not carried ; and if hon. gentlemen opposite were to cry out "carried" until the crack of doom, the people of this country will hear more of this matter. I say here, that in the history of parliaments, trifling as this matter is in its incidents, nothing has occurred that calls more for the scrutiny of the public outside of these walls, than what has taken place in regard to these translators. Here is one hon. gentleman in this House whose son is to be appointed, and another hon. gentleman whose partner is to be appointed, and, Sir, what guarantee have we of the fitness of these gentlemen? These gentlemen also are as violent partisans as any of those gentlemen could possibly have been whose dismissal was sought with so much eagerness. Now, Sir, let us suppose hon. gentlemen acting in this House, ostensibly in the public interest, ostensibly in the interest of efficiency in regard to the officers of Parliament ; let us suppose that an hon. gentleman in this House had made out a case for rendering vacant offices in the gift of the Government of the Day, and it turned out that he wanted the vacant place for a partner of his own or for a relative of his own. Why, Sir, it would so clearly vitiate his position and his bona fides as a member of Parliament that it might fairly be a question whether he should retain his seat any longer in this House. I think I am not going too far in contending that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen smile at that, but if they will look over the records of Parliament and the standard of honour that is held up in the great mother of parliaments, by whose standard we measure ourselves here, and in whose glass we try to dress our proceedings, they will find that there is more in what I say than they think. When Mr. Butt brought before Parliament the case of an Indian Prince and advocated his cause with the eloquence and the resources that belonged to that great man, Mr. Roebuck found out that Butt had taken a fee for doing that, and what was the result ? In order to avoid expulsion, Butt not only retired from Parliament but he disappeared from the Four Courts of Dublin, and did not return for years to the city. What is the difference between an hon. gentleman taking a fee to advocate a certain course in Parliament, and an hon. gentleman coming, first to a committee and subsequently to this House, and advocating the dismissal of a man against whom there is no charge as regards inefficiency, and then placing in that position a man who is his own partner ?

Mr. MONET. Would the hon. member allow me a word ? I may say that Mr. Geoffrion is not and never has been my partner.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I am now in a strait betwixt the two. I do not know how to take what the hon. gentleman says, because it was the hon. gentleman's own word that I had for it, that Mr. Geoffrion was his partner.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must accept the hon. member's statement.

Mr. MONET. I have no interest whatever in the appointment of Mr. Geoffrion. I practice in the county of Napierville, and very seldom go to Montreal ; but when I do I have, as is said in French, a pied-à-terre in Mr. Geoffrion's office. My name is on a sign at the door of his office, but I am not his partner and never have been, and I have no interest in his appointment.

Mr. DAVIN. I am bound to take what the hon. gentleman states ; but I heard him, and gentlemen around me heard him say that Mr. Geoffrion was his partner.

Mr. MONET. Will the hon. gentleman oblige me by saying who told him that Mr. Geoffrion was my partner ?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Monet—that is the name. I was sitting at the same table in the committee room with him at the time. Then, we have another gentleman whose son is to be appointed. I hope there is no doubt on that subject. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of importance ; it is a matter that affects, in my opinion, the honour of this House ; and, although I do not intend to make any motion on this matter, I think the House should not pass this motion without understanding the motives that have actuated those who have prosecuted these cases.

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) I feel quite surprised at the remarks fallen from the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davin), in connection with the fact that my son has, it happens, been appoint-

ed on the staff of translators. I am so much the more amazed at those remarks, as when that appointment was suggested, I mentioned the matter to the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, and asked him how he would view the proposed appointment of my son as a translator. Then the hon. gentleman told me: I shall be most happy to see him appointed, and should his name come before the committee, I will vote for him. Those are the very words used by the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman turns around, and in the same breath, charges me and my son, before this House, of violating the law concerning the independence of the members of Parliament. I may tell the hon. gentleman that, if we are guilty of such a breach of the law, we have become so only after having sought his advice on the matter.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I may remark that this is only a question of justice towards the dismissed officers, as well as one of justice towards this House, and the gentlemen whom it is proposed to appoint as translators in the place of those who were dismissed. The hon. gentlemen who are members of the Debates Committee have thought it fit to report to this House, after having dismissed, on the ground of active interference in politics, three translators from the staff of the official translators of this House, that three other translators should be appointed to fill the places of those who were dismissed. We are entitled to know from the Government whether the gentlemen whom it is proposed to foist upon us, are men who have kept altogether aloof from the political arena; whether they have not taken an active part in the late elections, and whether they have not used offensive and abusive language with reference to their political opponents, during the late electoral contest. Why, Sir, if those gentlemen were guilty of exactly the same offence as those whose dismissal was sought for with so much eagerness were guilty of, I fail to see why these three men should be dismissed and three partisans put in their places.

I think the House should deal justly by the dismissed translators. As a rule, those to whom some wrong has been done are entitled to appeal to the tribunals for the redress of their grievances. But there is no gainsaying that when this House, or a committee of the House choose to commit an injustice, there lies no appeal to the tribunals for him who is wronged. So that, however modest may be the position of an officer of this House who suffers an injustice at our hands, I hold that it is a very serious matter for this House, or for a committee of the House, to do him an injustice. But, it may be urged, where is the injustice when those translators are treated exactly as the previous translators, whose places they are to fill, were? The same measure of justice is meted out to them, and they have nothing to complain of. Let me ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he was of opinion in 1888 that justice was done by the translators who were dismissed at that time, and whether he did not qualify, in the strongest terms, the course then pursued by the Government, when he stated that a crying wrong was being perpetrated against those officials of the House. I say, therefore, that the hon. gentleman has no right to appeal to the precedent created at that time and to come and tell us that they are simply doing by those who go out, what we did in 1888 by those who were then dismissed. If in 1888 when he was leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman cried out that the policy of the Government with regard to the translators was a crying injustice, I hold that neither the Government nor the hon. gentleman himself have a right to come and tell us now that they are dealing justly both by those who go out and by those who are put in their places.

If I understood aright the programme of the hon. gentlemen at the late elections, they claimed to be a Government pledged to reform. Well, Sir, I venture to tell the hon. gentlemen that the people of this country will say that this Government, who have so far refrained from declaring their policy, except by persecuting the civil service employees and the translators of this House, is not a Reformist Government, but an apish Government, in so far as they are trying to ape exactly the dangerous precedents established by their predecessors in office, while doing nothing to mend the mistakes made by the late Government. The hon. gentlemen are dumb as to their general policy; they have not, so far, made known their policy either on the Manitoba school question or on the tariff. It is only when it comes to persecuting the civil service employees and the official translators they agree upon a policy. With the exception of a few items, such as removing from the civil service a certain number of Conservative officials, they have so far refrained from disclosing their policy. I say, therefore, that the course of the hon. gentlemen will be condemned at the hands of the people of this country.

Why, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite have no time to concern themselves about those great questions of public policy affecting the interests of the people of this country, but they have plenty of time to spy upon the civil service employees and the servants of this House, and to hunt for arguments for dismissing them. But I hold, Sir, that such a course is not creditable to a Reform Government, but rather worthy of a Government with a pack of hungry followers to provide for, in order to redeem the promises made during the late electoral contest. The Government of the day are more concerned about providing for those hungry followers than about giving satisfaction to

the people of this country who are calling upon the Government to declare their policy upon the great issues of the day. The Government do not deal justly by the civil service and the officers of this House, and their actual course shown clearly that the hon. gentlemen, before organizing this persecution, and providing for their hungry followers, should have announced before this House their policy concerning the great issues of the late electoral campaign. The Government should have enunciated their policy on the Manitoba school question. They should also have disclosed their policy concerning the reform of the civil service, but a just and fair reform, not one of persecution against journalists, members of the translating staff of the House, and against tribunes of the people who took part in the late electoral contest. The Government would have done more creditable work if they had undertaken the great reforms which they had pledged themselves before the electors to achieve, with a view of carrying the country, instead of persecuting those orators who took part in the late electoral contest and the publicists who sought to impress upon the people the views which they deemed the best in the interests of the country.

I am really amazed, Sir, to see my hon. friend the leader of the House, posing as a persecutor of tribunes of the people, of publicists and journalists, when those gentlemen, according to the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman himself in 1888, were free, outside the session, to go into journalism, to take part in the electoral contests and to give free expression to the views they thought the most conducive to promote the public interests. Let not the hon. gentleman come and tell us that he is meting out to the translators who have just been dismissed the same measure of justice as was meted out by the late Government to those dismissed in 1888. Let the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that, from the grounds alleged by himself in 1888, what he is now doing is not giving a full measure of justice, but rather one of injustice, and that as a reformer, granting that there is anything to reform, the hon. gentleman is bound to reform the civil service on the lines of justice. He should not try to ape the late Government, who, as he stated, had made a blunder in the matter.

Mr. STENSON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I remarked, while listening to the remarks just fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Dupont) that he qualified as persecutors of the tribunes of the people those who dismissed the officers of the House who participated in the late electoral contest. One would be led to believe that the Reformist party is the only culprit in this case. I shall not take up a great deal of the time of the House on this question, but, as I am one of the victims of persecution, I may remind the hon. member for Bagot that it is not only the Liberal party that has been guilty of persecuting civil servants. And in my case, there was no similarity, as I was not a federal officer, but a civil servant in the employ of the provincial government, and of the provincial House of Assembly, whose rulers belong to the party which the hon. gentleman is supporting in this House. Not only was I denied an opportunity of vindicating myself; not only was I dismissed, before committing any fault for which I might have been brought to trial, but no sooner had I been invited to run for the Dominion Parliament than I was notified by the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, a gentleman of the same political persuasion as the hon. member for Bagot, that I had to make my choice between being a candidate or a school inspector, and that without any delay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not wait till I was brought to trial. As soon as I was notified by my employers that I had to make my choice between keeping my position and running for the Dominion Parliament, although I did not see any inconsistency in being an office-holder under the local government and being a candidate at the federal elections. I complied with their request, without needing much urging. I received that order on the 2nd June, and on the following day I resigned my position. From the fact that a member of the local government objected to an office-holder under him running for the House of Commons, I understood that it was the proper course for me to resign. If those who have committed the offence for which they have now atoned had pursued the same course, we would have been spared a great deal of discussion and the time of the House would not have been wasted in useless wrangles, and a large sum of public money would have been saved. I challenge the late Attorney General of the province of Quebec to rise in his place and state to this House that I had uttered a single offensive word against the local government, notwithstanding that they opposed me most bitterly. And I hold that, after resigning his position in the Quebec Cabinet, he had no more right than I had to take part in the federal elections. I may say that, in my opinion, he was less justifiable than I was to pursue such a course, because I had been invited by the people, whilst he should have kept quiet and minded his own business in the provincial government. I believe that this charge of persecution recoils upon the hon. gentlemen opposite and that it becomes them ill to raise that cry, because they were the first to persecute their opponents, and they did it mercilessly.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in explanation of the remark I made when I interrupted a little while ago, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The hon. gentle-

man stated that he had heard me say that Mr. Geoffrion was a partner of mine, and he even hinted that such was the reason why I had brought up charges against some translators of the debates. When the question as to whether Mr. Geoffrion had the proper qualifications came up for debate before the committee, I said that I knew him well, and that we used the same office.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot allude to what took place in the committee. It is against the rules of this House.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) I only made allusion to that, to illustrate what I had said, but I bow to your ruling, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can deny having made any statement under any circumstances, if he chooses, but it is against the rules of this House to refer specifically to what has occurred in the committee.

Mr. MONET. (Translation). I never told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that Mr. Geoffrion was a partner of mine in the common acceptation of the word, meaning thereby a legal firm drawing part of their revenue from the general practice of the office, so as to enable him to draw part of the revenue accruing from my practice, and vice versa. As a matter of fact, there is no such partnership between Mr. Geoffrion and myself. The partnership existing between us is a merely nominal one. I practice in the district of Iberville, but I have also cases which require my presence before the Montreal courts, and whenever I go there I use Mr. Geoffrion's office; and my partnership with him only amounts to this, that I have the freedom of his office.

I need hardly add, Sir, that I have no pecuniary interest whatever in Mr. Geoffrion's appointment, and that that gentleman will reap all the profits, should any accrue to him, which I am inclined to question, as he will have to leave his office and neglect his practice, in order to come to Ottawa during the session to discharge his official duties, should he accept the appointment, which, after all, may prove detrimental to his interests. So that I have not the slightest interest in Mr. Geoffrion's appointment.

The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has referred to the gentlemen we have appointed to fill the vacancies created by the dismissal of the translators, as hungry office-seekers. Such an utterance, when applied to the gentlemen whose appointment is recommended to this House, to say the least, lack politeness. What is there so extraordinary? Why, looking at the course followed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not see in it any difference whatever from that we are now pursuing. In 1888, when the appointment of translators to fill up the vacancies created by the dismissal of the three translators came up before the House for ratification, were not three Conservatives appointed in the place of the dismissed translators? The only exception made to that rule was when the translators dismissed in 1888 were first appointed on the staff. That was a means of rewarding those who had taken an active part in politics in favour of the Conservative party. Why, then, I ask, should not the party now in power pursue the same course? The only thing we want is that the Government employees, of whatever rank, so long as they are in the service, should refrain from infringing upon the rule of strict neutrality imposed upon them. Such is the principle we have acted upon in those dismissals. Now, Sir, I am charged with having voted in committee upon the complaints which I had lodged against those translators, and which resulted in their dismissal. I object to those translators interfering in politics while in office. Should the same grievance exist later on, those whose appointment is now recommended to this House by the report of the committee, then the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) or any of the hon. gentlemen opposite will be free to lodge a complaint against them. I am accused of being a persecutor, because, after having lodged a complaint in committee, I voted as a member of that same committee against the accused. Previous to lodging a complaint against them, I had investigated the facts of the case, and when the complaints were brought before the committee I was fully cognizant of the facts which, to my mind, fully warranted the dismissal of those gentlemen. Those charges have been substantiated, as I expected, and the facts found quite sufficient to warrant the action being taken. Previous to lodging my complaint, as well as after that, I had found that the facts of the case were sufficient for that purpose, and I think it was only consistent on my part to vote for the dismissal of those translators who had interfered in politics while in the service of this House. True enough, I might have followed the course quite frequently pursued in this House by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and voted against the dismissal of those translators. The hon. gentleman, as the House knows very well, has frequently moved motions which he afterwards undertook to vote down. But I did not think it fit to tread in his footsteps, and to vote down comlpaints which I knew were well founded.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, permit me to make a personal explanation, as you permitted the hon. member. I heard somebody ask if a certain gentleman was qualified, and I heard Mr. Monet say, "Yes, he is qualified; he is a partner of mine." Others heard the same.

Mr. MONET. I never said that.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, there are one or two things that make this case somewhat peculiar. I thought I should have heard the

chairman of the committee, or some member of the committee, say something with reference to the qualifications of these gentlemen whom it is proposed to appoint as translators; but the chairman of the committee, who moved the adoption of the report, did not seem to think that was a matter of the least importance. The main thing with my hon. friend seems to have been to get three out, and to get three others in; and he has not vouchsafed to this House one single word as to whether there has been any test at all made of these gentlemen's capabilities—whether they are literary men, journalists, whether they know something of public life and what may be called the atmosphere of a discussion which ranges over the whole field of Canadian politics, and which no translator can well turn from one language into another unless he is somewhat familiar with that atmosphere, and with the general history of Canadian politics. Not a word from my hon. friend about these things. With him qualifications seem to be not worth mentioning. But if one has been an offensive partisan—and by offensive it will be recollected the hon. gentleman means aggressive as opposed to defensive—that is sufficient. The hon. gentleman has spoken, but I should like some member of the committee, before we vote on this matter, to give the House some information as to whether these men are qualified, what their qualifications are, whether any test is applied by the Committee on Debates, and whether that test has been applied in this instance. So far as I could follow the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet), he came very near to acknowledging to this House that he and Mr. Geoffrion were partners. At first he decidedly said that they were not partners and never had been; but his explanation brings their relationship very close to a partnership. It shows a very strong interest between the two, going so far that they use each other's office and take each other's cases. Well, that may be a distinction, but it is a distinction without any difference, so far as principle is concerned. With reference to the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset), I want to ask my hon. friend the leader of the Government, in view of the position taken by himself and by other members of the Reform party in this House for so many years, as to the great necessity of maintaining the purity of Parliament intact and of having the independence of the members thoroughly hedged around, whether he thinks it contributes to that independence and that purity of Parliament for a member sitting in this House and criticising the acts of a government, as every member is supposed to do, to have his own son appointed to an office which has not a life tenure, which is only a temporary office, from which he is liable to be dismissed on the whim or the wish of the party in power. I do not see the least difference in reality between that and giving the office to the hon. member for Rimouski himself. You give it to his son, and his son can only keep it so long as he is a persona grata with the Government and the party that is; and it will not tend to the hon. gentleman's independence in criticising or disagreeing with the policy of the Government to know that he is held by such a bond as that. I would like to have my hon. friend state whether he thinks that does not come very close to trenching upon the independence of Parliament; and when he answers that question, I do hope he will not answer it by quoting an instance, and resorting to the argument that the other side did the same thing, but that he will give his opinion of this state of things.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I state that, because that argument is pushed so far that it takes away any ground of independent action on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite at all. Whenever they go back on their pledges, their answer to the arraignment is simply to look up a precedent in which some other party did something in the same line. That may satisfy them, but it is not a fair answer; and I hope the hon. gentleman will in this case treat the question on its merits as I put it to him. The whole question with reference to these translators has been a page in the history of this Parliament which will not conduce to the dignity of Parliament, or the good judgment of Parliament in the eyes of those who read its history.

Here you have an hon. gentleman preferring charges against the translators, into the particulars of whose tenure I will not take up time by going at all—his case fails, as we were informed by all the newspapers, before the committee, he goes for further evidence, and at last he gets a vote of the committee and has these men put out. At the very next meeting of the committee, something must have transpired, for just after the solemn vote of the House that these should no longer be translators of the House and relegating the duty to the committee of appointing other translators in their place, we have a further report from that committee asking Parliament to undo what it did a day or two before and to keep these men on until the end of the session. Why? Evidently because there were two parties who wanted to divide the spoils and they could not agree.

Mr. SCRIVER. That was not the reason.

Mr. ELLIS. That is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman has said that the committee could not agree upon the translators, and that therefore the matter went over. The fact of the matter is that it was considered an act of humanity or justice, or kindness, to allow the old

translators to continue until the end of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that I was not referring to what took place in the committee. I was not there, and even if I were, I could not refer to it. But, I say, putting the two things together, that when this Parliament, the day before, solemnly decided that these men were unfit to be translators of the debates, and imposed on the committee the task of appointing others in their places, and when the committee met for the purpose of appointing men worthy and fit to do the work——

Mr. SCRIVER. And you then drew the inference you were not warranted in drawing.

Mr. FOSTER. I can draw any inference I please. The very next day the committee comes down, evidently not being able to agree upon the translators, and asks this House to go back upon its solemn assertion of the day before, that these men were not fit to be translators of this House, and to keep them on until the end of the session. My inference is that the committee found it impossible, at that meeting, to make the new appointments; and from what I have seen in the newspapers, there were more applicants than were recommended, and there were more recommended than were required to fill the places, and as the committee could not agree, they decided to recommend the continuance of the dismissed translators until the end of the session. That is my inference. Is it unfair? I think not. Then, according to the newspapers, one gentleman withdrew a name he had placed before the committee and agreed to substitute another in its stead, and because the nominating parties had prepared notes, and come to an arrangement, we have this recommendation of the committee. Were these gentlemen who were recommended, and as to whose qualification we have not a word from the chairman of the committee, active partisans before they became translators? In the election ending June 23rd last, were those men actively engaged in politics? Were they Liberals who took part in that contest, and if they were—and I can scarcely doubt it—where is the principle that my hon. friend stands upon?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They were not holding office then.

Mr. FOSTER. I apprehended that that would be what my hon. friend would say, and I will come to that in a moment. I ask the hon. leader of the House on what principle he stands, when one day he asks this House to take three men off the translators' list and take their living from them because they actively engaged in politics in the election ending June 23rd, and then to-day he asks us to put on three men who were actively engaged in the same election. Is there any gentleman in this House prepared to rise and say that none of these men took an aggressive part in politics? The chairman of the committee made his own definition. I am keeping him to it. His definition of offensive partisanship was that it was opposed to defensive and was aggressive. It was not necessary to be discourteous, but simply to take an active part in politics. Did these gentlemen take an active part? Where is the principle on which my hon. friend stands? Surely he will not take refuge under the miserable subterfuge that was hinted——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the statement "miserable subterfuge," as applied to the statement of the hon. member, is quite out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I applied that to his statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, I will take anything back for the sake of peace and quietness. I will take it all back. But what I meant to say——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). That is not respectful to the Chair. The hon. gentleman said: "Certainly, I will take anything back." That is disrespectful to the Chair. He was ordered to take it back, and the hon. gentleman should bow to the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has given an instance to this House of his utter incapacity to make a fair statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has not taken back the expression yet.

Mr. FOSTER. I leave it to the Speaker himself. I made two statements. I said, at first, I will take anything back, and then afterwards I said: I will take that all back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For peace and quietness.

Mr. FOSTER. If Mr. Speaker does not bear me out in that, I will make the apology necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear the latter part of the statement that he would take it all back. Of course, if the hon. gentleman said that, it covers the ground.

Mr. FOSTER. I really did say that and meant it in good faith.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was not the hon. gentleman's complete statement. He said he would take it back for the sake of peace and quietness, and not because he was ordered to do so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He said, in the presence of the House, I will take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another example which the hon. gentleman has given of his utter incapacity——

Mr. DOMVILLE. I think that should be taken back also.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another example of the hon. gentleman's utter incapacity to make a re-statement of what an hon. gentleman has just said in the House. I said at first, in a jocular way, or an earnest way, if the hon. gentleman wishes: "I will take anything back for the sake of peace and quietness." And after that I said to Mr. Speaker: "I will take it all back." I did not mean any disrespect at all. What I meant to say was that the interpellation of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) was, I thought, a subterfuge, and if that is too strong, I take it back. What I meant was that it does not meet the case fairly. It is not an answer to the question of principle to say that these men were not officers at that time. The principle goes deeper than the mere holding of the office. If you are going to purge the civil service of this country, so far as this is concerned, you must purge it in one way—you must make it a rule that partisanship shall not entitle a man to an office, and shall not keep him in office after he is appointed. The mere fact that a man is not an office-holder, does not take him out of the category of partisans, so far as the principle is concerned. This episode is a page of our history that will not read to the credit of the House. Once, twice, three times, we have discussed the manifestation of the persecuting spirit which appears in this dismissal of three translators, one of whom did nothing at all, except that, when he was called to the platform at a meeting, he expressed his opinions in a courteous and manly way, without allusions that could be taken objection to. These three men are dismissed, and three partisans are put in their places; and we have taken up hour after hour in this House discussing this small matter of persecuting men who do not think as the dominant party do, and putting others in who persecute the other party.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has, in the course of his remarks on two or three different occasions, assumed to state the policy of the Government on the question now before the House. I have only to state to my hon. friend that upon the whole question the Government have no policy and did not endeavour to influence in any way the decision of the committee. Every member of the committee is ready to bear witness that, when they applied, as it is not unnatural they should do under such circumstances, to know if the Government had any wishes or desires to express, or rules to lay down, in every instance they were told that it was a matter for the committee to deal with, and one with which the Government had no desire to interfere—it was a matter of the discipline of the House. But, as a member of this House, I am free to admit, and free to say, that I have strong convictions, which I expressed on a former occasion. The hon. gentleman has asked me upon what principle I stand on this matter. I stand upon the very principle laid down by his own friends in 1888. I stated, on a former occasion, and I repeat now, that it is no pleasure for me to see these three men dismissed; but, if they are dismissed, it is not the fault of the party now in power, but it is altogether in pursuance of the rule laid down in 1888—laid down at that time very unfairly, laid down this year with justice—because in 1888, when three men were dismissed, it had been well understood that the translators should be free to engage in journalism or in any other occupation, and even to participate in politics. But, in their case, the rule was laid down that translators, temporary employees of this House who were not required to give all their time to the business of the House, were not to interfere in politics. After that, any officer of this kind who interfered in politics, did so at his own peril. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that the inconsistency is shown in this, that, if you dismiss men who are active partisans, you appoint men who have been active partisans. The only answer I have to make is that at the present time we are not concerned to know whether the men whose appointment is now proposed, were or were not active partisans. If they were such, they were within their rights. But, if they become active partisans now that they are promoted, they do it at their peril, and they must expect the same measure to be meted out to them as is meted out to the others. If we were to introduce the system of preventing men being appointed to office because they have been active partisans, we should have to completely revise the rule of the civil service. It is childish for the hon. gentleman to bring forward such an argument. But, while it is childish to bring forward such an argument, because it is contrary to the whole tenor of the civil service, as we have it, we have the right to expect that every man who has been an active partisan, the moment he enters the building as a member of the civil service, shall cease to be a partisan. The hon. gentleman says that we know nothing of the qualifications of these gentlemen whose appointment is recommended by the committee. For my part, I am willing to take the sense of the committee, who have passed upon this question, and I presume that the committee we have appointed and in whose judgment we have trusted, have selected men who are fit to discharge the duties entrusted to them. I might go further than that. Of the three

gentlemen appointed, one of them, the gentleman with whose name that of my hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Monet) has been connected, Mr. Geoffrion, I know personally and well. I will answer for his qualifications. As to the young gentleman who is the son of one of the members of this House, I cannot say I know; yet I believe that he also is well qualified. As to the third, I do not know him, except as a political friend. Referring to the point made a moment ago, in raising the question whether it was proper for the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) to have a son appointed to this office, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was wise, very wise, to anticipate the reproach that might be made. Why, looking at the other side, I have yet to see a man who has not a relative of some kind in the civil service. We bring that forward, not simply to justify our own cause, but to show the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen opposite and the length to which they are ready to go in order to raise an objection. The hon. member for Rimouski is not a member of this committee. It is true, he is a member of this House. I must say that I cannot see any impropriety in the son of a member of this House being employed as an officer of this House. If the hon. gentleman sees any impropriety in this, well, he is endowed with a scrupulousness which is not manifested in the actions of his friends.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), in drawing the inference that, as the committee did not appoint the translators at their first meeting, they could not agree upon the men to be selected, and were obliged to retain the services of the three translators. Now, the fact is that the present translators were kept in these positions for this session out of consideration for them. We thought that they ought to be allowed to discharge the duties of the office for the remainder of this session and draw the full indemnity. It was out of pure benevolence to these men that the proposition was made, and it was made at the meeting at which these new translators were appointed. So the hon. member for York was entirely in error in this respect. The arrangement was made at the last meeting of the committee, and I made the proposition myself, that these men should be paid for the remainder of the session, because I thought they were entitled to it, the session being so near its close. We have never found fault with the work of these men. We assumed that they were faithful translators. It was no harm to any member of this House to keep them in office; in doing this we felt that we were simply doing an act of justice to them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not propose for a moment to protract this very lengthy discussion. The subject appears to have been pretty well exhausted, and it does not require anything more to be said on either side. But I rise for the purpose of drawing the attention of the First Minister to a statement he made in the course of his remarks just delivered to the House. As I understood that hon. gentleman, he took the ground that if a matter was brought before Parliament, that if he contended that what Parliament proposed to do was a grave injustice, a thing that ought not to be done, and voted against it, and if his view was overruled, that for all future time he was bound by the action of Parliament in which he had been in a minority, he was bound by the action of a majority to which he was opposed, and he was bound to adopt the precedent and the principle that he regarded as a grave injustice and an impropriety. Now, that is a doctrine which I hardly think the hon. gentleman intends to propound. Does he mean to say that in questions of public policy, if the majority opposed to him place on record a bad precedent, that is to bind him for the term of his natural life, and that when he comes into power he is going to adopt that bad precedent as his rule of action, and carry it out? Let the hon. gentleman pursue that doctrine a little further. The question of the National Policy has been before this House for 18 years, and the hon. gentleman has taken a position of antagonism to that policy, but the House has voted him down. He is recorded on the journals of the House as disbelieving in the National Policy, and every one supposed that when the hon. gentleman came into power he would carry out the principles which he had advocated in the House when he had been in a minority. Well, where is the difference, if the hon. gentleman is bound by a policy to which he was strongly opposed as immoral, as unjust and improper. Every one supposed that the hon. gentleman's views placed on record in Parliament and before the country, were a pledge that if he attained power, he would change the National Policy and carry out the policy he had himself maintained as being more wise and just; but that is not at all the view he takes of his duty as manifested in his policy towards these translators. I only rise for the purpose of drawing the attention of my hon. friend to the position which he seemed to assume, in his previous remarks, that having opposed a policy which was overruled by a majority of this House, he is now bound to maintain a policy in which he did not believe, and which he had strongly denounced.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think the hon. gentleman has entirely misunderstood the position taken by my hon. friend. As I understand it, what the leader of the Government maintained, was this: that some years ago a new rule was introduced. His objection to the punishment inflicted on the late translators who were dismissed by a preceding Government, was that they were

punished without any rule having been established ; that was his position. Up to that time it had been supposed that these men were free. The House then decided that these translators, although employed but for a part of the year, were not to interfere. That rule was violated by the gentlemen who have been dismissed. My hon. friend's position was that while he had opposed the punishment of the former translators because no such rule had been established, that after such rule had been established, and due notice had been given to these men, they were justly dismissed. That was the position of my hon. friend.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I wish to give the information asked for by the hon. member for York about the qualifications of the men who have been recommended by the committee as translators. I know intimately the three gentlemen who are recommended to this House for appointment. Mr. Pelland is a lawyer of about ten years' practice. He speaks and writes, and can translate, both French into English, and English into French, to perfection. He knows both languages perfectly. I may say the same thing of Mr. Geoffrion, and also of Mr. Fiset. I have known the three gentlemen for a number of years past, and I know their qualifications. When I moved the appointment of these three gentlemen, I stated in the committee, and I repeat to this House, that if I had not personal knowledge of their eminent qualifications, I would not have taken the responsibility of moving their appointment. I may say that although we have no fault to find with the qualifications of the three translators who have been dismissed, I believe the House will be as well served, if not better, by the new appointees. While I am on my feet I may take occasion to contrast the conduct of the Liberal party in 1896 towards the translators who have been dismissed, with that of the Conservative party in 1888 under similar circumstances. The Liberal party in 1896 has called before the committee the parties complained of, we have heard their explanations, we have given them every opportunity to set themselves right, and we have acted according to the rules laid down in 1888, according to right, justice and fair play. Not only so, but we have come before this House recommending that they should be kept on till the end of the session, and receive their full salary. What did the Conservative party do in 1888? At almost the very beginning of the session, three men were dismissed without trial, without a hearing, and received only $150 each on their salaries. They were dismissed contrary to justice and fair-play, without investigation, and upon the mere dicta of one of the Ministers of the Crown. Well, Sir, I am prepared to stand by the contrast between the two parties and the two policies, and I believe that the conduct we have adopted towards these translators is more just, more fair, and more humane than the policy carried out by the Conservative majority in 1888.

Mr. EARLE. I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the debate on this question, but simply to say that after having heard the statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Monet), I desire to say that I have heard the member for Napierville state that Mr. Geoffrion was his partner. I thought it was only an act of justice to the member for Assiniboia that I should state this fact.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. member who leads the Opposition has been criticising the position taken by the leader of the Government in respect to this question, and he seems to complain that the leader of the Government has referred to a precedent which was laid down some time ago in a recent Parliament upon a subject of a similar character. Now, it appears to me that it is entirely proper for the leader of the Government to have referred to that circumstance, not because it would be an entire justification for his action in the present case, but because it materially affects the value which the members of the House, and probably the public at large, would place upon the criticisms pronounced by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think the best evidence which can be afforded of the value of an opinion expressed by that hon. gentleman is to show that his conduct has been in entire conformity with the views he has expressed. If his conduct has not been in conformity with those views, I think every one would be justified in attaching less importance to his criticisms. Now, since we are discussing the subject of dismissals, and since the subject has formed so important a topic of debate during the present session, perhaps I might be justified in calling attention to a precedent of some importance which may have some weight with the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. I know how strong his opinions are upon the subject of dismissals. I know how averse he is, as he has now declared himself, to dealing summarily with persons who, being in the public service, have taken an active part in election contests. I know that he has a very strong opinion that it is introducing a system of terrorism to dismiss a Government employee from office, unless his conduct has been subjected to a very careful investigation, and the matter has assumed something of the form of a judicial inquiry. I know how strongly he holds these views upon that question, and not only are they held by him, but they are held by very many of the gentlemen who support him, if we are to draw that inference from the strength of the language which they employ.

Now, Sir, I take much pleasure in calling to the attention of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to a case which has occurred in his own experience, a case in which he

himself was a somewhat prominent actor, a case which occurred when he was administering the department over which I have now the honour to preside. When I bring to his personal knowledge the circumstances which I have now in my mind, and when I adduce for his benefit the evidence which I possess, I think it will have a very marked effect in influencing his judgment and his opinion upon the conduct of others. I think he will be led to conclude, that that which he has called a system of terrorism, that that which he has characterized as gross and brutal in the extreme, and that which in others he has rebuked as being the conduct of cold-blooded and unfeeling persons; is not after all open to any such criticism, but was on the contrary very proper and very commendable. I may call the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to a case which occurred not later than the year 1883. During the month of April of that year and for some time previously the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) presided over the Department of Railways and Canals, and he took occasion in view of what he alleged to be improper conduct in one of the minor and subordinate officials of that department, to summarily dismiss him; without any trial, without any jury being summoned and without any investigation being held. A young man some seventeen or eighteen years of age, in the receipt of a very moderate income, was summarily dismissed, no doubt with others, but of his particular case I have knowledge. He was summarily dismissed from office because he ventured to take part in an election contest. Did the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) in that case invite him to submit the matter to an investigation? Did he appoint a judge; did he summon a jury; did he take the utmost pains in order that no system of terrorization should prevail, that no injustice should be done, and that no brutal exercise of arbitrary authority should be perpetrated by him? Not at all. The hon gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) simply gave his order, the fiat was issued, the services of the employee were dispensed with and he was dismissed from office. And further, Sir, notwithstanding that this young man sought to be informed as to why he had been dismissed, notwithstanding that his friends had made application to tell them why it was that he had been dealt with in this summary way; he was refused information, he was refused the reason of his dismissal; and it was not until months after the discharge took place, that at last the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was constrained to make a statement of the reason which led him to take the course he did. I hold in my hand now a letter headed:

Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, 7th April, 1893.

That letter is in these terms, and I will read it for the information of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition:

My dear sir,—In reply to your letters of the 17th November and the 9th of February on the subject of the dismissal of your son from the service of the Intercolonial Railway, I have to state that the reason for his dismissal was that he openly took a very active part in opposition to the Government at the last election. This, as you will readily understand——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mark you: "as you will readily understand." My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) was amazed that any one should have entertained a doubt as to the entire justice and propriety of his meting out this summary justice upon this young lad who had dared, as the hon. gentleman alleged, to take an active part in the election.

This, as you will readily understand, no Government officer can be permitted to do, and your son's action was so conspicuous that it could not be passed over.

Yours faithfully,
CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Who is that to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This was addressed to James Ryan, Esq., Moncton.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who was it signed by?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Signed by my hon. friend; signed by Charles Tupper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know the handwriting of the hon. gentleman, and I can certify that this is his own proper signature. Now, Mr. Speaker, one word of comment upon this letter. Hon. gentlemen know when the general election took place which preceded the 7th of April, 1883. They know from the statement in this letter that on the 17th November, 1882, the hon. gentleman had been applied to by the father of this boy to know upon what ground he had been dismissed from office. It is apparent also from the letter that on the 9th February a similar appeal was made to the hon. gentleman. It was not, therefore, until after he had been called upon for an explanation on the 17th November, and after the intervening months between that date and the 9th February passed by, and after a further delay from the 9th of February to the 7th of April, that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper)—who when the occasion calls for it can rise in his place and in the most impassioned terms denounce the brutality and the injustice, and the wrong of dismissing a man from the public service unless he has a trial and an investigation—it was not until after all these months had elapsed, that the hon. gentleman condes-

cended to give the slightest reason or explanation of why that boy was dismissed.

Motion agreed to on division, and report concurred in.

SUPREME COURT—TEMPORARY JUDGE.

On the order being called for the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that a temporary judge of the Supreme Court may be paid, in addition to his ordinary salary and free of all taxes and deductions imposed by any Act of Parliament, the difference, for the period during which he has acted as temporary judge, between such salary and the salary of a puisné judge of the Supreme Court, and also such travelling allowance as the Governor in Council directs.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this order be discharged. Since the Bill to which this resolution refers was introduced in the Senate, we have ascertained that Mr. Justice King would be available for the present term of the Supreme Court, and that Mr. Justice Gwynne has returned to Canada.

Order discharged.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PETTET. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House for a few minutes to a portion of an article which appeared in an Ottawa city newspaper this morning, which reflects upon myself and upon other members sitting upon this side of the House. The portion of the article to which I refer, reads as follows :—

A somewhat unusual scene preceded the vote on Mr. Davin's amendment. For the first time in the recollection of some of the oldest parliamentarians, groups were caucussed and votes canvassed in the Chamber. As a general thing the House divides on such clear cut issues that every party man knows just about where he stands. But in this instance the party men, especially among the Opposition side, were a little at sea. As between their protectionist principles and the desire to " show up " the Liberal party, however, there was not much wavering, and the great bulk of the Conservatives voted solidly with the Government and against the motion. But it did seem strange in view of their particular tenets to see the miserable attempt made by the Patron members to shirk the vote. Messrs. Rogers, of Frontenac ; Tolmie, of West Bruse, and Pettet, of Prince Edward, were in the House and heard the question put, yet it was not until Mr. Davin arose and called attention to the fact that the hon. members had not voted, that the three Patrons reluctantly arose and declared in favour of the amendment. The incident was altogether an unusual one.

I have only to say to the House that, being a new member, I was not aware of the rule that those sitting on this side of the House were expected to vote first. It was not a miserable attempt at all to shirk the vote, but it was for the reason I have given. I have only to add that as long as I have the honour to sit in this House, I hope I shall not be guilty of shirking any vote.

SUPPLY OF MILITARY CLOTHING.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to read a telegram which I have just this moment received from the Hon. W. E. Sanford, referring to a statement made by me in the House on the occasion of the debate on the military clothing. He has requested me to read the telegram to the House, and I think it only fair to him that I should do so :

My attention has just been called to your statement on the floor of the House that you were informed I had an absolute monopoly of the output of the scarlet serge manufactured by the Sherbrooke mills. I have no interest nor has the W. E. Sanford Manufacturing Company in these mills. The scarlet serge was offered to the trade generally, at the time of tendering. The suspicion that there was an understanding among those tendering, I am assured by our manager, has no foundation in fact. As you have no desire to do me personally an injustice, nor the company of which I am president, I trust you will make this explanation to the House.

W. E. SANFORD.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I have very great pleasure in reading to the House the telegram which Mr. Sanford has sent to me.

SUPPLY—MAJOR GENERAL CAMERON

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I would like, on behalf of a gentleman who complains of the treatment he has received at the hands of the Government, I refer to the late Commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston to bring his case to the notice of the House. This complaint is a dual one. In the first place, he complains that he has been dismissed without a fair opportunity of making his defence. In the second place, he complains that he has not been equitably treated in the matter of allowance, even supposing he was entitled to be dismissed. This gentleman has had a very honourable record, and that record should have entitled him to honourable treatment at the hands of the Government. He is now quite advanced in years, and he has in his lifetime, on numerous occasions, received at the hands of his Sovereign, and also at the hands of the military authorities in England, marked manifestations of approval of his conduct and his ability. To relate briefly this gentleman's history, I may say that

he entered the Royal Artillery in 1856; became captain in 1866; major in 1875; lieutenant-colonel in 1882; colonel in 1886; and retired major general in 1887. This history of itself goes to show that the gentleman was at least entitled to some consideration, but apart from that, he has received distinguishing marks of approval from his Sovereign and the military authorities in England, which are direct credentials of his fitness for the office he held. I may mention that in 1859, on the establishment of the School of Gunnery at Shoeburyness in England, he was one of the first class of officers elected to graduate as instructors of gunnery. In 1863 he was selected to organize the Armstrong Mountain Battery, as the base of operations for the Ambeyla campaign, then in progress. The campaign ended, he was sent from Peshawur to Dinapore in command of a military train, including the Armstrong mountain battery, preparatory to the Bhootan campaign. Appointed adjutant of the artillery of the four columns of the Dooar field force operating against Bhootan, he displayed great military ability and received flattering marks of approval from the commanding officer. From 1877 to 1880 he commanded an artillery district at Malta. He was invited to take a sub-commissionership in Cyprus, under Sir Garnet Wolseley, but was debarred by regimental exigencies. In 1886 he declined the command of the artillery at Guernsey for family considerations. For the same reason he declined to accept the command of the troops in South Australia. Then he was offered the commandership of the Canadian militia on the retirement of Major General Middleton, which, I understand, he also refused. From 1872 to 1876 he was appointed Her Majesty's Commissioner for the delimitation of the international boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains, and was in military command and civil charge of the expedition, and superintended the marking of the line. For this, on the recommendation, no doubt, of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the leader of the Reform Administration, he received the decoration of C.M.G. at the hands of Her Majesty. He also received a letter from Lord Derby acknowledging his eminent services on that occasion. In 1881 he was invited by a committee of the Royal Society to superintend in Canada the British magnetic and meteorological observations, but was prevented from accepting by military exigencies. He was also appointed to the commission for the delimitation of the international boundary between Alaska and Canada, and he made a report on that subject, which was highly commended by the home authorities. In 1883 he was appointed secretary to the Canadian delegation at the International Conference at Paris for the protection of submarine cables. In 1887-88 he acted as official secretary to the Canadian commissioner at the Washington Fisheries Conference. These are all acknowledgements from the highest source of his possession in a marked degree of a mastery of those special branches of science and military subjects which are the requirements of a military educationist of the highest order. In 1888 he was appointed to the position of Commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston. We start General Cameron's regime, then, with strong presumptive proof of his fitness for the position of commandant. I am not going to enter into a full detail of General Cameron's regime; but I will say this, notwithstanding rumours that may be, that are abroad, which led to the appointment of a commission by the late Government, or rather led to the sending of a delegation to inquire into the working of this establishment, so idle and unfounded were these rumours that the present major general commanding the militia of Canada, Major General Gascoigne, made a report which entirely exonerates the commandant. Yes, if anything was required to justify the mastership of that institution, it was that report, which shows how shadowy were the criticisms of his administration. The report was in two parts. A portion of the first part I shall read, simply to show how full and elaborate was the investigation which General Gascoigne made into the affairs of that institution. He said, in his first report, dated 2nd December, 1895, that he had "made a most exhaustive inspection throughout," and in the more detailed report which accompanied this letter, or report—the fourth paragraph reads as follows:—

> I was greatly pleased with the physique and general appearance of these young men. Take them all round, they were a body of youths of whom Canada may justly be proud. They were of unusually good physique, well set up, with a healthy appearance and pleasant manners. I noticed that their hair was not kept as closely cut as should be in a military, or indeed in any other college, but with this trifling exception to which I directed attention, there was nothing whatever to take exception to, but quite the reverse. I feel confident that every one of these young men, whatever his future may be, whether civil or military, will leave the college greatly benefited by his stay there; will be improved in tone and manner, and will, therefore, be a better citizen of this great Dominion. The country should therefore be proud of the college, and to do its utmost to improve and help it. I consider that the mixture of civil and military education is a most happy one, the discipline taught by the military element at the college being of the utmost benefit to all alike, whether their destination be civil or military, and as the number of military openings to young men is exceedingly limited in Canada, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a civil education side by side, and I consider that this is most happily arranged.

At that time this delegation reflected on the management of that institution, and one of the grounds of complaint of the commander of the college is that no fair oppor-

tunity was given him to make his defence before that commission. They proceeded in a thoroughly un-British way, not tolerated by the rules of the British Army or by any principle of British jurisprudence. They proceeded ex parte, they denied him the privilege of being brought face to face with his accusers, or even the privilege of hearing the testimony adverse or favourable to him, of asking a single question in cross-examination. They even denied him a copy of the evidence. On the report of this delegation and the report of General Gascoigne, which latter is a complete exoneration of the hon. gentleman, the commandant was dismissed. Apart, however, from these reports of General Gascoigne, I may say that the record of the institution is itself its greatest justification and the greatest vindication of the commandant. The report of the delegation was in two parts. One part was fair enough; the other was strongly condemnatory, in general terms, of the commandant, as being unfit for his position. This last report, based on the evidence of the cadets and professors examined was never submitted to him, and he never knew of its existence until the beginning of this session. On the 30th June, 1896, the commandant made a report on the state of the institution, and I will read a few paragraphs in that report, which are not the opinions of the commandant himself, but simply facts of history, and which afford the strongest justification of, and the highest encomiums that can be passed on the commandant. He says:

If our critics could for a moment have realized this point, and allowed honesty guided by intelligence to regulate their remarks, they could not have yielded to the malign influence which led them to disparage the work being worthily done by the instructors and cadets here. They might have learnt that in 1893, the Inspector General of Fortifications of Her Majesty's Forces, on a deputation on military education to the Secretary of State for War, spoke of our graduates in the highest terms, saying: "The officers we get elsewhere than from Woolwich, are far better than those who come from Woolwich, either with regard to science or with regard to general education. The officers which we get from the Military College of Canada are very good men indeed; it is true we get only one or two from there so perhaps they are the best the college can produce." Again, before a Royal Commission to inquire into the entrance examination, in 1894, they are referred to as having had a higher standard of work, and more knowledge of what was required by Royal Engineers, than graduates from Woolwich.

Our adverse critics might have learnt too, that within a few weeks preceding the commencement of their attacks, general progress had advanced to a point never before attained in the history of the college since its foundation in 1876.

Previous to the last four years, the most distinguished gold medallist of the college was Mr. Wm. J. Stewart, who graduated so long ago as 1883 with a record of 54,656 marks.

During the last four years that record has been exceeded in four instances by from 924 to 1,802 marks.

The next highest record made previously to 1892, was by Capt. Lang, D.S.O., R.E., with 53,505 in 1883. Since 1891 his record has been surpassed seven times by an average of 1,769 marks.

The third highest record up to 1892 was made by Mr. R. W. Leonard, with 53,271 marks; this again in 1883. His score has been surpassed, since 1891, eight times, by an average of 2,760 marks.

Only three graduates just named—inclusive of but one gold medallist—find place and rank as 5th, 9th and 11th, amongst the following gentlemen, who, with one exception in 1891, all graduated since 1891:—Messrs. F. H. Vercoe, G. R. Frith, G. S. Wilkes, R. J. F. Hayter, G. F. F. Osborne, V. L. Beer, J. F. Fraser, G. N. Cory, W. C. Dumble, N. S. Ridout, D. S. McInnes, J. W. Osborne.

So that but for the men of 1883, all those whose names I have read, graduates of the last few years, surpassed all previous records since the foundation of the college in 1876. Morover, prior to 1892, in only one instance did the marks of a gold medallist exceed the mere average of the graduating class of last year.

Since that report was penned, the result of the examinations to England for admission to the Imperial service of graduates from the military schools has come to hand.

The following graduates of the Royal Military College, Kingston, have been granted commissions in the Imperial service, a notification having been received to-day from the War Office:—W. A. S. Evans, to the Royal Engineers; W. W. H. N. Cantlie, to the Royal Artillery; M. C. Stephen and W. C. C. Wood, to the Infantry, and Mr. G. E. Hardie, to the Indian Staff.

These facts are sufficient raison d'être for the Military College, and an admirable proof of its effective management by its late commandant; but the objections that have been taken to this institution are not, either from the reports of the Major General or the commandant themselves, so much objections to anything the commandant did or was incapable of doing, as objections to the general administration of the college itself. Some of them claim that, in the administration of the affairs of that college, there should simply be military instruction given, and that it is absurd in this country, where we have numerous colleges graduating men in arts, to combine an ordinary arts course with a military course. I shall not engage in a discussion of that matter. It is one concerning the general administration of the Militia Department, and it is not one in which the commandant could exercise the slightest authority, or is in any way responsible. Having so high a record, both as to the military career of General Cameron and his career as an educationist, in connection wth the Military College, he is entitled to fair treatment. What treatment did he receive? His engagement was one continuing from year to year, and he was entitled to a fair notice before being discharged. The notice he received was entirely too limited. He was discharged with simply fifteen days' notice, and awarded two months' pay, when he was entitled to one year's pay.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. POWELL. I state that in ordinary institutions he would be entitled to twelve months' pay, as a matter of law. Of course, the Crown can do no wrong, and he may not be able to recover in a court of law. Let us see what the regulations are with respect to other professors of the institution. Under the rules and regulations governing the institution, every instructor in the college is compelled to give six months' notice before he can resign. There should be some mutuality of contract. If a man is compelled to give six months' notice before he resigns, the Government should give him six months' notice before calling on him to resign or award him six months' salary at least in case of immediate dismissal. And if they dismissed him summarily and immediately, they should at least have given him six months' salary. Now, in the case of his predecessors in that office, it must not be forgotten that they were appointees from the active list of the British army, and, according to the rules of that army, they were simply given leave of absence, and, at the termination of their employment under the Dominion Government, their regular employment in the British army at once recommenced. In the case of General Cameron's immediate predecessor, he was granted two months' pay and travelling expenses back to England. Immediately these men left the Canadian service, their pay in the British army re-attached. But this does not hold good in the case of a man on the retired list, and that is one of the hardships that General Cameron suffered. He was not even allowed travelling expenses back to England, but, by the Order in Council, he is allowed travelling expenses from the Military College to any point in Canada that he may select as his home.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment. What he says is true as regards the first Order in Council, but the Order in Council has been amended, and the hon. gentleman will see by the Estimates laid on the Table that there is provision for the return of General Cameron to England or to any point in Canada, which is the same as in the case of General Luard.

Mr. POWELL. I was not aware of the change, and I presume that this has been made since the papers were laid on the Table, for I have examined those papers carefully and I find no record of such an Order in Council.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) allow me to ask him one question? Where does he get these war services that he quoted? I hold here the services of all the officers of the Royal Artillery, and I do not find what he has quoted. Will he please tell me where he finds these services?

Mr. POWELL. I am not sure that I understand the question, but it seems to me that it is not pertinent to the subject I am discussing. Of course the rules governing employment in the Military College under the Dominion Government are not the same as those of the British army.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You have stated certain services as bearing on this claim on the Government. Where do you get them from?

Mr. POWELL. I base the claim from the Government regulations and the principles of justice, not from my hon. friend (Mr. Domville) who is a gallant Colonel——

Mr. DOMVILLE. Never mind the "gallant Colonel."

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is a bright and shining light in the volunteer service who offered his services to Her Majesty, declaring himself ready to command a brigade and shed his blood upon the battlefields of Soudan, and he should not be ignorant of the fact that the general army regulations are not the regulations that control military schools and colleges.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That has nothing to do with the question I put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have asked a question, and I would like an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to put a question, except with the consent of the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. POWELL. I have no objection to answer any question put to me. But the hon. gentleman must surely understand that I am discussing the Military College, and not the regulations of the British army. At the time I was interrupted I was proceeding to refer to the particular points of which Major General Cameron complains. I will take the army regulations. One of the regulations, as my hon. friend (Mr. Domville) is no doubt aware, is that when a superior officer has ground of complaint against an inferior, he must specify with great particularity the points that he has to urge against him. The words of the regulations are as follows:—

> Whenever an officer is disadvantageously reported upon by his commanding officer or when the answers contained to any of the questions in the confidential report made by him are not thoroughly satisfactory, the particulars of the reports are to be read verbatim to him by the officer making it in presence, when possible, of the inspecting officer (i.e., General) of the senior officers of the corps.

Nothing of this kind was done in the case of Major General Cameron. He asked to be allowed to meet his accusers face to face, and the Government denied him the privilege, nor would they give him the oppor-

tunity of cross-examining the witnesses against him, or even seeing the evidence on which he was condemned. Then at a later stage when application was made to the Minister of Militia by the late commandant for an investigation into these matters he was courteously asked not to continue the correspondence. The following is the closing part of the letter of the Minister of Militia :—

You are now in possession of all the information in this department relative to your case. You furthermore find fault with the Government for not having furnished you with a copy of the Supplementary Report of the Board of Visitors, recently laid on the Table of the House. Had I supposed it possible that the late Government had not furnished you with a copy of this document, I should certainly have done so. It is inconceivable to me how such an omission could have occurred. But I do not think that you have any right to hold me responsible in the slightest degree. I have no means of knowing whether this report, or what reports affecting you may have been considered by the late Government, but in view of the two reports of the board of visitors and of the report of General Gascoigne, the Government felt that it would be unjust to you as well as to the college and the country at large to require you to remain longer in the position of commandant of the college.

I trust that you will not consider any continuance of this correspondence necessary.

Yours faithfully,
F. W. BORDEN,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

To that the commandant replied :

Kingston, Ont., 23rd Sept., 1896.

The Honourable F. W. Borden,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st inst., communicating to me the only two recommendations to Council in my case.

In one of these reference is made to my claim to travelling allowance, and to a communication on the same subject from the Major General commanding the militia of the nature of which I am ignorant, but no reference is made to my claims, on equitable grounds, to one year's salary in lieu of notice terminating my appointment.

I learn from your letters that you are now aware that by your action I was required to immediately vacate office—followed by the publication of the statements of opinions of others which gave rise to your actions, without prior invitation to me to meet the allegations which influenced you ; and further, that even under such circumstances you desire correspondence on the subject should cease.

You disclaim responsibility for the consequences to me of the course that has been followed, and dispute my right to complain on the ground that to some one else was due the oversight of not communicating to me the charges against me.

But he with whom rests the authority to condemn and who exercises it, cannot justly overlook his duty to hear both sides, nor honourably evade his responsibility to give redress, by mere reference to the alleged faults of others.

I have the honour, to be, sir,
Your most obedient servant,
D. R. CAMERON.

Mr. POWELL.

I think, Sir, from the tenor of the correspondence and from the facts of the case this gentleman has been very severely and very unjustly dealt with, and I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will not pursue the course he intimated here of discontinuing all communication with the late commandant, and that in justice to him he will allow the commandant one year's salary as a matter of fair-play and equity—an act consonant with that justice that is meted out to even the humblest menial.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Before addressing myself to the facts which the hon. gentleman has been discussing, I may call his attention, as an old member of Parliament, to the fact that he did not extend to me the usual courtesy of notifying me that he intended to bring this question of the Military College and the resignation or removal of Major General Cameron as commandant of that college. So important a question as that of the Military College, I think, demanded from him the extension to me of the usual courtesy of notifying me that he intended to bring it up at this time.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me—I presumed he was well aware of the fact that the matter would be brought up, since the letters and returns were called for, and, inferentially, at least, he was notified that this matter would come up for discussion. I certainly did not intend any discourtesy to him, and had it occurred to me, I would have notified him. I might have brought it up in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I certainly expected that the question would be brought up in connection with the Estimates, but I received no notice, and no notice had been placed on the Order Paper that it would be brought up in this way. But I might not have been present in the House when the hon. gentleman brought the question up, and it would have been more fitting that he should have given me notice, and more in accordance with the custom. But, as it has turned out, no great harm has been done, because I am, to some extent, prepared, and I happen to be in my place. Now, the hon. gentleman concluded his remarks by expressing the hope that it was not my intention to cut off all communication with Major General Cameron, with reference to certain claims which he makes upon the Government, one of which is for a year's pay. Most assuredly, it is not my intention to cut off all communications ; but I felt that the letters which that gentleman was writing to me, and the correspondence which was going on at the time I made that observation in the concluding part of my letter, were such that nothing useful would come out of it. That was the reason I expressed the hope that that particular branch of the correspondence might not continue.

Most assuredly, any claim which General Cameron has, will be considered. I have no desire, nor has the Government, to treat General Cameron or anybody else unfairly. With regard to the short notice which was given, it was impossible for the Government to have acted otherwise. The Government did not take office until near the middle of July, and at the very earliest moment thereafter the Government took action in regard to this matter. The usual course has been pursued, two months' pay has been granted, and the money necessary for the return of General Cameron to his home in England, or to any part of Canada that he may select to settle in, the House will be asked to grant. Now, that is precisely what was done in the case of General Cameron's predecessor. If he has a case, as the hon. gentleman thinks, for a larger grant than two months' pay, it will be considered. The hon. gentleman, speaking as a lawyer, thinks that General Cameron has such a claim ; it is not my opinion that he has, but I can assure him that the claim, whatever it may be, will be fairly considered. The hon. gentleman has said that General Cameron had no opportunity to answer the report of the Board of Visitors appointed to investigate the affairs of the college. Well, I am informed that this report was made precisely in the same way as the previous reports. It is a matter of almost yearly occurrence that the affairs of the college are investigated by a Board of Visitors, and I believe that precisely the same course was pursued when the last inquiry was made by the board, in November, 1895, as was pursued in previous cases.

Mr. POWELL. I may remark to the hon. gentleman that I am informed of what is certainly an extraordinary proceeding, and which never before occurred in the history of that institution, namely, that the commandant was not asked to be present at all, but that the students and professors were brought in one by one, under promise that nothing would be said as to their statements, and behind his back, and in this un-British manner, this gentleman was condemned.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, these allegations of the hon. gentleman have not been brought to my attention. I believe that the composition of the board was such as to guarantee that the investigation made by that board was fair and honourable. Walker Powell, colonel and adjutant general of militia, was chairman of that board ; T. J. Duchesnay, lieut.-colonel and deputy adjutant general of district No. 7, was a member of that board ; H. Smith, lieut.-colonel and deputy adjutant general of district No. 1, was a member of that board ; Duncan Macpherson, captain and divisional engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was a member of that board ; and Mr. Sandford Fleming, who, it is true, did not agree with those gentlemen in their report, was a member of that board. But his disagreement was not so much with reference to that part of the report concerning Major General Cameron, as it was with reference to the lines of instruction in which the college should be conducted. Now, when the hon. gentleman makes a statement on the floor of this House that this Board of Visitors proceeded in an entirely unfair and un-British manner, he is making a direct charge against gentlemen who have hitherto occupied high positions in this country, as men of honour and men of integrity. I shall be loath to believe it possible that these gentlemen conducted any Star Chamber investigation ; I cannot believe it possible that they proceeded in any other way than in a fair, honourable and truly British fashion. Well, Sir, I do not propose to enter into details in reference to this matter.

The hon. gentleman has referred to the career of General Cameron prior to the time of his taking charge as commandant of this college. Now, I do not desire even were it possible for me, to detract in the slightest particular, from the high encomiums which that hon. member has bestowed upon General Cameron. He is a distinguished officer of the British army; there is no doubt about that. He has done important service for the British Crown ; I agree with that fully.

Mr. POWELL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me. I am sorry to break the continuity of his remarks, but on page 15 of the return brought down last year, in the report of the commandant, in which he answers the charges which are preferred by this commission, you will find this statement:

> That the board received evidence of slackness in discipline prevailing—I cannot question ; but I am not aware what the evidence was, nor of the weight due to it, for, at the special instance of the board, I absented myself from presence while they were examining members of my staff and cadets.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have simply to say as I hav said already, that the names of the gentlemen who composed that Board of Visitors are a guarantee that everything done at the time of that investigation was done fairly, and in accordance with proper rules, and without any departure from the code of honour. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) complained that General Cameron did not receive a copy of the second report of the Board of Visitors which was laid on the Table of the House with other papers this session. I have said in my letter to General Cameron, that I could not conceive it possible that he did not receive a copy. Of course I am bound to accept his statement, and I do accept his statement. Had I had the slightest idea that he had never seen that report, I should certainly have sent him a copy at once. It is not my fault that he did not receive it. He was in the hands, I suppose, of his friends, and surely he had

a right to expect fair treatment from them. His complaint should be against the late Government and not against the present Government. That Board of Visitors was appointed a year ago when the late Government was in power. Both of these reports were in the hands of the late Administration, and if General Cameron did not receive fair-play by the manner in which the investigation was carried on, it was their duty to see what he did. I had a right to assume, and this Government had a right to assume under all the circumstances, that General Cameron must have received from the hands of the late Government the fullest fair-play.

Mr. POWELL. I am unaware that the late Government took any action upon the report of the commission. I understood that General Cameron's answer was regarded by them as a conclusive answer, and that they retained him in office.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The late Government published one report, and they had in their possession all the reports. The late Government failed to place in the hands of General Cameron the supplementary report of which he complained, and which was laid on the Table of the House this session.

Mr. POWELL. With General Gascoigne's report in hand, they considered the matter did not require explanation, and they retained the General.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What was the nature of General Gascoigne's report ?

Mr. POWELL. The only objection General Gascoigne raised was that the cadets had not their hair cut close enough.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have here General Gascoigne's report, which in referring to the commandant, reads as follows :—

1. The Commandant.—I am decidedly of opinion that there should be a limit to his term of appointment. I cannot but think that after a certain lapse of time, any man loses that zeal, activity and interest which it is so absolutely essential should be kept up in the case of the officer in chief command of a military educational establishment. Young men are especially quick to receive impressions ; and energy and great personal smartness of dress and appearance are, in my opinion, essential to form a good commandant. In my opinion, this position is one that should be thrown open to some exceptionally smart, energetic officer of the Canadian militia. But there should be a fixed limit to the term of appointment, renewable, perhaps, for a limited extension at the option of the Government.

Now that is the report of General Gascoigne.

Mr. POWELL. But take the whole report and there is not a word condemnatory of the commandant from beginning to end.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). What do you call that. It is as severe a condemnation as could be.

Mr. POWELL. That report refers to general regulations.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) has read this report. General Gascoigne divides it under different headings. The first, referring to " the commandant," and the others to the professors, the hospital, the cadets, commissions in the permanent forces, and so on. The part of the report I have read was that which General Gascoigne limited to a criticism of the commandant.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did General Cameron have that report ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly. The report I have read from, has been published to the world for six months. Now, in the report first published the Board of Visitors referred to the commandant as follows :—

The board, therefore, considers that the education of cadets who attend this college should be continuous, be thorough so far as the means within reach will permit, and of a modern type, and that, in order to insure this desirable result, the commandant should be changed at short intervals of, say, five or seven years, as may be found expedient or necessary ; also, that as long as it is necessary to employ the services of a military officer from Great Britain as commandant, he be required to be an officer of not higher rank than lieutenant-colonel on the active list of the Imperial regular army.

That is the part of the main report of the Board of Visitors which refers especially to the commandant, and they say that he should not be kept in his position for longer than from five to seven years, and that he should not hold rank higher than that of lieutenant-colonel. Well, Major General Cameron was in this position for about eight years, I think, and it is as clear as can be what is the meaning of the report of the Board of Visitors. The supplementary report also deals with the commandant, and it has been laid on the Table of the House. It is dated the same day as the report from which I have just read, and referring to the officers composing the staff, it says :

The board of visitors for the Royal Military College for the current year desires to say in addition to the general report, that according to evidence produced to the board, it is necessary for the well-being of the college and in the interest of the country that several of the staff should be replaced by better men. The first of these is the commandant. This officer, it is clear, does not take that interest in his work and does not exercise that supervision over those under him which he should do. To this more than anything else appears to be due that lack of confidence in the college which seems to have spread throughout the country. At all events, that is the feeling amongst the staff and cadets, and the board is satisfied that no real improvement can take place in the college until a change has been made in the commandant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the hon. gentleman whether, in the face of a report like that, signed by such men as those who compose this board, it would be possible for the Government to retain in his place a gentle man described as Major General Cameron is there described.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman asks me a question, and I will answer it. I would say that where an ex parte charge of that kind is made, without an opportunity for cross-examination by the person charged, any tribunal which would render a judgment of dismissal would act in a way entirely unjudicial, and in a way which so far as I know has no parallel in the history of jurisprudence in any country in the civilized world.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, I have pointed out, over and over again, how this Board of Visitors is constituted, and how deliberately it went about its work and made the reports which I have given to the House. It would be an insult to the men who compose that board to say that they made that report without having first satisfied themselves that it was a just and correct report, and in face, first, of the report of the Board of Visitors, the main report; secondly, the subsequent report, and, thirdly, the report made by the Major General commanding, it seems to me it was absolutely impossible that the gentleman who was in the position of commandant of that school should remain in that position any longer. Even if the report was an injustice, if you like to put it in that way, it was absolutely impossible that the college should succeed or should even go on under those conditions. What are the facts with regard to the college? The facts are that from some cause or other the college has been steadily going down until this year there are only eight or nine new cadets going in. With regard to the college itself, there is a wide field for discussion, and I admit frankly that I have not yet had an opportunity of taking the matter up and considering it as I propose to do, and as I believe its importance demands. I have read very carefully the report of Mr. Sandford Fleming, a report which I think is entitled to careful consideration. But for the present the college is going on as usual. The hon. gentleman seems to lean to the view that the college should be changed to a purely military one.

Mr. POWELL. No; I was simply stating the objections urged by certain members of the commission. I did not express any opinion upon it. If the hon. gentleman wishes my opinion, I think the Canadian constituency is altogether too small to conduct a college on the lines recommended by Mr. Sandford Fleming.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is a feeling in the country that it is no part of the duty of this Dominion to run a university in competition, to some extent, with the regular universities of Canada. As I have said, it is a question which requires very careful consideration and very delicate handling. In view of the fact that the Imperial government has placed annually at the disposal of the gentlemen who graduate annually from this college five important places in the British Army, we have to consider whether it is not our duty to maintain the college as it is. There are certain Imperial interests in connection with it which have to be considered, and I think it would be premature for me, particularly as the hon. gentleman says he himself has not formed any opinion in reference to it, to discuss this particular branch of the subject.

I have nothing further to add to what I have said with reference to Major General Cameron. The Government have acted in good faith in this matter, believing that their action was in the best interest of the country, and that they were doing full justice to Major General Cameron so far as it was in their power to do so under the circumstances.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not think the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) was as courteous to me as he might have been when I asked him his authority for his statement of the services of Major General Cameron. He retorted by saying that I had offered to go with my regiment to the Soudan. That was no answer. If he were to go into the courts of Westmoreland and conduct a case in that way, his client would not be satisfied. I think my hon. friend ought to tell us where he got his information, in order that the House may not labour under any mistake. My hon. friend does not think fit to take any notice of my request. Therefore, I say he has omitted one circumstance. He might have stated that Major General Cameron received a medal from the Royal Humane Society for wading into the canal at Ottawa to take a little boy out of it. Major General Cameron needs no recommendation from this House. He needs no eulogy from my hon. friend from Westmoreland, who put forward a very bad case for the General. I suppose that any officer of the Royal Artillery who severs his connection with it honourably, is satisfied with what rank the British government bestows upon him. I have no desire to disparage Major General Cameron in this respect; but my hon. friend makes him suffer under a hardship. He talked about the rules of the British army. What does he know about the rules of the British army, coming as he does from Westmoreland? I will tell my hon. friend that any man who enters a school of gunnery in England, whether at Sandhurst or at Woolwich, is appointed for seven years, and if he had ever so much distinction he could not remain one hour longer, and for the very reason laid down in my hon. friend's report, in order that they may

have a younger man, one who has not been there so long, and has not had time to grow careless. That being the case, what complaint have we from Major General Cameron. He says he was dismissed. He was not dismissed. He was only there on sufferance. He had retired from the British army, in which he had served with distinction, and had taken this position, There could be only one reason for his remaining there, and that was that he belonged to a distinguished family of Canada and was entitled to an appointment as well as the rest of them. Under the new conditions and changes, it is necessary that we should get rid of some of these old men, who have, in their day, done good service, but whom it is now desirable we should replace by younger men. Everybody feels that something should be done for this college. I do not know where the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) got his brief, but he certainly did not get it from any of the records, and he would not tell us where he got it. He was kind enough to refer to my son who graduated from the Kingston College with honours, but I say that had any one else but General Cameron been in charge, he would have done very much better in that institution. General Cameron had a pique against him because I needed him at home one day. There were family reasons why he could not join the college that day, and General Cameron, to whom the application for leave of absence was made, did not attend to the matter himself but had a telegram sent by one of his junior officers refusing to grant the request. I applied to the then hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Adolphe Caron), who very kindly said that he would have the matter made right, and it was, and from the day my boy went back to the college until the day he left, he received no consideration from General Cameron. Instead of giving him, after he had passed with honours, a certificate of good conduct, he gave him a certificate that his conduct was not satisfactory. How could he have passed with honours, had his conduct not been up to the mark? Although this boy passed out with honours, fifth or sixth from the top, yet because he got his leave of absence, on that particular occasion, from the head of the department, and not from General Cameron himself, General Cameron gave him a certificate which was a slur on his college. I have placed in the hands of my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), a protest from the ex-cadets against the manner in which this college is conducted. I do think that when the Government gave him $1,600 in place of the pension he had from the British government, they did very well for him, much better than he expected. Had he been under the Imperial government, he would have had nothing because, being retired, he is not entitled to have a position of that kind. But he received from this Government very generous treatment, perhaps on account of his relationship to an hon. gentleman in this House. Considering that he had served eight years, and that the Government proposed to give him $1,600 in lieu of any damages he might sustain by the change in his position, which position I maintain he had no title to, I think the hon. member for Westmoreland went a long way to make out a case. I do hope there will be a great change in the management of the college. I have great faith in the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), who has promised to look into it. There is a feeling in this country that it does not meet the case.

An hon. MEMBER. Wipe it out.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not know about that, but I do think some great radical change is necessary. Whatever feeling I may have with regard to the treatment of my boy, I need not take that matter up, because I find in the very report my hon. friend read a condemnation of his conduct. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) should not appear in this House as an advocate, when he does not give his authority, but should take the House into his confidence and say where he got this history from, which he gave the House.

Mr. BRITTON. I think the Royal Military College is something this country ought to be proud of. I think that it is to Canada what West Point is to the United States, and as the United States are proud of that institution, and as the people of England are proud of their military schools at Sandhurst and Woolwich, so we ought to be proud of our military college at Kingston; and instead of crying it down, we ought to see what really is the matter, if there is anything the matter in the administration of its affairs and try to apply a remedy. We would then be doing the very best that can be done to utilize to the best purpose the money now spent on that institution. The men who have been turned out from the Military College have made their mark, not only in Canada, but all over the world, and the men that have been turned out in the past—and I speak with some personal knowledge of the subject—are no better than those now being trained in the institution. I am free to admit that the numbers have diminished. It is not so very difficult to find the causes of that diminution. It is easy to criticise educational institutions. They, above all other institutions, seem to be particularly open to criticism, and there are three classes of persons that are most prone to criticise them. There is, first, the students, and no matter what his ability may be, the student knows a great deal more when at college than he does at any other time. Then, in addition, we have the parents who criticise, and of whose criticism we have had an instance to-day. Our hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) has brought his own personal grievances into

this House. Because he thinks that his boy was not properly treated, he was ready with his criticism against the commandant. Then we have another class of critics, the tax-payers, who feel bound to see that the work they pay for is being well done, and to that extent their criticism is fair. But they ought not to jump to conclusions from letters written in the newspapers, whether they appear in the "Army and Navy Gazette," or in a local paper. They ought to know the facts before pronouncing judgment. Nobody who advocates the maintenance of that institution will say that its administration is, or has been, perfect. There is room for improvement, and I hope that, under the administration of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), who is capable and energetic, such improvements will be made as will greatly benefit the college. And, for my part, I am satisfied he will do that, because he has everything there, the site, the buildings themselves, and the experienced staff, though it may be that some changes will be found necessary—he has all that is necessary to make the institution a success. Now, at present the cost, according to Estimates of this House, is only $66,600 for the year. The total militia estimates as passed and to be passed—for I assume that these further Supplementaries will be passed—grant for Militia and Defence no less than $2,640,835.70. I admit that the amount this year is exceptionally large owing to large contracts for clothing and arms that have to be provided for this year. Still the item, even in an ordinary year, is a very large one. In comparison with the estimate for this year, the expense of the Military College is only 2½ per cent of the total amount expended for the purpose of Militia and Defence. We have not arrived at that stage when that expense can be done away with. War is yet one of the possibilities that we have to look forward to, and it is necessary that this money should be provided for the purposes of defence. And that being so, I say without fear of contradiction by any person who will examine into the matter and ascertain the facts, that there is no part of that money for Militia and Defence that is better spent or that yields a better money's worth than the amount spent for the maintenance of the Royal Military College. That college is necessary yet, and, if it is necessary, then the only question is as to the management. Now, I admit—and the hon. Minister of Militia has referred to that—that the Government is face to face with the questions that are presented by these two reports of the Board of Visitors. The Board of Visitors is composed of five members, and has presented a majority report and a minority report. The difference between these gentlemen, Mr. Sandford Fleming on the one side and the four others on the other side, is set forth in statements in their several reports, which I may briefly quote. At page 9 of the report, Mr. Sandford Fleming says:

> If I understand the purpose for which the Royal Military College at Kingston has been established, it is with the primary object to provide the means of imparting a military education, the final object being to assure the presence in the community in after years, of a number of thoroughly educated military men, who although engaged in civil life would be available for service in any critical emergency.

On the other side, is is shown at page 8 of the report, that the view of the majority is that a combined civil and military education during courses lasting four years is best suited, under existing circumstances, to advance the interest of the college and the country. These are the two views succinctly placed before the Government as to how that college is to be maintained in the future. Now, this board met on the 13th November last. On the 15th November they differed as to the object or mission of this Royal Military College, and therefore Mr. Fleming did not continue to sit at the Board of Visitors or to discuss the question with them any longer. Up to that point no question had arisen, so far as I understand their report, in reference to the efficiency of Major General Cameron, nor had they dealt with that question at all. We find, at page 9, the following letter from Mr. Sandford Fleming to Col. Powell:

> Dear Colonel Powell,—Since I left you last night I have given the discussion of the Board of Visitors of the Military College, especially with respect to the system followed in the education of cadets, my earnest consideration. As I differ in my views so completely from yourself and all other members of the board, on a fundamental point, and it will be impossible for me to join in the report of the board, I can see no good will result from further attendance on my part. I propose to address the Minister in a separate communication.
>
> It is with extreme regret that I am constrained to differ from my colleagues.

So we do not get any light from him or his report in regard to the efficiency either of the commandant or any other officer in connection with the college. But these other gentlemen have placed before the Government their views in regard to the mission of the Military College and the work it is to do; and so it must be dealt with by the Government. I admit that up to the present time the Government adopts the views of the majority of the committee, and if they do that they are in perfect accord with the commandant of the college, as will be seen by his reply. Now, these reports are dated 18th November, 1895, apparently to inform the Government, to whom these reports were presented. It is worthy of notice that while there are two reports from four members of the Board of Visitors, only one speaks particularly in reference to the commandant. The other deals very little with him, rather deals with the general principle in regard to the administration

of affairs of the college than with any particular occupant of any office in connection with it. But why these two reports were pigeon-holed by the late Government, I confess I fail to see. We know nothing of these two reports until in March, and I think on the 14th of March one of the reports is sent to Major General Cameron, and he answers it in a way which has been shown, so that I need not trouble with reading that. Now, the late Government though having dealt with it in that way and having received Major General Cameron's answer, and having Major General Gascoigne's letters before them, apparently did nothing further in the matter. Whether they accepted these as satisfactory explanations, whatever may have been the reason, the fact remains that they did nothing further in the matter. Now, the next thing we know about is that prior to the new Government coming in, Major General Cameron, in the course of his duty, presented his report, dated 30th June last. That report, which is also among the papers, is a full report upon the affairs of the Royal Military College. The next thing we know is that the new Government come in. The new Government find these reports in the office of the Minister of Militia. Now, looking at it from my standpoint and considering what the Government ought to do in a matter of that kind, it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Militia is perfectly right in saying that he assumed that the late Government had done their duty and had shown General Cameron—although there is no reference to it in any way in the correspondence—or had made him aware in some way of all that there was in reference to him in the department, unless they were satisfied that whatever charges there were were entirely groundless. Assuming, as he did, that they had done so, what was the duty of the Minister of Militia in the matter ? I do not think that any hon. member on this side or any on the other side can find fault with the hon. Minister if, assuming this, he concluded that it would be better for Major General Cameron to resign. If that is so, it only becomes a question of the terms upon which he would deal with the commandant. Upon that point I wish to say a word. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), of course, is not responsible for what the late Government did in that matter. He, of course, could not have been cognizant of the facts at the time this report was made in November last when he had not charge of the Government ; and, when he did take charge of it, of course, he did not hold the office of Minister of Militia, and therefore in no sense can he be blamed for the conduct of the late Government in this matter. I think they were blameworthy primarily in not, in the interests of all parties, dealing with these reports as they were presented. If this report, which only saw the light when it was brought down to this House, is true, then, in the interest of the college and of the country, the late Government ought to have dealt with it ; but if it was not true, then in the interest of Major General Cameron and of the students under his charge, they ought to have dealt with it. But it was not dealt with, and as to the action of the present Government, I am not prepared to blame them for asking for Major General Cameron's resignation. But having asked for his resignation, it becomes a question what compensation is to be made to him for allowing him to remain in that office down to the very eve of the opening of the college, and then asking him to go.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BRITTON. Before recess I said the late Government should have taken some action on these four reports that were then in the hands of the Minister of Militia. When I say these four reports, I may say that only one, and that was the second one of the four Visitors, called for any action on the lines we are discussing. If they did not do their duty, would that be a reason for doing any injustice to Major General Cameron ? Will any injustice be done to him if he gets only what the Government now propose to give him ? Perhaps the word "injustice" is too strong—will he be dealt with less liberally if he gets anything less than a year's salary, than the manager of a perfectly solvent company would be in a similar case ? Hon. gentlemen should not make up their minds that Major General Cameron is not entitled to anything, nor should the Government be influenced in the same direction merely because some hon. members have very little regard for the Royal Military College. I think when hon. gentlemen seek to belittle its advantage to this country, it is because they have not appreciated its work, and do not know how little, comparatively, it has cost for the results attained. I do not think, however, their view in reference to the college should at all affect their view in dealing with this question ; nor do I think some additional allowance should be refused because they may think that Major General Cameron was not the best man for the place, should they come to any such conclusion. I do not say that I have come to any such conclusion. I found Major General Cameron a conscientious man, a man most interested in the college, and a man, I believe, whose highest ambition was to have the college succeed, and to have the young men who went out from it, fully equipped for the work they had to do. Now, of these four reports, there is only one, I think, that really gives notice to Major General Cameron that his services were summarily to be dispensed with, or that he would be required to resign immediately. That report Major General

Cameron never saw until it was brought down to this House. Now, then the only notice he had that his resignation would be required was the letter of Major General Gascoigne, dated 14th August, by which he was given to understand that he ought to resign by the first of September, as it was intended by the Government to make new arrangements. As I said before, I find no fault with that, the necessity was cast upon the Government to do something in the line of what they did do. Now, as to what is to be done with Major General Cameron, I regard the case very like that of an improvident contract that has been forced upon the incoming Government by the outgoing Government; and that being so, I think it would be the duty of the new Government to ratify a contract fairly made, and perhaps it is only fair to deal with Major General Cameron in that way. Now, we find that in the Supplementary Estimates two months' additional salary is provided, and his travelling expenses to the place he desires to go in Canada or England. I do not think myself that is sufficient, but I recognize perfectly the good faith of the Government and their desire to do what is fair and just. He is not in the position of an individual only hired by the year. At the same time I do not forget that the statute creating the Royal Military College provides that the commandant shall hold office only during the pleasure of the Crown; but when he is there, and is continued on year after year, and when the Government could not expect him to leave unless he gave at least six months' notice, which is the rule with all other professors, then it seems to me this Government ought not to deal harshly with him in the matter of salary. I think he was entitled to longer notice, and to more consideration under these circumstances. As the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) said, there ought to be mutuality in matters of this kind, and what we would expect of him, we ought to be ready to accord to him. We ought not to forget, either, that he is an Imperial officer, borrowed by us for that purpose. We sought Major General Cameron. It is true the office is a good one, a valuable one, and it was no doubt to his advantage to take it; but at the same time it is right for every man to make the best bargain he can in his own interest. We sought for an officer from the other side, and we were permitted to have Major General Cameron, and having an Imperial officer, we ought to deal liberally with him, we ought to deal in no parsimonious way with him, and if we err at all, we should on the side of generosity. It is important that a good feeling should exist between the Government and its employees, particularly those of the character of Major General Cameron. With regard to the opinions that were expressed by these Visitors who made the report, and I do not quarrel with those opinions. I think very likely the head of that institution should not be there too long; but that is all beside the question we are discussing now. If time permitted, I think I could show to the satisfaction of the House that the efficiency of that college could be maintained at an expenditure somewhat less than is asked for this year. I am satisfied that when the Minister visits that college, and when he considers any new departure that he may take in reference to it, he will find opportunities which I am sure he will not be slow to take advantage of, whereby the highest state of efficiency of that Royal Military College can be maintained with economy, and at such an expenditure that no hon. gentleman could object to. I speak not on account of personal friendship to the gentleman in question, although I have the pleasure of his acquaintance. In reading these reports, and finding the notice that Major General Cameron had of them, I felt that if it were my case I would think an injustice was done to me, and I try to do to others as I would they should do to me.

Mr. BEATTIE. I do not rise in order to take part in the debate, but I merely wish to ask the Minister of Militia a question. In reading the report of the board appointed to investigate the state of affairs at the Military College in Kingston, I understood him to say that the board was composed of six gentlemen: three lieutenant-colonels and commandants of military schools. Surely, I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, because these gentlemen recommend that no officer should hold a position like Major General Cameron's, for more than five or eight years. It seems very strange to me that gentlemen holding a somewhat similar position should bring in such an extraordinary report. Perhaps if these gentlemen had a little of their own policy carried out in their own case, it might change their opinion.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to call the attention of the Government to an important question. I will relieve the House immediately from any anxiety by stating that I do not intend to make a speech. I regret that the First Minister is not here, but at this late period of the session, if I defer the question I intend to put, I might not have another opportunity of asking it. I would like to know whether or not any settlement has been come to on the Manitoba school question, and if so, what is that settlement. If there has been no settlement, I wish to know if negotiations are actually proceeding, or if correspondence is still being carried on between this Government and the government of the province of Manitoba. It was promised all through the last campaign

in the most formal and solemn manner, that as soon as my hon. friend who now leads the Government came into power, he would appoint a commission to proceed to Manitoba to effect a settlement of this vexed question. I ask the Ministry to vouchsafe some information on this point, and to tell the country and the House whether this commission has been appointed. It was held out to us, and I think the promise had a great deal of effect, that Sir Oliver Mowat would be appointed as the chief commissioner in this matter and that by his good offices, no doubt a satisfactory settlement would be brought about. Has anything been done in this direction ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I might just reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) that, as was stated by the Premier on more than one occasion, there is every reasonable prospect of this matter being amicably settled. Beyond that, at present, I am not in a position to go.

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

(In the Committee).

To provide for the establishment of a fog alarm at Belle Isle..... $20,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). On the south-east coast of the Island of Belle Isle lying outside the Straits, there has been hitherto established a fog alarm by the throwing of bombs. That has been found very unsatisfactory, and for some time past the steamship owners and the committee of Lloyds have been pressing on the attention of the Government the absolute necessity of having a proper fog alarm there. I need not state the immense importance in a place like that, of having a proper fog alarm system. Col. Anderson went there at my request some two months ago and examined the place, and made a report in which he strongly advised compliance with the request of those interested for a proper fog alarm. This vote is to carry out his recommendation.

To provide for two gas buoys at Lake Erie $3,500

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where are these gas buoys to be placed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Col. Anderson has visited the place and selected the sites.

Mr. McGREGOR. One is near Bar Point, the other at Colchester Reef, and a third at Pelee Point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A large delegation of masters and seamen came here and agreed with Col. Anderson as to the points at which the buoys should be placed.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Have these buoys been already procured ?

Mr. McGREGOR. Col. Anderson is there now, placing the buoys.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The buoys have already arrived from London.

Mr. TISDALE. Has the Minister provided in the main Estimates for an additional buoy at Port Dover ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. REID. Would the Minister have a buoy placed on the rock in what is called the Narrows, just west of Brockville ? The main channel there is only 100 feet wide, and there is a dangerous rock right in the centre of it. A large steamer with a barge in tow was stranded on this rock this summer. It would only cost a few dollars to have a buoy placed there, which would be of great assistance to mariners. I would like the hon. Minister to get his deputy to investigate this matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will take care that the hon. gentleman's remarks are brought to the special attention of the officer charged with that.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. Minister will find in his department correspondence from me in relation to that matter. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries under the late Government did take some action to reduce the shoal in question ; but owing to the low state of the water during the last year or two, it proved to be insufficient, and I think it would be well if the Minister would make some inquiries in regard to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the state of the lighthouse on the pier at the town of Oakville. Some two years ago, owing to the pier becoming partially undermined, the lighthouse was moved towards the shore, and remained there a considerable time. During the early part of this year the pier was repaired and levelled up ; so it would be no trouble to remove the lighthouse to the end of the pier where it was before, and where it would be useful. It is of very little use where it is at the present. I would ask the Minister to make a note of that.

To provide for the expenses of the British Commission appointed under the Behring Sea claims convention, and the remuneration and expenses of counsel and witnesses, and other expenses in connection therewith $50,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This amount is, I think, larger than we shall require. When the Estimates were first made up, I had no data upon which to judge what the expenses

would be. I knew that the American government had provided a sum of $75,000, and I thought in a rough way that we had better appropriate $50,000; but after I had made that recommendation to Council, I sat down with my officers and went over the subject very carefully, and it seems to me I shall not require to ask the House for so large a sum. I would therefore move that this vote be reduced to $30,000, which, I think will be sufficient.

Mr. ELLIS. Does this Government pay the whole cost?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Each government is to pay one-half of the expenses of the commission. Negotiations were carried on by Great Britain and the United States with the view of apportioning the expenses between them. No final decision was arrived at; but at last the United States government agreed to pay one-half of the cost, and the Imperial government agreed to bear all of our expenses, beyond 5 per cent on the amount of the award. Up to 5 per cent we have to defray, and in the meantime we have to make provision for them.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give us some idea of what will be the plan and the composition of the commission, not only as regards the commissioners, but as regards the counsel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that before the late Government went out of office, Mr. Justice King, on behalf of the Dominion Government, and Mr. Justice Putnam, on behalf of the United States government, were appointed. Communications have passed between the respective governments with the object of having the appointment of these two gentlemen simultaneously announced in an official way. Informal negotiations are now proceeding between the two commissioners in order to ascertain approximately when the commission shall meet. The United States government have appointed two counsel to represent them before the commission, and the Canadian Government have done the same thing. A local agent in British Columbia will also be necessary to act as a solicitor for the purpose of collecting the witnesses, and getting them ready for the sitting of the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any selection been made?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, Mr. Bodwell will be the agent in British Columbia, and the Hon. Mr. Peters and Mr. Beique of Montreal are the two Canadian counsel; and the claimants themselves have selected counsel to represent them. I have no doubt that these counsel will act in unison with the counsel appointed by the Dominion Government. The time for the sitting of the commission has not been fixed; but the informal negotiations are proceeding between the commissioners on that subject. My own idea is that it will meet about the middle of November. I cannot give any more definite information than that.

To provide for paying cost of a new sailing schooner built for the Fisheries Protection Service, to replace the "Vigilant," including sails..... $10,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What are you going to do with the "Vigilant"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When my predecessor was in power he made a contract for the construction of a new boat called the "Osprey," which was launched about three weeks ago. One of the terms of the contract was that the contractor should take the "Vigilant" at the value of $2,000 as part of his payment.

To pay balance costs recovering license fees wrongfully exacted by Newfoundland government from Dominion fishermen.... $500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the litigation yet concluded?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not absolutely concluded yet.

To provide for expert investigation into seal life, in connection with Award Regulations, Behring Sea..... $3,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is this an investigation that is now under way?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Independent investigations are proceeding, on the part of the respective government, for the purpose of examining into the whole question of seal life, the habits of the seals, their destruction, and the causes of that destruction. The late Government appointed Mr. Macoun and Mr. Halkett, who are out there now. We have received some reports from them.

Indian Schools, Manitoba and North-west Territories $16,176

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the difference between moneys voted for purposes "in" the North-west Territories and for purposes "for" the North-west Territories. In this House, from time to time, complaint is made that there is a large amount expended in the North-west Territories for the North-west Territories, a great deal more than this country can afford. It is necessary for the representatives of the Territories to come before this House, from time to time, and make a claim on behalf of the people for certain expenditures for the development of those Territories; and if they are met, in making those claims, by the assertion that already vast expenditure has been made in

the Territories, then the claims they make on behalf of the improvements they require for the development of the Territories are at a certain disadvantage. What I want to point out is that this particular expenditure is not expenditure in any way connected with the people of the North-west Territories. It is not an expenditure connected with the development of the North-west Territories. It is not an expenditure for which the people of the North-west Territories have asked, but it is an expenditure in pursuance of a certain policy settled upon by the Government of this Dominion, on ideas which they have derived from sources not connected with the people of the Territories. When this expenditure is swollen to the amount that it is apparently swollen to now, it is certainly bound to have a detrimental effect on the interests of the people of the Territories, in the minds of members of this House. We recognize the principle of dealing justly with the Indians of the country. We have no complaint against the Government for dealing justly with those Indians. The treaties that have been made should certainly be fulfilled, not only in the letter but in the spirit, generously and intelligently. But over and above all that is contained in the treaties of those Indians, in pursuance of a certain policy of the Government, expenditure has been undertaken with regard to them which has come to alarming proportions, such proportions as are detrimental to the welfare of the people of the Territories when asking money for ordinary public improvements to which the Territories are entitled as well as the other provinces, and which are necessary in the Territories to a greater extent than in the other provinces. I allude to the expenditure on the education of the Indians. I find in the main Estimates a vote of $285,000 for the education of Indian children in Manitoba and the North-west Territories during the year, and in addition I find this sum of $16,000 for the same purpose. I find that the main estimate shows an increase over the amount expended last year, to the extent of $56,000. I say that when the amount expended on the education alone of the Indians of the Territories has reached this enormous sum, and when it is being increased to the extent of $56,000 a year, it is time for the people of the Territories, it seems to me, to put themselves right before the House by showing that this expenditure is none of their making and is for none of their benefit. They decline altogether to be charged with this expenditure as a part of the expenditure of this country for the benefit of the Territories. A short time ago, I laid before this House a statement of the requirements for the ordinary business of the government of the Territories, in the matter of public improvements and education. There seemed to be a feeling on the part of hon. members that I had a good deal of hardihood to claim on behalf of the people an increase over the amount appearing in the main Estimates, of $242,000 for these purposes. But the total sum spent to carry on the government of the Territories, supply the needs of education and provide the necessary public works throughout the territory, is short of the amount we have already voted in the main Estimates for the education of the Indians of the territory by amout $43,000. In other words, this Parliament is spending on the education of the children of the Indians of the Territories $43,000 more money than it is expending in carrying on the government of the Territories and making the public improvements that are necessary for the development of the Territories, so as to make them what the people here are legislating to make them—a market for your manufactures and a field for the operations of your merchants and your capitalists. This is the purpose for which, as I understand it, money is being voted for the Territories. That is why we ask you to supply money for the North-west Territories, and the amount of money that is now voted does not suffice for that end. I desire to call attention to the fact that, in voting this money, Parliament is voting it for a purpose not related to the development of the Territories, and not in any sense chargeable to the Territories. We have not asked for the expenditure, and it is not in the line of the development of the country. I do not know that hon. members are aware as they should be, of the magnitude of the sum or the purpose for which it is voted. In answer to a question I asked in the House a short time ago, we were informed that the total number of pupils in the industrial schools in the Territories, which absorb the greater part of that money, was less than 1,000. Now, in the public schools of the Territories there are ten thousand pupils in attendance. Where you spend $285,000 in educating less than a thousand Indian children, you decline to spend more than $242,000 in educating ten thousand white children in the Territories, in providing public works and carrying on the public business of the Territories. I wish the House to have a thorough understanding as to who is responsible for this vast expenditure, so that the people of the North-west may not be charged with any part of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the Minister will not allow the statement to pass without saying something with regard to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. No; not carried. I have never heard a worse indictment of the whole system of the educating of children in the North-west than we have just heard from one of the strongest supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. He said that this expenditure was not asked by the North-west, and was not for the benefit of the North-west.

Mr. OLIVER. If I might be allowed a word in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), I would say that I think the an-

swer to my question would come very much better from himself than from the hon. Minister, who did not direct the policy that brought about this state of affairs, and who, in this supplementary vote, as I understand, is simply carrying out the obligations of the previous Government.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is quite wrong in the last statement. As to his first statement, I am not sure but that he has struck the nail on the head; I think, if any answer is given, I will have to give it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) says his criticism is directed chiefly against the late Administration. I trust we may have some statement with reference to the policy of the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted? Carried. Moved that a sum—

Mr. FOSTER. I protest——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. FOSTER. I protest against your declaring this item carried and calling another while I am on my feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman has nothing to say.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, you do not know what I can say.

Mr. DOBELL. It gives me very great pleasure to explain this expenditure. We are asking to spend $700. That is to provide a school building to cost $400 and a teacher, $300. The reserve is situated a great distance from the others in the township, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, though for the last eighteen years they have had the power to provide schools, have not provided this school, which was required under the treaty. We intend to carry out the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest what the Minister has said. The hon. member for Alberta said that this expenditure was to carry out obligations of the late Government. But the hon. Minister says that this is a new expenditure, undertaken by themselves, undertaken because we neglected our duties in reference to it. But I wish to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) who is acting for the Minister of the Interior, if he has not missed the point of the charge of the hon. member for Alberta. The charge was that $285,000 was being spent for the cultivation of the intellectual areas of about 1,000 Indian children, and that this expenditure was not wished by the Territories, and was not for the advantage of the Territories.

Mr. DOBELL. I am sure my hon. friend the member for Alberta will be quite satisfied, if I give the explanations seriatim, as the items rise.

Mr. FOSTER. Under all the circumstances, I think we shall have to take the items seriatim.

Removing the present buildings to new site, to provide outbuildings for the Elkhorn Industrial School..... $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. We must have an explanation of this from somebody.

Mr. DOBELL. This is owing to the destruction by fire of the main buildings of the school. It is necessary to erect a new building, for which provision has been made in the main Estimates, and also outbuildings. It is intended to remove the buildings not destroyed to a more suitable site. The details are as follows:—Laundry, $1,000; gymnasium, $1,500; bakery, $1,000; removal, $1,500; total, $5,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How far is the removal?

Mr. DOBELL. We have not yet decided as to the site, although we have decided upon the neighbourhood. It is only a matter of some $1,500 or $1,600.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be interesting to know what progress is being made by these Indians. We are spending a lot of money in educating them and turning them to useful pursuits. Could the hon. gentleman give us information as to the number of pupils that are taught in these schools, and what progress they are making? I notice a nice display of their work in the vestibule of this building; could the hon. gentleman tell us where it is from?

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think anything could be more satisfactory than the object lesson which we see in this building. That is the result of work in several schools, and it shows the capacity of those Indians to learn useful pursuits, and to benefit from the lessons taught them. Our treatment of the Indians is in striking contrast to that accorded the Indians in the United States by the government of that country; and it reflects a great credit on the Dominion of Canada and shows the care and patience with which the Indian children have been trained.

Mr. OLIVER. I examined the exhibit that is made in the Parliament buildings, and I would like to remove the impression that it is all the work of the Indian schools. Some of the exhibits there are the work essentially of Indians who are not instructed in that particular direction in the Indian schools. Besides, there is what is known in the west as cooey sticks. They are in the shape of a nicely-smoothed stone, fastened on to a moderately long rawhide handle, and are for the purpose of knocking out the brains of their enemies who happen to come within reach.

Mr. DOBELL. I may tell my hon. friend that those instruments will not be required in this House.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry to see the levity with which this important subject is treated. The education of our Indian children reflects the greatest credit upon this country. If the Conservative party and the late Conservative Government are responsible for the policy that has been dealt out to the Canadian Indians and for the policy of educating those children, it is one of their greatest achievements. Nothing that the Canadian Government can do reflects more credit upon them than the care we are taking of the original possessors of the soil of Canada, from whom we have taken their land. I am surprised at the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). When his Minister rose up to reply to his criticism, he gave an example of what the children had done, by pointing to the exhibit in the basement. But the hon. member for Alberta rises up and says that the work there exposed was not all due to the skill of these children who are taught in the Indian schools; and, of course, it is calculated to go abroad that, in some respects, the Government and the department which the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) represents so well in this House, have committed a fraud on Parliament, and a fraud on the public. With the exception of a trifling matter, to which that hon. gentleman has referred, I may say that all these exhibits are the work of children taught in those schools. A similar display, made at the Chicago Exhibition of the work of our Indian children, excited the admiration of the world that thronged to that exhibition. In the exhibition in the North-west, there was nothing that attracted so much admiration from everybody who visited it, as the exhibit of the work of our Indian children. But I am not surprised that the member for Alberta directs his cannon against the Government that he is forward to support, if only he can rise up and appear the protagonist to an indifferent and incapable member like myself, who has so badly, for ten years, represented the North-west in this House, and who has now to sit at the feet of this highly cultivated Gamaliel, and highly modest gentleman, who comes here to give me instruction. I am not surprised that he pitches into his own Government, because it is consonant with his past, and it is entirely consistent. Before hon. gentlemen are delighted with their bantling, they had better reflect upon the story that Æschylus tells in one of his dramas, of the little tiger that is played with as if it were a kitten, and, when the animal grows, it becomes ferocious and unmanageable. Within two years, those hon. gentlemen opposite will find it a little difficult to deal with the eccentric gentleman who now gives them his support. We have had his opinion to-night, flippant, as all his opinions here have been flippant, as all his attempts to enlighten this House have been. I want to give you his opinion of the Liberal party four years ago, and his opinion of the Conservative party. This is what he said some four years ago:

> The reason that the people of the Territories do not kick more vigorously when election day arrives is because they have no assurance that if the Opposition attained power to-morrow they would do any better in these respects than the Government is doing. The Liberals have never made a study of the North-west or its affairs, have never championed its cause or that of its settlers—more than to score a point for the party when opportunity offered—and, indeed, have permitted themselves to rest under the libel that they are anything but friends of the North-west. Whatever may be the shortcomings of the Government party, they at least profess an interest in the Territories, which the Opposition does not even profess. Under the circumstances the people of the Territories can scarcely be expected to enthuse much over a prospective change of Government, or to give a majority in favour of it.

When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) pitches into his own Government here, he is entirely consistent and I entirely endorse the sentiments which I have quoted from him. I may say in addition that I entertain a higher opinion of the Government of my opponents, than he does; because, seeing that our treaties with the Indians are founded in justice and humanity, the present Government are not merely treading in the traditions of the past, and in the footsteps of their predecessors, but they are taking a wise, a humane, and a statesmanlike course.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose I should apologize to the House for having alluded to this matter at all.

To pay for the removal of Canadian Indians from Montana and expenses in connection therewith $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. DOBELL. These Indians belong to various bands in the North-west Territories, and they have been residing in Montana. They aggregate about 800 souls and the American authorities desire to have them returned to Canada. Measures will be taken during the present year to accomplish this and to settle the Indians on the reserves to which they belong.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the money to be expended for these Indians?

Mr. DOBELL. It is for the cost of removing them, and I suppose helping them to put up wigwams or something of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In what manner is it intended to move them? Are the Mounted Police to be employed?

Mr. DOBELL. Six hundred have come in, many of them were brought by railway from the northern part of Montana.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will scarcely be able to pay wigwams for them out of this vote. I do not think the Auditor General would consent to the payment out of this vote for palatial residences for these Indians. When the hon. gentleman brings these Indians to Canada, has he any guarantee that they will stay here? Will they not as they did before, scatter and go across the border?

Mr. DOBELL. I believe the Mounted Police have supervision over these men and keep them on the reserve.

Mr. FOSTER. How long is it since they strayed over to Montana?

Mr. DOBELL. Since the rebellion.

Mr. FOSTER. The Mounted Police were there then to exercise supervision over them.

Mr. DOBELL. The force of men were scattered at that time and were unable to watch them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is hardly satisfactory, because the Mounted Police force was much larger then than now.

Mr. DOBELL. These were men that were actual rebels and who fled into Montana at the time of the rebellion.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the Indians get more afraid of the police from year to year.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any request that these Indians should be brought back to Canada; did they ask it themselves, or have we invited them back?

Mr. DOBELL. They belong to Canada, and the United States insisted upon our taking them back.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they willing to come back themselves?

Mr. DOBELL. I think they are very glad to get back again.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In what way has that request come from the Government of the United States, and when did it come?

Mr. DOBELL. We have sent some Indians across to the United States, and we have received our Indians back from the United States.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot put up with an answer like that. The hon. gentleman stated that the United States had asked us to remove these Indians, and when I asked him in what manner the communication came from the United States, he tells me that we have exchanged Indians.

Mr. DOBELL. I thought the hon. gentleman would have known about this because the request came from the United States eighteen months ago when he was a member of the Government. An official application was made through the Secretary of State, and it came through the proper channel.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these Indians do the Government intend to bring back?

Mr. DOBELL. The total number is 800, and 600 have been received already.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this vote to provide for all of them, or merely for the balance who remain in the States?

Mr. DOBELL. All of them.

Tannery on Blackfeet Reserve, and for the services of an instructor in tannery $1,300

Mr. SPROULE. Is this tannery controlled by the instructor, and are the Indians taken in to learn the trade?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it simply a school of instruction, or is it supposed to carry on something for the benefit of the Indians?

Mr. DOBELL. I believe it is exceedingly difficult to find employment for the Indians. It was thought by the late Government very desirable to teach these Indians certain trades, and this tannery is the natural outcome of that purpose. The late Government, I believe, sent instructors there, and this vote is to carry on this enterprise.

To provide for ten additional pupils at Crowstand Boarding School at $70 ..... $720

Mr. SPROULE. How many pupils are at this school?

Mr. DOBELL. This school is a Presbyterian school. There are thirty-two pupils already provided for.

Mr. SPROULE. How are the pupils taken in? Are all taken in who apply, or is there any system of selection?

Mr. DOBELL. They have to pass a medical examination.

Mr. SPROULE. Are all who pass that examination admissible?

Mr. DOBELL. I believe they only take the most intelligent.

To defray the expense of delimitating the boundary between Canada and the United States along the frontiers of New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia $75,000

Mr. FOSTER. We would like an explanation of this?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I believe part of this money is for the purpose of defining the boundary line between British Columbia and the United States. The hon. gentleman is aware that there have been considerable disputes over the proprietorship of the gold fields of that region,

and a good deal of territory claimed by the United States appears to have been adjudged to Canada, including some very rich gold fields. The great bulk of the expenditure is, I believe, to be made there.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any work going on in Quebec and Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is, I believe, a little.

Mr. PRIOR. Does the hon. gentleman think this is for the Alaska boundary, or chiefly for the southern boundary ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Chiefly for the southern boundary, I think.

Mr. PRIOR. I did not know there was any dispute as to the southern boundary.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman knows that under the treaty there was considerable difficulty in deciding where the line ten leagues from the coast is found. So far a good deal of progress has been made, but a good deal remains to be done, and from the nature of the country it is rather expensive work.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how many are employed on this work ?

Mr. DOBELL. There are about twelve employed at present. The United States government have, I believe, appropriated $75,000 for the same work.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they all employed in British Columbia ?

Mr. DOBELL. A portion of the twelve are employed on Lake Erie. I will give the hon. gentleman the particulars. On the 3rd of July, 1895, the acting Secretary of State of the United States called attention to the apparently conflicting claims on Coleman's Island, Hunter's Island and other islands adjacent to the boundary line between Minnesota and the province of Ontario. It appears that the government of the United States was not aware that by the treaty of 1842, concluded by Lord Ashburton and Mr. Daniel Webster, the British and the United States plenipotentiaries respectively, a certain line traced by the plenipotentiaries on a map had been agreed to as the boundary. This information was conveyed to the government of the United States ; but in order to avoid any future difficulty the United States government was invited to join in the appointment of a commission to travel over the whole boundary line from Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods to determine whether the maps of 1842 were sufficient to decide all doubtful points without ambiguity. The United States government have not yet expressed their assent to this proposal; but in order that this Government may have a full knowledge of the details so as to meet any difficulty that may arise, a survey party has been sent to travel from Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods to collect information. This exploration has been completed, but the report has not been received.

Mr. FOSTER. Upon the hon. gentleman's statement, it seems that the point in dispute is upon that part of the boundary line between Lake Superior and the Lake of the Woods ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Part of it. There is some dispute in New Brunswick also.

Mr. FOSTER. In New Brunswick, I understand, it is the water line in Passamaquoddy Bay that has been before a commission. I do not understand that there is any dispute as to the land boundary line between New Brunswick and Maine. There cannot be much to do on the water line. The commission have been at work on that for two seasons, and their work must be pretty well completed by this time. I understand that the proposal with regard to Lake Superior and the Lake of the Woods is for a joint survey, but that the Government are going to send a party there themselves.

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The point that strikes me is this. Will it be satisfactory to the United States that these two parties should make independent surveys, or would it not be better to do as they are doing in British Columbia and make a joint survey, in which the two parties work alternately and then alternately survey each other's work, so that when once the work is done there is no point of dispute between the two, whereas if they work independently is it not likely, if they differ, that a joint survey will be required ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It seemed to have been thought by the department that the maps and plan and data in our possession would give sufficient information to enable this line to be delimited, but the United States, not having agreed to a joint commission, the department thought it essential, in order to an intelligent discussion from our standpoint, that an actual survey should be made, and that is being proceeded with for the purpose of giving us accurate data on which we can discuss intelligently the dispute between the two countries as to the exact location where the line should be.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the surveyors at work on the boundary ?

Mr. DOBELL. In British Columbia, Washington Territory, and also Meridian 141, which is the boundary between Canada and the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Have these survey parties been out for the season in anticipation of this vote ?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I want to call the attention of the committee to a question which is of great importance to the province of Quebec. There has been an agitation going on for a long while in the province of Quebec as to the northern boundary of the province, and I believe the question was debated here a great many times by Sir Hector Langevin. If my information be correct, the late Administration passed an Order in Council fixing the northern limit of the province of Quebec at a point at or near the east Maine River and considerably extending the territory of the province of Quebec towards the north. Is there anything in these Estimates to fix that boundary ?

Mr. DOBELL. No.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Why, then, is the name of the province of Quebec included ? I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that this Order in Council has been passed, and we would like to know whether it is the intention of this Government to carry out that Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This vote does not touch the point referred to by the hon. gentleman at all. The important question to which the hon. gentleman refers has not yet come before the Government at all.

To defray the expense of exploring, surveying, &c., the country lying between the Stickine River and the sources of the Yukon $6,000

Mr. PRIOR. Has anything been done yet on this work ?

Mr. DOBELL. No, nothing has been done.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that there is another route besides the one from the Stickine River to the Yukon. The other route is from the head of Lynn Canal over the White Pass to Teslin Lake and thence to the Yukon River. There is no proper road now for miners to come in by, and it is very hard for them to get their goods in in any quantity. At present nearly all the goods going to the Yukon country are coming around by the mouth of the Yukon. They have to go up by St. Michael's, and they are American goods that are mostly coming in. If we could get a good road through the Lynn Canal into the Teslin Lake and so on to the Yukon, that would be much shorter. If that cannot be found, I take it that the Stickine is the best. The Government should put on two surveys.

Mr. DOBELL. It is the intention to survey all possible routes to open up that country and not to spare any expense in having the routes properly surveyed.

Mr. PRIOR. I should like to see it done as soon as possible. Better spend $15 000 in one year than five or six thousand dollars per year in three years.

Mr. DOBELL. It will be gone on with early next spring.

Collection of Revenue—Customs..... $32,566 94

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see the Controller of Customs here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the item had better stand. I have sent for the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson).

Electric light inspection—To provide for the payment of standard instruments already purchased or ordered last fiscal year $4,000

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to ask the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) how much the department proposes to expend on capital account for the purpose of electric light inspection, that is, for standard measures ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). My hon. friend (Mr. Wood) knows that a law was passed in 1894 respecting units of electric measures. There are certain instruments still wanting in order to comply with the requirements of the law. And these instruments are the following :—Current balances, electro-motive standards, and subsidiary standard for outside work. These instruments are indispensable to the carrying out of the provisions of the law. I may say, at the same time, that the inspection and measurement of electric light is one of the few services that not only meet expenditure, but leave a balance in our favour. Last year, the revenue from that service was $8,066, while the expenditure was only $6,693, leaving a balance of $1,373.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot forbear expressing my gratification at hearing the statement of the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue that this service is more than self-supporting. I suppose the instruments are necessary. At the same time, I would express the hope that this sum will complete for some years the equipment of this branch.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask if the expenditure of $6,693 includes the expenditure for the standard instruments ? I suppose not.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. The figures are even more satisfactory than I stated, because this expenditure of $6,693 actually covers $3,000 for instruments.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give us what has been expended up to this time for the standards ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. So far, $3,031 has been expended for instruments. So the working expenditure

was a trifle over $3,000, while the revenue was $8,066.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When the Department of Inland Revenue organized this branch, it was largely, as to cost and income, an experiment; and the department were wise in placing the fee so that the income of the branch would be at least as large as the expenditure. But my hon. friend (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière) must know that the cost of the inspection bears rather heavily, especially upon the smaller companies which have been organized now in almost every town and village in Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that, while the expenditure on this system—which was organized, I understand, while my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) was Controller of Inland Revenue—has been only about $3,000, the income has been something like $8,000, leaving out the question of the purchase of the instruments. This leaves a balance in favour of the branch, on the year's working, of about $5,000. I think that, in view of that splendid showing, the hon. gentleman might very well consider seriously the reduction of this system to these local companies.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) would like me to communicate to the committee and to himself a regulation passed on the 21st August last:

> In view of the great number of small companies having an installation of 500 lamps and under, the department is of opinion that the registration fee of $25 in such cases is excessive, and its recommendation that the fee be reduced to $10.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is the second reduction. There was a reduction about a year and a half ago.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is a reduction made last month.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to capital —Further amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing plans, &c..... $16,500

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister please tell us what this is for, and what surveys are being carried on?

Mr. DOBELL. Three years ago, the department had an appropriation of $150,000 for surveys. Two years ago the amount was cut down to $100,000, and last year it was $75,0000. Surveys are going on in all directions, and it is thought quite evident that that appropriation of $75,000 proposed for the current year is not sufficient. At the beginning of the present season, it was estimated that in addition to the vote for the last fiscal year, the sum of $25,000 would be required. $8,500 of this sum was voted by Parliament last session, and was made available up to 30th June last. This further amount of $16,000 is to provide for the expenditure for the remainder of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent of the $75,000?

Mr. DOBELL. $8,500.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend sees that of that $75,000 $8,500 is still unexpended. It seems a little odd to ask for $16,000 now.

Mr. DOBELL. The total amount two years ago was $150,000. This year we voted $75,000, and $16,500 are required to provide for the balance of the year over and above the $75,000 already voted, making the total amount to about $91,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how these surveys are being done, whether by day labour or by contract?

Mr. DOBELL. The surveys have all been conducted by day's work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It used to be all by contract.

Mr. DOBELL. I cannot speak positively, but I think it has all been done by day's work.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that a part of the work was done by day labour at $5 a day, but another part was done by contract. I want to know whether the same system is continued?

Mr. DOBELL. There has been no change made.

Penitentiaries—Commissions for investigating the affairs of the penitentiaries of Canada $3,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Solicitor General say what he intends to do with this money?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend will admit that in taking charge of the Department of Justice, it is necessary that we should acquire a full knowledge of the administration of the penitentiaries. Now, my hon. friend stated a few days ago that we would find in the penitentiary branch a report of the inspector, Mr. Stewart. I may say that no such report exists. Let me give the committee a few facts to show the necessity there is to make this investigation. There are five penitentiaries under the control of the Department of Justice, and in addition there is the Regina jail, and the daily average of prisoners is 1,256. Three years ago the administration of our penitentiaries cost $359,000 a year, and it has now reached $481,000, an increase of $150,000 inside of three years. If we take the per diem expenditure, for instance, we find that at St. Vincent de Paul it is 68 cents, at Kingston 89 cents, Manitoba $1.26, British Columbia $1.15. Now, how is it possible that the per diem expenditure can vary so greatly among these different penitentiaries? If we look at the Central Prison at Toronto, which ex-

ists under somewhat similar conditions as the penitentiaries, we find that the per diem expenditure is only 27 cents a day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. 17 cents in Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me point out this other fact, which is important, regarding the per capita cost per year. In Kingston it is $367.15 ; St. Vincent de Paul, $234, a difference of over $100 per capita. How can we explain that ? In British Columbia the per capita cost $424 ; in Manitoba, $541 ; while in the Central Prison at Toronto, is only $99 a year. I take my facts from the report of our own inspector, and the report of the Central Prison at Toronto, and I think they show the need of finding out why so great discrepancies exist.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think my hon. friend will have to make a stronger case than that, before he asks for a special commission. The hon. gentleman cannot, as he practically admitted, have gone very far into the management of the penitentiaries, or have consulted the records of the department, when he puts before the committee these figures. As regards the difference between the maintenance of prisoners in British Columbia and Manitoba, as compared with the maintenance at the Central Prison of Ontario, every one is aware that the circumstances are entirely different. Prices cannot be compared for the ordinary commodities of life between the western provinces and the eastern provinces. Time and again in connection with that department, this Parliament has heard that explanation, so often, in fact, that I hesitate to go over the different reasons that have been given for the great divergence. The hon. gentleman says that he requires an investigation. Well, Parliament has put at his disposal an officer for that express purpose. He cannot, pretend that that officer has proved unequal to the discharge of his duties. That officer is the Inspector of Penitentiaries. He came into the department only a year or two ago, and he was at that time of life, and endowed with such business ability, that those in charge of the department at that time supposed that he would be able efficiently to discharge those very duties the hon. gentleman now proposes to put upon a new board of inspection. Some years ago, there was a board of visitors, so to speak, who went through the form of reporting fully on the condition of the various penitentiaries. That system was supplanted by the present system, and instead of there being that board, there was constituted an inspector whose duties are to visit each penitentiary every year, to go thoroughly into the management, and report the result of his investigation. Mr. Stewart was appointed about a year ago and the first duty he undertook at my request was to make a thorough and independent inquiry into these various penitentiaries. I was perfectly correct in saying the other night that we should have the reports which Mr. Stewart made, not only during my incumbency, but those which I suppose he made since. If we had the benefit of these reports before us, or if the Solicitor General was able to say that the inspector had advised that he was unequal to the task of making such a report, something of a case might be made out for this additional inspection. Mr. Stewart, although a very short time in office, had done sufficient work to enable him to write a very interesting report for the year ending June, 1895, and that is the last of his reports we have published. The hon. the Solicitor General hardly does that office justice in expressing astonishment at the increased cost of the maintenance of these penitentiaries, because the hon. gentleman has left out the increased revenue we derive from them. One great increase was caused by the establishment of the binder twine industry which involved a huge outlay and a large increase in the annual expenditure, but we are deriving a revenue from that now.

Mr. McGREGOR. When we compare the cost of Toronto with that at Winnipeg and other penitentiaries, it should be remembered that they have a binder twine industry at Toronto the same as at Kingston.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am quite aware of that. I say the Solicitor General omitted from his statement the industries which have been established in the penitentiaries in recent years. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) shakes his head. Surely he does not deny that these industries have been established within a recent period.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I stated most positively that I have taken into account the revenue, and I deducted that revenue from the expenditure in the result which I gave to the House a moment ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's statement in detail would be interesting. He simply said that the expenditure had increased at a certain rate, but he did not explain to the House that that expenditure was materially added to an account of the recent policy of equipping the penitentiary for the management of this new industry. Again, as the Minister of Public Works may have learned from his officers, in late years the penitentiary branch has been doing the work that used to be on the shoulders of the Public Works Department, and the Estimates this year show that that policy has been continued. All that swells the expenditure, and there should in consequence be a proportionate reduction in other departments of government. The fact that these new industries have been undertaken more vigorously in recent years, would account at once for the sudden increase in the cost of the penitentiaries. The

report which I have in my hand shows that Mr. Stewart has begun to do the work which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) suggests should be undertaken. In the short time he has been in office, Mr. Stewart could not thoroughly sift all the information it is possible to obtain. But, the Solicitor General has advanced no argument to show that in the regular manner and in reasonable time—if he has confidence in his inspector—all the information will not be obtained by the inspector, which any commission the hon. gentleman may devise can succeed in acquiring. Mr. Stewart's report to which I have referred gives a financial statement, the revenue as well as the cash outlay. The prison population of Canada per capita, costs $348.26, which for the population of Canada is 8½ cents per head. The inspector adds:

> The increasing demands in connection with prison accommodation are being, to a large extent, met by the increased utilization of convict labour. It is, therefore, safe to assume that the requirements of this branch of the public service will not materially increase for many years to come.

That puts briefly the criticism which I have ventured to offer that the figures which have startled the Solicitor General are due to the exceptional causes, which causes were the equipment of the penitentiaries in order that convict labour could be more thoroughly utilized.

In that report, Mr. Stewart says:

> Since my appointment in February last I have visited each of the institutions under my supervision.

He then submits various criticisms in regard to each of the penitentiaries in order, and I would call attention to some of his concluding observations:

> The deputy wardens are the officers upon whom devolve, more directly, the duty of enforcing discipline. They are, without exception, experienced and faithful.
>
> The great majority of the prison police are intelligent and efficient, but in a few cases an apparent disregard for neatness, a shuffling gait and awkward use of weapons indicate needed improvement. A system of regular police drill and occasional target practice has been introduced at each of the penitentiaries, and from which good results are already apparent. A prerequisite to permanent appointment should be a thorough knowledge of police drill, including the proper use and care of fire-arms.
>
> * * * * * * * * *
>
> So far as I am able to judge, by observation and by correspondence, I am convinced that each of the prisons is under the control of a warden who is competent, energetic and devoted to his work, and whose sole aim is the success of the institution which has been confided to his charge.

In the brief period that I had the opportunity of advising with this officer, he had been able himself to effect a great many reforms in the internal economy of these various institutions, and he was steadily reducing the cost of supplies, both food and clothing. My recollection leads me to say that the troubles that were reported were troubles that were within the control of the department. There is no advantage to be derived from a commission, so far as I am able to see, and the Solicitor General has not pointed out any which the inspector cannot himself afford. With the reduction of these expenses of maintenance going on under the advice and work of the inspector, I think that all the Solicitor General desires to do can be done. Some motion has been made in connection with the difficulties concerning the binder twine deficits, and the condition of affairs in connection with the Connor and Kelly contracts. With regard to the Connor contract, the particulars have been fully put before the House. The fact is that these men broke down with their contracts. In the case of Connor, the warden, who should have obtained satisfactory security before handing the goods over to the contractor, neglected doing that, taking bonds of no considerable value. Notwithstanding that, the Solicitor General was able to convince the committee a short time ago that there would be no actual loss to the country. What is a commisson going to do that cannot be done by a committee of this House at the very next session of Parliament? For instance, in regard to the binder twine industry, there is not a single particular that a commission could obtain that cannot be obtained by the Puble Accounts Committee or any committee to which this matter might be referred by Parliament. So that the fact that there has been a very heavy expenditure in connection with these penitentiaries, and that the expenditure varies according to the province, cannot in my opinion warrant the hon. gentleman in asking for an expenditure over and above the regular expenditure that is put in his hands to enable him to obtain through his inspector all information that this commission would be asked to obtain. Although it is some time since I was in the department, I am certain that the hon. gentleman will not say that the present inspector is not actively and energetically attending to his duties, and I am certain that he will not intimate that he has not full confidence in that officer's ability and integrity. Under these circumstances, and considering that there has been no suggestion at large for an inquiry of this character, I do not think the hon. gentleman has made out a case for a special commission.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is for the committee to decide whether I have made out a case or not. I cannot leave that absolutely in the hands of my hon. friend. I am not concerned with the capacity of the officials in the department. I am dealing with a condition of things which we ascertained at the time we came into possession of this department. My hon.

friend accounts for the difference in the expenditure on penitentiaries generally by stating that the binder twine industry had brought about increased expenditure. The expenditure for 1892-93 was $359,000. That was the year the binder twine industry was started. That industry necessitated an outlay on capital account of $40,280. The next year the expenditure was increased to $446,000; the next year is was $389,000, and this year we have an increase of $100,000 over last year, the amount being $481,900.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the prison population?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 1,228 in 1893, and 1,256 in 1895. Let us see what revenue we derive from these penitentiaries. According to the report, we find that the binder twine industry at the Kingston penitentiary has given us $34.58 per capita a year, whereas the industries connected with the Central Prison yields $62.18 per capita a year. In the presence of such a condition of things as that, surely the least we can ask, without imputing any bad faith, or reflecting in any way on the officials of the department, is that an investigation should be held, so that we can ascertain how it comes to pass that under similar conditions such different results are obtained. Let me answer the other point. My hon. friend says there is a difference between the expenditure in Manitoba and British Columbia, and that in the eastern provinces. That is true to a certain extent; but perhaps my hon. friend would bear in mind that Kingston is not so far from St. Vincent de Paul, and between these two there is a difference in the expenditure of $130 a year per capita. That may no doubt be accounted for to some extent by the increased expenditure at Kingston arising from improvements and the binder twine industry, but that does not account for it wholly.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of each prison?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At Kingston, 516; at St. Vincent de Paul, 376. Now, take the expenditure at Manitoba, for instance. Of course, I understand that the conditions existing there are such as justify a greater expenditure; but how is it possible to reconcile such differences as these; Manitoba, $541 per capita; British Columbia, $424; and Dorchester, N.B., $278.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does that include capital expenditure?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am taking the figures from the report of 1895, pages 37 to 41.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the number of convicts in Manitoba?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The daily average is 82½. In British Columbia the daily average is 102. I give these figures, and I say, further that, there is considerable friction in some of our penitentiaries, which has existed a long time, and must necessarily be investigated in order to discover the cause and apply a remedy. Take the binder-twine industry, which comes out in this way: capital, $40,280; revenue, 1894-95, $15,000; revenue, 1895-96, $29,000. In that year we were short $21,600, being the balance due on sales not paid; but I am glad to say that these accounts are in such a position that we stand a good chance of collecting them all.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman say that in Ontario there was a profit on binder twine?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was not discussing that, but for the hon. gentleman's information I will tell him that, instead of the expense in Ontario increasing per diem, the expenditure in the Ontario Central Prison, last year, was 27 cents per diem, and the year previous to that it was 36 cents.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the cost of maintenance in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 68 cents.

Mr. QUINN. In Montreal jail the cost is only 17 cents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a very serious reflection on the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. If it is only 17 cents in the Montreal jail, how can you account for it being 68 cents in the penitentiary, which is within 4 miles of the jail?

Mr. QUINN. The food is better.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The convicts are better fed than the prisoners in the jail. The central prisoners in Ontario stand on exactly the same basis as our penitentiaries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is my information, and, when they can reduce the expenditure as they do, and ours shows an increase, that seems to me to suggest food for reflection and cause for inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you the population in the case of the central prisoners in Toronto, on which that calculation is based?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The average is 320.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not taken into account the extraordinary expenditure, even outside the establishment of these new industries at Kingston, which have been going on for years. We have had to come down, in recent years, for heavy votes in connection with the rearrangement of that penitentiary altogether. First of all, the only place we had for the lunatic prisoners was Kingston, and additional arrangements

had to be made for their accommodation. It was arranged afterwards that all the female prisoners should be taken from the eastern provinces and kept at Kingston. Then, very heavy expenditure was found necessary in order to establish a new system of locking, and this new system was adopted in consequence of the many escapes that had occurred. The new arrangement of prison wings and cells, a new female prison and a criminal insane asylum, and cottages for the keeper's guards cost a great deal of money, and were all taken up within a few years. That would explain the extraordinary increase, and make intelligible the observation of the inspector that that was rapidly coming to an end, and, had the hon. gentleman taken these into account, the difficulty which the hon. gentleman felt, would have been at once removed. I gave a good deal of attention to these subjects, when I was in the Department of Justice, and I am satisfied that there is nothing extraordinary to be found in connection with any of these expenditures. The friction to which the hon. gentleman alluded, have existed, no doubt, in connection with some of these penitentiaries, and I am afraid will exist for a long time. But that has more to do with the discipline and the interference that the outside public are always attempting, sometimes with very good motives, in connection with religious matters, as to whether one denomination is more favoured than another. All these troubles are incidental to any institution managed by a government. I have heard nothing from the hon. gentleman that, to my mind, justifies any extraordinary steps being taken. I am not at all opposed to a most thorough investigation, if he comes armed with the statement of an officer in whom he has confidence, and makes out a prima facie case, which that officer cannot grapple with, without neglecting his duties; but surely we are all desirous of avoiding unnecessary expense, and this is a case where this $3,000 might well be dropped. The case of the binder-twine industry the hon. gentleman has referred to, and he frankly admits that, in the end, the money will be paid all right, but if any other suspicion is lurking in his mind that there is something which reflects on the credit of either the political head or subordinate, let him make out a prima facie case; but, until he has done so, the proper machinery would be a committee of this House, and that inquiry might be attempted before we adopt an extraordinary proceeding.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to look at page 28 of the report of the Minister of Justice, and, if I understand it properly, the hon. gentleman is not correct in saying that the cost of St. Vincent de Paul is 60 cents. At the close of the second paragraph of the report of the warden, I find this statement:

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

If the earnings of convicts amounting to $56,835.10 are taken into account, the expenditure will be reduced to $22,810.67, and the yearly cost of each convict amounted to $60.66½ or per diem, 16½.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the cost per diem is 16½ cents?

Mr. DAVIN. There it is in your own report, page 28.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the report of the warden of the penitentiary. I am not going to analyse it, I have not time to do so standing on my feet. But I would just ask the hon. gentleman to take the report of the accountant and warden at page 38.

Mr. QUINN. I do not think it is fair to compare he expenditure in a jail with that in a penitentiary. We all know that the great cost of the penitentiaries is in the fact that people are confined there for a term of years, and it is intended that they shall learn some useful employment while confined there. In this fact the difference in cost in the various penitentiaries is very largely accounted for. It does not require a royal commission to find it out; it appears in the figures. For example, the principle item which causes excessive cost in Kingston is $84.14 4-10 per capita on account of the binder twine industry. There is also the maintenance of buildings, $14.87; repairs to buildings, $10.57 6-10, and the maintenance of machinery, $10.08 2-10. In St. Vincent de Paul the binder twine industry does not appear, while the cost of maintenance of machinery is only 25½ cents, and repairs to buildings only $6.10, while for the maintenance of buildings I do not see an entry at all. The real basis upon which to calculate the cost per capita of the convicts is to compare the cost of rations. If we look at that we find that in Kingston it cost $40.68 4-10 per capita; in St. Vincent de Paul, $46.66½; in Dorchester, $38.45; in Manitoba, $64.55; and in British Columbia, $71.72. I say it would be unreasonable to compare the cost in the penitentiary with the cost in the jails or in the Central Prison of Toronto, where the longest term of imprisonment, I believe, is three years. In these institutions the convicts are not put at labour which is designed to give them a trade to which they can apply themselves when they are released as in the case of our penitentiaries. This enters largely into the per capita cost of the prisoners.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Supplementing the observations that I made I would like to quote a few words from the report of the warden of the Kingston penitentiary:

Many years ago expenditures on capital account were made through the Department of Public Works, which may account in some respects for

the advance in penitentiary maintenance. Of late years all improvements——

And I have mentioned how heavy they were.

—have been directly under the control of the Department of Justice. This change has been advantageous, while at the same time involving increased responsibility and labour as regards administration of the prison. Besides the permanent improvements mentioned, repairs of an extensive character are required every year, keeping on constant duty such mechanical skill as can be made reliable from among the convicts.

He says further:

Herewith is a return I caused to be made giving the value of labour and material expended on the property during the years mentioned. Probably a more accurate one, if time permitted, would be in excess of this amount.

Total estimate of labour.....	$334,749 88
Total estimate of material, including stone and lime.....	175,277 74
Total	$510,027 62

This labour, &c., is entirely confined to the buildings, &c. There is no reference to the other labour expended, necessary for meeting the requirements of the prison, such as tailoring, shoemaking and whatever may be termed domestic work of the place. The estimated return of labour as given in the annual reports each year, gives an aggregate value of $558,591.50, or an average per year of $62,065.72.

When all this is considered, it will be observed that if all is taken into account, the per capita cost would appear much less, and maintenance proper reduced.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not wish to be understood as saying that what the hon. gentleman has said is not fair. Nor do I wish to cast any reflection upon the department. But we think it is proper to have this investigation for the reasons I have given. Perhaps it might be fair to add that I have found, so far as St. Vincent de Paul is concerned, that the taking over of the quarries has increased the expenditures; in Kingston there has been an increase in connection with the binder twine industry; and in British Columbia the newly established brick yards have added to the cost.

Mr. McGREGOR. It seems to me that a commission would do good for this reason. In the city of Detroit they have a house of correction in which are 700 prisoners. Last year they gave to the city $36,000 over and above the cost of maintenance of the prisoners. Now, in speaking about Manitoba, he said that twenty-five years ago it cost a little more than $600 per year to keep a prisoner. But now we have cheaper flour, cheaper beef, they grow their own potatoes, and the larger portion of the vegetables required for the prison, and these things ought to be much cheaper now. If there is anything that requires a committee of inquiry, it is the maintenance of our penitentiaries. We are not finding fault with the former Minister of Justice. I am strongly impressed that he did his duty, as did also the gentleman who preceded him, the late Sir John Thompson. But if they can get $36,000 out of the House of Correction in Detroit, there is no reason why we should not make our prisoners defray a large portion of the expenditure in keeping them.

Mr. FOSTER. The question of penitentiaries is so important that I would not object to any necessary expenditure of money for the purposes the hon. Solicitor General has indicated. I listened carefully to his statement of the reasons why this commission should be appointed, and I confess that I cannot see that he has made out a case. He has put the necessity for it on several grounds, but they are all grounds which, as it appears to me, require no commission. They are simply the actual, bald facts which his own officers in the penitentiaries, or the inspector, can find out. For instance, he says the cost per capita of maintenance is different in different penitentiaries. That is a fact, and the documents on the face of them show that the cost is different. But is that a reason why we should spend $3,000 upon a commission? If a commission goes to these penitentiaries what will it find out more than is known by the Minister, or the Solicitor General and his officers at the present moment? The cost on capital expenditure has increased from year to year in the way of the enlargement or erection of buildings, putting in machinery, or the like of that. It is a mere question of account to find out why that cost has been incurred, and in what direction. Will the commission get you anything more than what you have already? Again, we have, as another item, the amount of the staff. You have a warden, you have an assistant warden, guards and officers. The commission goes and finds the exact number, and their salaries, and when it reports on these things, it reports to you not a single fact that is not now known to the officers and the inspector of the department. What is your inspector for, if he is not for that purpose? You know your present population, you know what is necessary to spend to guard your prison? Your inspector knows whether you have too many or too few guards. If he is ordered to report, and if the department is in earnest to carry out his recommendation, why, it can be done without a commission. That commission cannot give you a single fact that you have not at your fingers' ends already. Another item is the cost of provisions. Send your commission to Manitoba or elsewhere, and it will bring you back the very figures you have already. How can the department get anything from a commission you do not already know? Your officers know the current rates in these different places, they know whether they are paying too much or too little. If they are be-

ing charged too much, how do they get them ? If by contract, they can make comparisons between the contract prices and the current prices. If by contract they are paying too much, let the proper officer go into the markets at Winnipeg and pay the same as everybody else pays. There is another point, and that is the plant put in for trades and instructions. You have come to the conclusion that you want to drill the prisoners in the different trades. You buy your machinery at market rates. You know whether you are paying too much or too little, and will the commission give you a single item of information upon that ? You know that if you put in plant you have got to pay for it, and you need not pay for it any more than current market rates. A commission will not help you there. You yourselves are always to be the judges of what you will pay for your plant. In all these things, what is there that the commission can give you that you have not now ? My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor) brought up the question of making these institutions self-supporting. That is a question of policy. Is the department here prepared to go to work and put the prison population into competition with the trades of the country in a way which will bring them in the most revenue, and put their goods upon the market in competition with the people ? If so, they can easily make these prisons more self-sustaining than they are now. They may make them largely self-sustaining under equal conditions with other institutions. That is a question of policy. That is not what my hon. friend wants to get at with his commission. If that is all he wants, he has the history of the prisons in the United States and other countries where, in some cases, they go on the principle of making them self-supporting, and in others they do not compete with the trades people. In making up their minds on what policy to pursue, a commission can not help them. They have their officers and their inspector. They have not said that they have not a proper inspector. They have every machinery they need to find out all these things. If a commission is to try and strike out a new line of policy, if the department itself thinks it would like to have the help of a commission in order to define a policy so as to make these prisons self-supporting, that might be a reason for a commission ; but no commission will do more in that respect then merely to collate the history of prisons now in existence, and of the results of the different systems. These you can gather with your superintendent and the men of your department, without the help of a commission. If you think the management is bad, the superintendent and the department itself can look into that management ; they are not so extensive ; you have only five prisons. Then before my hon. friend asks for $3,000 for what seems to me a useless expenditure, he should tell us what is to be the scope of this commission. Is it going into lines of policy ? Is it going to make an investigation in order to inform the Government whether the prisons can be made self-supporting ? If it is going to take up that line, there may be something more to be said, although that is open to the objections I have stated. What is to be the formation of this commission ? We want to know that from the Government before we vote them $3,000. Are they going to make up the commission out of their own officers, or are they going to make it up from experts, from other countries ? Or are they going to give to some one who is not an expert, simply a job ? Before you ask us for $3,000, you should give us the scope of the commission, and you should give us some idea of what will be the constitution of that commission. Surely you are not going to ask this committee to vote you $6,000 under the circumstances unless you give us information on these points.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman has taken the stand he has done on this matter. I do not object to some of the questions he has put at all. Where he seeks information I think that information should be given. But those of us who have sat in this House for some years, know that for the last ten years at least, there has been every year a long and animated and critical discussion upon the expenditure in connection with these penitentiaries. The hon. gentleman knows that the opinion is deep-seated in the minds of most of the representatives of the people in this House, that extravagance has reigned in these penitentiaries. The argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), if good for anything, is good against the appointment of any commission under any conceivable circumstances. No matter how bad the internal economy of one of these penitentiaries may be, the answer of the hon. gentleman to it is perfect : You have got an inspector, and why have a commission ? The hon. gentleman knows very well that the hon. the Solicitor General has given the House some very startling facts. The discrepancy existing in the cost of those several penitentiaries is startling. The hon. gentleman himself (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) can give no explanation of it. I have seen Minister of Justice after Minister of Justice attempt to do it, but I have never seen one of them do it successfully. We have the statement made here by gentlemen from Montreal, that the cost of maintaining prisoners in the provincial prisons is immeasureably below the cost of the Dominion Government expenditure. We have the same statement made with respect to the Toronto prison. With these facts before us, it is our duty to find some explanation of them. Considering the question of the expenditure of these penitentiaries, and

considering the extraordinary and indefensible increase during the last three years, it is time that a thorough investigation should be made into the internal economy and management of every one of them. Let us know whether the staff is too large; let us know whether, consistently with the efficiency of the institution, that staff can be reduced; let us know whether the manner of purchasing the goods for the penitentiaries is the best one in the interests of the country; let us know whether too high prices are being paid; let us know whether the accounts are being properly kept.

Why, it is within the knowledge of every hon. gentleman here that the Government of which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was a leading and distinguished member, was obliged to appoint a commission into the condition of the British Columbia penitentiary, because the accounts of that penitentiary had got into a disgraceful state. The inspector was there then, but the inspector was not sufficient, and the hon. gentleman himself had to send a special commissioner to make a special examination. I am here to-day to say that to this day I have never had a satisfactory explanation of the condition of that penitentiary. I have seen hon. gentlemen representing British Columbia, supporting the then Government, express in this House their extreme disapprobation and disapproval of the condition of affairs in that penitentiary, and their extreme dissatisfaction with the explanations that were given. No one knows to this date whether that matter has been properly cleared up or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman forgets that there was a complete reorganization after the report, and that some officers were dismissed and new officers appointed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Although you had the inspector, such was the condition of affairs that you had to send out a special commissioner to report upon the facts, and, when you got it, you reorganized the penitentiary. Was your commission, then, a farce? I trow not. In the face of this precedent, established by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) himself, in the face of the startling facts which the Solicitor General has given here, in the face of what I assume to be the desire of hon. members on both sides, to cut down extravagant expenditure to the lowest point consistent with the efficiency of the institutions; in the face of those facts, I must express surprise that there should be any opposition to a thorough investigation being made into the internal economy, the management and the details of cost of those penitentiaries. I am not aware that the Department of Justice is in a position to answer as to how the commission will be composed, but I assume it will be composed of men who will be thoroughly conversant with matters of this kind, and who will have such practical knowledge as will enable them to make valuable suggestions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many commissioners?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware. I will leave that to my hon. friend the Solicitor General to answer. As the matter now stands, the people of the country will not be satisfied unless better explanations are given of the extraordinary increase of the cost of the penitentiaries, and unless they are assured that there is no reasonable hope of cutting it down. From the part I myself have taken in the criticism of this expenditure, year after year, I am satisfied, comparing the expenditure of one penitentiary with the other, that there is gross extravagance and that the management requires thorough examination and revision. The precedent set by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) himself, shows that, although you have an inspector, there are times when you should have an additional examination and a commission such as the Solicitor General now proposes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does this not rather treat the inspector in rather a severe manner? If the inspector is doing his duty, we should have a report from him as to such a state of affairs as will warrant a commission. The House will remember that before Judge Drake, in British Columbia, was commissioned to inquire into the penitentiary there, a scandalous state of affairs was brought to the surface by our officials. There were charges and counter-charges by the officers of the penitentiary, and almost a revolt amongst them. Irregularities were discovered in the accounts, and such a condition of things, of course, demanded investigation. No one on this side of the House is pretending that a case cannot be made out, but what we say is that no case has been made out. We have no report from the inspector since the one to which the Solicitor General refers, and surely the House ought to know what that officer has discovered himself. I see, however, that hon. gentlemen are bound to have a commission. That seems to be their temperament, and I regret it very much, because I think it is going to be a waste of money. I would ask the Solicitor General how many commissioners are to be appointed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not prepared to answer that now. I think our sole duty, at the present time, is merely to make out a case for the appointment of a commission. If we have made out that case to the satisfaction of the majority of the House, it must be left to those in charge of the administration of justice to determine how many commissioners will be appointed, and the scope of their duties. Hon. gentlemen on the other side, it appears to me, are too intelligent and have demonstrated their

ability up to the present time to too great an extent, not to seize upon what we are after. When you come to realize that in the central prison of Toronto the average revenue per prisoner is $62.18 per year, and that in our St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary it is only $3.07; in Manitoba, $13, and in British Columbia, $10, surely there is something in that to inquire into.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman asked his inspector to give him any explanation of that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not. I claim that our expenditure has gone up $100,000 in the last year, and I say that if the administration of our penitentiary affairs has been such that we have not produced better results, then it is time we should inquire into it. I am prepared to take this responsibility without reflecting in any way on the character of the inspector. I am not doing so; it would be wrong for me to do so; I could not do so with any justice. I am not dealing with his character or capacity; I am dealing with existing conditions. In addition to that, I would draw the attention of the hon. member for Pictou to an interview which took place with him in June, 1895, when he was asked by Mr. Meredith, a representative of the Prisoners' Aid Association of Canada, to have an investigation into the affairs of the penitentiaries. That association thought at that time that it was important that the whole question of prison reform should be investigated with reference not only to the buildings, but the internal economy of the buildings. In a letter of the 14th of June, 1895, to Mr. Meredith, my hon. friend said:

> Dear Dr. Meredith,—With reference to our conversation on Wednesday last, regarding the memorial of the Prisoners' Aid Association of Toronto, I beg to assure you of my desire to meet the views of the memorialists as fully as it shall be found practicable to do so.

My hon. friend went on to say—it is only fair that I should read the whole letter:

> I am not yet in possession of sufficient information to warrant me in arriving at a definite conclusion regarding the various points raised, but as regards the two principal suggestions, namely, the appointment of a commission to investigate reformatory methods and prison construction, and the feasibility of establishing a separate reformatory in an urban locality, I shall not fail to bring your views to the attention of my colleagues at the earliest possible moment.

At that time, therefore, this question was brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman. So that not only from the standpoint of the economical administration of our affairs, but from the standpoint of prison reform, a commission is desirable; and I am authorized to state that the scope of the inquiry will extend not only to the economical features of the penitentiaries, but also to the features pointed out by this association.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely the committee ought to have some information as to where this commission is going to begin and end. How can we expect reasonable men in the House to consider that the Solicitor General has gone into this subject with that care which should precede a request for public money? No man in the House knows what this commission will cost, because the hon. gentleman cannot tell us how many commissioners there will be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It does not matter how many commissioners there will be. The amount is $3,000, and that is all you can spend.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows better than that. He knows that if he comes down to Parliament and gets an initial vote of $3,000 for a commission, that is no limit to it. I would ask the Solicitor General if a name has not already been under the consideration of the department—one name, at any rate?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think my hon. friend might be more definite, and say what name he refers to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Noxon.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I never heard the name before.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understood that Mr. Noxon was to be given a commission, and that this provision was to enable the Government to pay him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How could that information get abroad?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I mentioned it as a rumour, nothing more, and I have the hon. gentleman's statement, which, so far as it goes, is satisfactory, that he never heard the name before. The hon. gentleman is not able to say anything more than that he is unaware of Mr. Noxon's name having been mentioned.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I never heard any name mentioned. I may say that this very day, before coming up, I had a conversation with the Minister of Justice about the matter, and I asked him if he had determined on the names of the commissioners, and he said he had not. That is all I know about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman able to state whether there will be on the commission a judicial officer or an expert in penitentiary matters.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All I can say is that if we get the money authorized here, the House must trust us to do our duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say that is a very unsatisfactory statement. I do not think I ever before heard a vote proposed for a commission without some particulars being given to the House as to the scope of the commission and its probable constitution. If you are not going to have a commission of acknowledged experts, I think it will be perfectly useless. If you are not going to confine your inquiry to the economics of the penitentiaries, the only report that you can get which will be of service to you is a report of experienced experts. Does the hon. gentleman know whether that point has been decided upon—whether you are going to get experts in penology, or whether this is just going to be a scratch commission ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman will find that we shall find men able to do their business and make a report satisfactory to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I submit that that is not an answer which a Parliament with independence ought to have when it is asked to vote public money. If a set of trustees are going to hire a teacher and ask for money for that purpose, they do not get the money until they come to an agreement as to what kind of teacher they are going to get—whether a first-class, a second-class or a third-class. Here is the Government coming down and asking for $3,000, and the Solicitor General is not able to tell us whether this is going to be a commission of experts or a scratch commission. I do not think he has risen to the occasion when he says: "Give us the money and we will be responsible for it." You must be responsible for it, of course, but at the same time if that is going to be the principle adopted, you might as well ask this House for thirty-eight or forty million dollars, and say, "Ask no questions, give it to us, and we will be responsible for its expenditure, and you must trust us to expend it properly." We do not do that. Every Minister that puts his estimate before the House, at a normal session, is bound to give a fair and frank explanation of every item for which he asks an expenditure. Am I outside of the rule in asking whether this is going to be an expert commission or a commission of business men ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has told us frankly that nothing has been determined on. Surely that is sufficient. The question, I take it, is whether he has made out a prima facie case that this commission should issue at all. I think he has. Then the question is, has the House confidence that the gentleman at the head of the department has sufficient knowledge to select the proper men to serve on this commission. You cannot expect him to come to this House and submit names before the commission issues. Surely Sir Oliver Mowat's experience is sufficient to warrant us in entrusting him with this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I acknowledge that Sir Oliver Mowat is a very excellent man in his way and a very good Minister of Justice, but I do not care who he is or how distinguished he is, he has no right to send down one of his subordinate officers and say to the House : Give me $3,000, and I am not going to tell you whether the commission is to be one of experts or what it is to be. The Solicitor General knows nothing about the scope or the constitution of the commission, and he tells us plainly that he will tell us nothing about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the hon. gentleman asked us to vote an amount for a commission on the liquor question, did he say whom he was going to appoint or whether they were to be experts or not ? No ; he came down and asked the House to vote a grant of money for a commission on that question, which cost $100,000, and he gave no information as to who the commissioners would be. Yet he has the brass to get up to-night and insist on the Government doing what he would not do himself.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that my hon. friend has been dining out and his memory is not too good, or he would not have made the statement he has made. If he would take up the "Hansard," and peruse it as industriously as he used, on former occasions, the Auditor General's report, he would find that the scope of the commission was plainly expressed and that there was no doubt as to how far it was to go. But we have no such explanation with regard to this commission. All we have is a demand for the money. We are not even told whether it is to be a commission of experts or not. Nobody has asked the hon. gentleman to tell the names.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to know them, but there are a great many things that one must do without this session. However we ought to know, at least, whether it is to be a commission of experts or one composed of men who are not scientific, so far as the management and the knowledge of prison discipline and methods are concerned.

Mr. McMULLEN. They are not going to appoint their own relations on this commission anyhow ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend voted to-day to appoint the son of a member of this House as an officer of this House. The hon. gentleman alludes, I suppose, to one of the members of the prohibition commission. Will he tell me what is his relationship to me, or if he is or is not, or in a remote or any degree a relation, will the hon. gentleman tell me that for the temperance

people of the country, from one end of the Dominion to the other, he was not looked upon as their ideal man.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to prolong this debate but I must dissent from the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a prima facie case has been made out. I wish to call the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact that the two tables he has taken for the purposes of comparison, namely, the Central Prison of Toronto and the Kingston penitentiary, do not correspond at all in their items. Let me point out the different items that appear in the penitentiary of Kingston, and which do not appear at all in that of Toronto, and which amount to a very considerable sum. There is the item for gratuities, another item is officers' mess. Another is maintenance of machinery. Then there are the female prison, and the item of repairs to the building, which is not included in the statement of the Toronto prison. Then there is the item of the new stable, which is charged to capital account in Toronto, and another item is the binder twine industry. These amount to $121, reducing the whole thing to a very small fraction between the case of the prisoners at the Central Prison, Toronto and at Kingston. Another point of difference is in the fact that in Toronto prison no females are taken care of. It must also be remembered that at Kingston the prisoners are all of a desperate character and require double the number of guards that are required in Toronto. When hon. gentlemen consider that the circumstances in each penitentiary are as wide apart as possible and the services not the same at all, they will find that a prima facie case has not been made out. With regard to the investigation of the Central Prison at Toronto, Mr. Noxon, who made the investigation, simply walked through the prison with his hands in his pocket. No witnesses were called, no evidence was taken and there was no report. He simply came to certain conclusions of his own sweet will and the whole thing was a perfect farce. I do not say that there are not abuses in the penitentiaries because it would be impossible that in any institution entrusted to man, there would not be abuses. But I do not think that the hon. gentleman has made out a case for investigation. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he will oblige me and, I think, the committee at the same time, by agreeing to ask his inspector to make a preliminary report, before the constitution of this committee is decided upon, on the very subjects he has stated to be those that have given him some trouble and of which he wants an explanation. If the inspector, as I believe will be able to give a satisfactory report, there will be no necessity for this commission. The inspector has made no report, as the hon. gentleman admits, and it would only be necessary to refer to him the observations the hon. gentleman himself has made and ask him to deal with these subjects. With that report the hon. gentlemen will be in a better position to arrange for that inevstigation should it be found necessary. With reference to Mr. Noxon, I may say, that the gentleman who mentioned his name to me as likely to be appointed was a gentleman from Toronto not connected with the service, who spoke to me on the subject this afternoon.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a question I would like to ask——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Better have the questions stated, and then I can answer them all together.

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to deal with another question than that which has been discussed. I wish to ask the Solicitor General a question in justice to parties who were accused a few nights ago. I understand him to say that the accounts in reference to the binder twine were in such a position that the country was not likely to lose anything; that the accounts were going to be paid. We have in the newspaper a list of names of the parties who are owing the Government. I read from the Minnedosa "Tribune:"

An hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not going to "Dispense." I want the Solicitor General to say if the money is due by one of these gentlemen as claimed. He says he does not owe it:

> The Winnipeg "Tribune," in its efforts against the late Conservative Government of the Dominion, publishes in a recent issue a list of names of dealers indebted to the Government for binder twine made in the Dominion penitentiary, and in it is found the name of Mr. J. F. Boyd, of this town, said to owe $150. Mr. Boyd says he does not owe the Government one cent, having paid his account in full almost one year ago.

I would like to ask the Solicitor General if that is correct. A long list was read in the House of parties who were said to be indebted to the Government. It was promised that an amended list would be brought down. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) made this statement:

> Now, let me read to hon. gentlemen some of the other amounts that are owing by various gentlemen throughout the Dominion; and, although I may not know the political complexion of all these gentlemen, perhaps hon. gentlemen who are listening to me will know it.

Then he read a long list of names. I would like to ask the Solicitor General also if he read the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee on the 1st April last, when an officer of his department came before the committee and gave evidence on this subject. I have the evidence here. If the hon. gentleman has read it, I have no doubt he will freely take back what he

said the other evening. The officer stated that the department had ample security for the account in the form of New Brunswick bonds and real estate, as well as in the form of $700,000 of binder twine which was still held by the Government—quite sufficient to pay all the indebtedness of Mr. Connor at that time. I would like to know from the Solicitor General, who says the country will not lose anything, what amount he has received from the parties whose names are on the list ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The first question asked by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) I believe, was as to Mr. Boyd. He was informed, I understand, that Mr. Boyd had paid the amount due by him a year ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what this paper says.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On the 18th September, Mr. Boyd was returned to me as a debtor in the sum of $150, the return being made by Mr. Stewart, the inspector of penitentiaries. The next question I understand to be whether I have read the evidence given before the committee of this House. I have not read it all, but I have read a portion of it. I am not called upon to dispute anything that was said there. One of the statements made was that we had ample security for the $20,000 due from Mr. Connor. I am informed that to-day Mr. Connor owes $21,649, and we are having considerable trouble to get it notwithstanding that we are transferring everything we have in the way of collateral security. We have not got the money yet.

Mr. QUINN. Before the item passes, I think the committee is entitled to an answer from the Solicitor General to the question of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I desire to answer, but we cannot all speak together.

Mr. QUINN. I recognize the good will of the Solicitor General and put it in contradiction to the conduct of his friends behind him who are so anxious to have the item carried that they do not want to hear the Solicitor General's explanation. I would like to have him tell us what amount of money is to be spent on this commission. I feel a little anxious about this, because I am totally opposed to the idea of a commission being appointed, outside of the regular staff, to investigate this matter. Notwithstanding the statement made about the startling difference that exists in these expenditures, I think that any book-keeper of ordinary intelligence who would examine the accounts of the different penitentiaries as given here in the report, would see how that "startling difference" is to be accounted for. It simply means that in some portion of the Dominion we are carrying on works that are not necessary in other portions, and that in some portions we are paying large sums for the heating of a building which expenditure is unnecessary elsewhere on account of the nature of the building or the clemency of the climate. I think it is not a matter to be investigated by a commission. I am afraid it is intended, perhaps, for the benefit of some two or three friends of the Government, who, it may be, have been doing good service and deserve that sort of thing from the Government. But I should like some assurance that the amount will not be exorbitant, and if these gentlemen must be supported from the public revenues, at least we may have some idea of the amount to be expended, and not begin by voting $3,000 now only to be asked for $10,000 or $20,000 next February. I would, therefore, ask the Solicitor General if he would be kind enough to state, if he can state—it is unfortunate the Minister of Justice is not in this House who might give the explanation, and I understand the difficulty the Solicitor General labours under in not having all the information himself—but he might be able to tell us within what limit this commission will operate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is very much exercised by the fear that this expenditure is going to be exorbitant. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that it is not going to be exorbitant. The hon. member for Pictou asked a question with reference to an examination to be made by Mr. Stewart. I cannot give any assurance on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this vote of $3,000 supposed to cover the whole cost ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am in a position to state positively, from the conversation I had with Sir Oliver Mowat, that if it does not meet the outlay, it will come very close to it.

Customs—Collection of Revenue—Amount required to meet salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports..... $3,000

Mr. BENNETT. I will take this occasion of asking an explanation from the Controller of Customs in regard to a vacancy that may or may not exist at the port of Barrie. Some two or three years ago, one Mr. Grant then being collector of customs, was dispossessed of his office by the then Controller of Customs, or, at least, suspended, and an official from the port of Toronto was placed in possession of the office, and up to the present time the duties of the office have been discharged by a clerk from the customs-house in Toronto. Now, on the 1st April, 1895,—and I want the hon. gentleman to bear the date in mind—an Order in Council was passed appointing one Mr. David Dunn collector of customs at the port of Barrie. Mr. Dunn was sent to the port at Chatham in order, as I understand it, to be schooled in the duties of the position of

collector of customs. On or about the 1st July, an Order in Council was passed appointing Mr. Craig as collector of customs at Barrie, and about the same time an Order in Council was passed appointing this Mr. Dunn to the position at the port of Chatham. Now, I find, in a return brought down to the House, that the name of Mr. Craig is placed in the schedule of appointments from which the assent of His Excellency is withheld, and I am at a loss to understand why the name should be so placed. I suppose it is not too late that the name should be transferred from that schedule and placed in the other. On reference to the return, I find this statement :

That His Excellency's approval is withheld from appointments on the following grounds :— 1st, by reason of the fact that it was a newly created office ; 2nd, that it was the filling of a vacancy which had existed for more than one year ; or 3rd, by reason of the fact that it was an appointment made on the event of a superannuation.

Now, the case of Mr. Craig certainly cannot come under any of these three categories. It is quite clear that it is not a new position, because it has existed for twenty years past. It is quite clear it is not an office that was vacant for more than a year, because Mr. Dunn had been appointed to the post on the 1st April, 1895 ; and it is quite clear that it is not a case of a superannuation and a consequential appointment. So it comes under none of the three categories that I have enumerated. If there is any question at all, it can only be on the point that the office had been vacant for more than a year. But, in this connection, I have this to say : Had Mr. Dunn been appointed on the 1st May, this year, and had he been sent to Chatham or any other place to be schooled in his duties, surely it could not be contended that the office had been vacant for a year, by reason of the fact that Mr. Dunn had not been formally installed in the office at Barrie. If that argument prevails, then, it must of necessity follow that the fact that the appointment was made on the 1st April, 1895, does not disentitle Mr. Craig from the benefit of being placed in the category of appointments from which the approval of His Excellency has not been withheld. Now, there was a debate a little while ago on the appointment of the collector of customs at Berlin. At that time, the leader of the House stated, in answer to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that such appointments would stand like every other appointment until removed for cause. I would ask the Controller of Customs if he would direct that the name of Mr. Craig be removed from the present schedule and be placed among those appointments which have been approved of by His Excellency, as not coming within any of the three exceptions I have mentioned. As to Mr. Craig's qualifications, I can say that he is in every sense fitted for the office. I regret the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not in his place, as he could acquiesce in what I am saying. Mr. Craig has occupied the position of warden of the county of Simcoe, and has been chairman of the finance committee for that county for many years. I trust the Controller of Customs will do what is right under the circumstances, and permit his appointment to go through, as has been done in many other cases.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). With reference to this case, the records of the department show, I believe, that Mr. Dunn was appointed sub-collector at Barrie by Order in Council of 1st April, 1895. But he was never notified of his appointment, nor was such appointment ever gazetted. The previous collector had defaulted, and was suspended on the 1st December, 1893, and was dismissed from the service on the 12th March, 1894. Mr. Dunn, as I say, was appointed sub-collector on the 1st April, 1895, but was never notified of it, he never took possession of the office, and was never there at all, so far as I am aware, but he was placed on the extra staff at the port of Chatham, and he has been there ever since drawing his pay which is charged to the port of Chatham and not charged to the port of Barrie at all. He is not acting as a permanent officer. If I understand the argument of my hon. friend aright, it is, that because he had been nominally appointed to the office at Barrie, therefore, that office could not be said to have been vacant, and, therefore, the placing in class "A" of the name of the gentleman he mentioned, instead of class "V" is wrong. He asks me if I would not take steps to have the name transferred from class "A" to class "B," with a view, I suppose, of having that gentleman appointed sub-collector at Barrie. I am pleased to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) say, what I dare say is quite correct, with reference to the character of that gentleman, but he will not be surprised if I should say to him, that if there be a vacancy at the port of Barrie, possibly I would like to have a larger range of selections than just one which might be mentioned to me by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not taken any steps in the direction which the hon. gentleman has indicated.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the Controller of Customs to say that the passage of an Order in Council is merely a nominal matter. Surely that cannot be correct. I ask the Controller again : if Mr. Dunn's appointment had been made on the 1st of April this year, and if Mr. Dunn had been sent, as he would have been sent, to some port to be instructed in the duties of his office ; would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) then contend, that there had been a vacancy in the office ? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) contend that Mr. Dunn has never been notified of his ap-

pointment? He admits that Mr. Dunn was sent to Chatham. For what? It was to be versed in the duties of a collector of customs. It was not to be expected that a man would be appointed one day, and the next day installed in the position without his having a preliminary schooling in the duties appertaining to the office. There stands to-day, and the Controller of Customs admits it, an Order in Council appointing Mr. Dunn to the position of collector of customs. Does the hon. gentleman contend that that Order in Council has ever been cancelled. There is no record in the department to show it. Surely that Order in Council must have had the effect of appointing Mr. Dunn to the position, and until it is cancelled, Mr. Dunn is to-day to all intents and purposes the collector at the port of Barrie. It must be patent to everybody that the Order in Council appointing Mr. Dunn exists until it is cancelled, and existing as it did then, it cannot be argued that there has been a vacancy for over a year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have given the facts as I have them here. The members of the late Government are here, and they can speak for themselves. I will have to ask them in answer, how it is that they appointed a collector to a certain port, never notified him of his appointment, and never gazetted him.

Mr. PENNY. While this item is before the committee, I would like to ask the hon. the Controller of Customs, if the Government has given any consideration to the question of establishing a Board of Customs experts?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. In answer to the hon. gentleman I would say that I believe that subject has been brought before the attention of Parliament in times past. It has been mentioned to me rather in a casual way, and I promised to give it some consideration. There is no vote taken in the Estimates this session for the constitution of such a board, and, therefore, it cannot be formed at present. If there be merit in it, and if it be in the interest of the public service that such a board should be created, I will, of course, endeavour to give effect to it. I have not fully considered it yet. We have heard our board of appraisers, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Penny) knows, and what strikes me just at this moment—without saying anything against the fact that it might be desirable to have such a board as he mentions—is that it would be necessary to consider the whole question relative to its cost, and as to whether any change or lessening of expense in the matter of appraisers could be made if we constituted another board whose duty would lie in the same direction as the duty of the present appraisers. That is all I can say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Penny) at present.

Mr. QUINN. I am very glad that my hon. friend from St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Penny) has brought up this question, as I was going to speak on the very same matter this evening. Early in the session I moved for all the papers and petitions which have been submitted to the Department of Customs asking for the appointment of a Board of Commissioners, or of a judge for the trial of causes between merchants and the Department of Customs. The papers have not yet been brought down, and were they before us at the present time we would be able to discuss the question more intelligently. I have had some experience in contesting cases with the Customs Department, and my own view is, that it would be well to appoint an independent board to take the matter out of the control of the departmental officers who have been in the department for a number of years, and place it in the hands of independent judges. I do not mean to confine the cases to trial by one judge in the Dominion, but to have the Board of Commissioners asked for by these petitions, consist of judges, to the number of three, from different portions of Canada, if necessary, who might meet from time to time and settle any differences arising. One thing of which the merchants of Montreal complain is that goods will be imported at Toronto and entered there at a certain rate of duty, whereas at Montreal the same articles would pay a very much higher rate. This is a thing that happens very frequently, and the ports at which it occurs particularly, as I am informed, are Hamilton, Toronto and Winnipeg. Another difficulty often arises with respect to the duties that will be charged by one officer of the department upon a certain line of goods, as compared with the duties charged by another officer. One will believe that the article is subject to say 30 per cent duty, and another will say that it is dutiable at 20 per cent, and the consequence is that the duties charged by the department on the same article are not uniform. The object of appointing a Board of Commissioners would be to establish the rate of duty which, in cases of doubt, should be charged throughout the entire Dominion. A further reason why judges should be appointed for the trial of these causes is this: Any person who has had experience in criminal law knows, that persons who are continually coming in contact with criminals come to think that every person brought before them is a criminal. That is the condition in which I think the officers of the Customs Department are. It matters not what the merchant may be, what his character may be, or what may be offered in his defence, the very moment that a complaint is made against him, that moment the officers of the department think him guilty. It cannot be pretended that they could afterwards investigate his case, and give an honest, fair and unbiassed decision upon it. The only way to have an unbiassed judgment given is to appoint men of high character

throughout the country, who will form a board, have a code procedure, and, having characters to maintain by the judgments which they will render, guide themselves by the precedents which they establish and those which have been established in other countries. I am glad the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal (Mr. Penny) has mentioned this question, and I would ask the Minister, if at all possible, to leave some part of this item open so that the question may be discussed more fully when the papers come down. While on my legs, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Collector of Customs to the matter of the salary of Mr. O'Hara, the present deputy collector of customs in Montreal, who for three years acted as collector of customs there. This matter was brought up by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) some time ago, when the main Estimates were being considered. I would now ask the hon. Minister if any of these items are for the purpose of providing for the salary which Mr. O'Hara claims to be due to him for acting as collector of customs after the death of the late Mr. M. P. Ryan.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It is not included in any of these items. If the case were dealt with, it would be dealt with in a separate vote by itself. With reference to the other question brought up by the hon. gentleman, it is worthy of attention, and it will engage my attention. I did not know that the papers he refers to had been asked for or I would have been pleased to have brought them down. I am afraid it is a little late in the session now to accomplish it, but if he will renew the request next session, I shall be pleased to bring down any papers we have in regard to that matter.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the hon. Controller of Customs, admitting as he does that Mr. Dunn was appointed by Order in Council on the 1st of April, 1895, and is consequently the appointee to the position at present, will not hold to the ruling that the position has been vacant for more than a year. Surely there can be nothing more positive than an Order in Council. As to the statement that there has been no notification to Mr. Dunn, surely the hon. gentleman must remember that Mr. Dunn was apprised of his appointment by his being placed at Chatham in order to become versed in the duties of his office. As to his not being gazetted, surely it is not intended that every trivial office to which men are appointed shall be announced in the "Canada Gazette." I maintain that this appointment should be placed in the same list as the other appointments, and I trust that the hon. gentleman, seeing that it stands on all fours with them, will not make an exceptional case of it.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am giving every attention to the hon. gentleman's representations, and I see the point he makes; but in addition to what I have stated, the port of Barrie, ever since March, 1894, has been served, I think, by an officer sent there from Toronto, for cause he was removed and another one has been sent there. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Dunn was sent to Chatham nearly two years ago to be taught his business. It would not require that long to learn his busines; and when the second one who was there for more than a year was removed for cause, why was not this collector recognized as a collector, and sent to the port of Barrie, but a special officer was sent from Toronto? These things indicate that it was never intended that he should be there.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. gentleman himself is responsible for that, as it occurred only a few days ago. With regard to the statement of the hon. Controller of Customs that Mr. David Dunn did not receive notice of his appointment, I gave him notice of it when I was Controller, and sent him to Chatham in order to get a little instruction from Mr. Stevenson, a very competent collector of customs, and because an officer was required there at the time. Whether the appointment was gazetted or not I cannot say. It belongs to the Department of the Secretary of State to see that appointments made by Order in Council are gazetted. That is a detail that does not invalidate an appointment, and I contend that Mr. David Dunn is entitled to retain the position of collector at Barrie, and that he has never been deposed.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he notified him privately?

Mr. WALLACE. He was notified by letter from the department, and detailed to do service at Chatham for the reasons I have stated.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. My information is that he was not notified, that there is no record on file in the department of his having been notified.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the circumstances, I would like to add my plea to that of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). If an Order in Council was passed, and the person appointed was notified in the regular course, that makes the case very strong. I do not see how you can fail to look upon it as an appointment.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Does not my hon. friend see how cruel he has been to Mr. Dunn, if he takes that position? Why did he, as a member of the Government, without giving him any notice at all, pass an Order in Council which cut him off?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is the argument of the hon. member for

Simcoe, that by your last Order in Council you cancelled the appointment of this efficient officer.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot understand that, neither do I think that was argued by the hon. member for Simcoe. If that were his argument, it would not be mine. I think that the second Order in Council appointing a man to a position is invalid, if previous to that there was an Order in Council filling the position which had not been cancelled. You cannot put two men in the one place. If there is an Order in Council saying that so and so is a collector, he is that collector; and a simple Order in Council appointing John Jones, or anybody else, to that office, without cancelling the first appointment, would not be valid.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). De facto, it cancels the first.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. The first man is there until his appointment is cancelled. I have sat at the Treasury Board for eight years, with the Minister of Justice always there, and, in cases where, through inadvertence, recommendation was made for the appointment of an officer, the first thing ordered was a report from the officers of the Treasury Board stating whether there is a vacancy or not. If there were not a vacancy, the Treasury Board always considered the place filled.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the Controller of Customs to say that there was an Order in Council appointing Dunn at Barrie, and he afterwards went into service at Chatham. Was there another Order in Council appointing him to a position at Chatham? If he went into service there without having an Order in Council, it must be on the strength of the one which was passed appointing him collector at Barrie.

Mr. WALLACE. I would consider Mr. Dunn as collector at Barrie. The Order in Council was never cancelled.

Mr. SPROULE. You say there was an Order in Council at first appointing Mr. Dunn collector at Barrie, that he afterwards turned up in the service at Chatham. Was there another Order in Council appointing him to the position at Chatham, because otherwise he must have been acting, under the Order in Council, at Barrie?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. He was not appointed by Order in Council at Chatham.

Mr. SPROULE. On what strength did he get there?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose he was sent by the then Controller.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With all due respect to the Controller of Customs, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has made out a very strong case. His Excellency says his approval is to be withheld from any appointment made to a place where a vacancy had existed for over a year. The first point to determine is whether that vacancy did exist for over a year or not. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has given the facts with regard to the appointment of Dunn. He was appointed the 1st July, 1895. There was no question at all that he was appointed. What does the appointment consist of? It consists of being recommended by the Minister in charge of the department, by the adoption of that report by Council, and by the signature of His Excellency. All these things were done, and Mr. Dunn went to work in the Customs Department. If that is not an appointment, then there never was one made. But the Controller of Customs said: You did not put him at his duties in the town of Barrie. Well, that may be a charge to make against the late Government, but certainly the hon. gentleman cannot charge the fault of the late Government—if it was a fault—to this officer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not quite so clear that the mere appointment of an officer by Order in Council and not followed by any other proceeding, is a valid appointment. A man might be appointed by Order in Council and not be notified, and never sworn in, and never enter on the duties of his office, yet, according to the hon. gentleman, he would be entitled to draw a salary. That does not seem to be a reasonable argument.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Dunn was performing the duty of an officer of customs at another place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that he was never sworn in as collector at Barrie, and was never notified. The late Controller says he was, but there must be some misunderstanding.

Mr. WALLACE. I presume he was.

The FINANCE MINISTER. It is only a presumption then?

Mr. WALLACE. It is more than a presumption, because the inspector of customs installed him in office, and he must have been in the first place notified, and in the second place sworn in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Controller of Customs says that he has searched the records and can find no record that Mr. Dunn was notified.

Mr. WALLACE. How did he perform the duties of this office?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He never performed the duties of collector of customs at Barrie. It might be that he was appointed temporarily and was sent to Chatham where he entered upon the duties of a temporary employee and he is still

there. I believe it is customary, when a gentleman is appointed, that a commission is issued to him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Often it is years afterwards. There are officers in the public service who have been there for twenty years and who have received no commission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The argument that a man may be appointed, no notice being given him and not entering upon the duties of his office, simply on the basis of an Order in Council passed, and that therefore he is to be regarded as a collector of customs and entitled to the salary of one, seems to me, open to debate.

Mr. BENNETT. If Mr. Dunn had been appointed on the 1st April, 1896, and had been sent to Chatham or to some other place to become versed in the duties of his office, would the hon. gentleman consider that his appointment had not been made properly under the Act ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would depend upon what he was notified of.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was an interesting report made by the late Sir John Thompson after an investigation into the question of Orders in Council. There was a case of superannuation, and the question arose whether the Order in Council was completed if approved by the Governor General, and, for instance, lost before issuing from the Privy Council. The conclusion at which Sir John Thompson arrived was that the Order in Council did not become effective where it had not left the Privy Council Chamber. The whole subject is reviewed in that case.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think you would have to give effect to the Order in Council departmentally. For instance, in the case of this collector of customs at Barrie, would the hon. gentleman consider that he might be collector of customs during two years without any security given ? Was any security ever given by David Dunn ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We cannot get a satisfactory conclusion upon any particular case without the statute. If the statute requires in the case mentioned that before he is appointed security must be given, that settles it. But according to many statutes covering appointment by Order in Council, when the order is passed the appointment is complete.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to draw the attention of the Controller of Customs to the case of Mr. O'Hara, which has not been provided for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It stands for consideration.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. QUINN. I would urge the desirability of recognizing Mr. O'Hara's claim. He is entitled on every ground of fairness to the salary of Controller of Customs. He is one of the most deserving officers in the service and has performed his duties in the most exemplary and most efficient manner. I am sure no officer in the department stands higher with the commercial community of Montreal than Mr. O'Hara, the deputy collector of that port.

Mr. PENNY. I would like to say that this is a very deserving case and that I think the services of Mr. O'Hara should be recognized. The only fault I have to find is that the friends of the hon. member for Montreal Centre did not think it wise to give this extra salary to Mr. O'Hara while they were in power. I hope the Government will take the matter into its favourable consideration and do justice to Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In the list of appointments of the Customs Department, I expected to find the name of Mr. Geo. R. Smith. Will the hon. Controller let me know to-morrow why that name does not appear.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I gave the reason yesterday in reply to a question of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

Department of Agriculture, chief clerk. $1,887 50

Mr. MONTAGUE. What Chief Clerk is this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Mr. Fisher). Mr. Dionne. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) will remember that in the Department of Agriculture when he was Minister there was one chief clerk and one first class clerk to whom he gave notice of superannuation. In consequence of that and some other arrangements, the number of clerks provided for in the main estimates prepared by the hon. gentleman was reduced. But the hon. gentleman left the department without having carried out his intention to superannuate these clerks. Having accepted his estimates, perhaps without sufficient consideration, I now find that these gentlemen have not been provided for for the current year. I may say that I have not had the opportunity to go into the whole question of the assistance in the department sufficiently to say whether these gentlemen should be superannuated or removed or left where they are. I may say also that these gentlemen objected to being superannuated, and they are not of the age or length of service which demands superannuation. Consequently I felt that it was necessary to look into the matter. Meantime, I propose to take the necessary sum to pay them for the year, without binding myself to spend the money if I find it unnecessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What the hon. Minister says seems to call for a word of explanation from me. When I went to the Department of Agriculture and arranged for the disposition of the service, I did propose to superannuate Mr. Dionne, Mr. Dauray and Mr. Leveque. I did so because I did not think their services were required. I had an Order in Council prepared and intended to carry it out, and when I went away to the old country, I expected the late Minister of Finance would have had it carried out. But friends of those men pressed very hard that reconsideration should be given to their cases, and the late Minister of Finance, in his kindness of heart, allowed the matter to stand until my return. I got back very late, and we went to the country shortly afterwards, and the matter was overlooked. However, they had their notice of superannuation, so that they can make no complaint on that score. In the next place, they are absolutely unnecessary to the workings of the department. I am aware that they did not want to be superannuated, but they were given all the law allowed them, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, it is in the discretion of the Minister, with the concurrence of his colleagues, to superannuate any officer who may not be necessary, provided he is given his proper legal allowance. I think the hon. gentleman should not ask for the whole year's salary. He might take a couple of month's salary, and then carry out the superannuation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman should not press that suggestion. While I appreciate his knowledge of the department, still circumstances might arise where his suggestions could not be carried out. We must not forget that while the superannuation of these men would relieve the department of the expense of paying them, we would still have to provide for two-thirds of their present salary, or thereabouts, and the men superannuated would do no work at all; whereas they are now obliged to do their work, and having been long in the department, I take it for granted they are competent. If they are not needed in their present positions, they may be found useful in some other positions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When I superannuated any officer, either in the State Department or the Department of Agriculture, I invariably abolished the office. I think we might ask the hon. gentleman to say that if he does carry out the superannuation, notwithstanding that the salary is voted for the year, he won't make a new appointment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows that in the department it frequently happens that a clerk does not do the work of his class, but the work of some other class. The work a clerk does, does not fix his status in the class in which he may happen to be.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was not raising that point at all. The hon. gentleman is asking for a whole year's salary for these men, and I am asking that if he proposes to superannuate them, he shall make no new appointments in their place.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot bind myself to that, with my present knowledge of the department, although I would be very glad to listen to the suggestions of the hon. member.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am only calling attention to the fact that there is ground for the superannuation of these men, on the ground that they are absolutely unnecessary in the department. What I want the Minister to say is that if he decides that they are unnecessary and superannuates them, he will not fill the vacancies, although he has a year's salary voted to him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am willing to say that if I superannuate them and put somebody else in their places, I will assume the responsibility of that act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think that is a fair answer. I want to give the hon. gentleman the fullest possible latitude in the re-organization of his department; but if he superannuates these men on the ground that they are unnecessary, then he ought to say to this committee that he won't fill their places.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I really cannot accept the hon. gentleman's request in regard to the management of the department which I now occupy. If I find, after investigation, that these officers are not needed, but that other officers are needed, I certainly must appoint the other officers, and I am ready to assume the responsibility.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the request I made of the hon. gentleman was at all out of the way. If he superannuates these gentlemen he can only do so on the ground that they are not needed in the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That may be so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If he superannuates them for any other cause, he has a right to fill the offices. If he superannuates them on the ground that they are not fit for duty, and puts better men in their places, he has a perfect right to fill the offices. But if he superannuates them on the ground that their services are not needed, then he ought to say to the committee that he will not fill their places.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly, if I superannuate them because they are not needed and the office is not needed, I am not going to fill it again.

Resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 2nd October, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I desire to present a motion and to ask for it the concurrence of all the members present. It is in relation to private Bills which have been presented during the present session, and on which fees have been paid. It is as follows :—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the following resolutions be adopted :—

Resolved, That all proceedings upon every private Bill which has been introduced before this House, in the present session, shall be suspended on the day on which Parliament shall be prorogued, in order that the promoters thereof may proceed with the same Bills in the next session of Parliament.

Resolved, That an alphabetical list of all such Bills, with a statement of the stage at which the same were suspended, shall be prepared by the Clerk of this House, and printed.

Resolved, That a list of such Bills, with the certificate of the Clerk of the House of the stage at which proceedings were suspended, be laid upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament, in the order in which they shall stand upon such list.

Resolved, That in respect of every Bill so laid upon the Table, the petition for the Bill, and the order of leave to bring in the same in the present session, shall be read, and thereupon such Bill shall be read a first time, and a second time (if the Bill shall have been read a second time previously, to its being suspended) ; and if such Bill shall have been reported by any committee in the present session, the order for referring the Bill to a committee shall be dispensed with, and the Bill ordered to lie upon the Table, to be referred to a committee of the whole House, or to be read a third time, as the case may be.

Resolved, That all petitions presented in the present session for and against private Bills, and which stood referred to the committees on such Bill, shall stand referred to the committees on the same Bills in the next session of Parliament.

Resolved, That all instructions to committees on Bills in the present session, which shall be suspended previously to their being reported by any committee, be instructions to the committee on the same Bills in the next session.

Resolved, That the said orders be considered sessional orders, to be in force till the end of next session, and that the same be printed.

A number of the promoters of private Bills have gone to the expense of inserting advertisements in the papers ; but the session has been so short that there has not been time to dispose of them. This arrangement will be of no advantage to any person, and it will save the promoters of private Bills from again incurring that expense. I found a precedent for this, and I think hon. members on both sides will agree that this ought to be done.

Mr. BERGERON. Quote your precedent.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). In the year 1865, in the Upper Canada legislature, Sir John Macdonald, seconded by Mr. Cartier, moved a motion to the same effect, and it passed unanimously. This motion is in the very same words, except that it refers only to private Bills, whereas the other motion included all Bills.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid it will be impossible to accept this proposal, for which there has been no precedent in this Dominion Parliament, without an opportunity of fully examining the subject. It is introducing a question that may lead to a great deal of inconvenience.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course if this motion is not unanimously adopted, it falls to the ground, no notice having been given of it. If objection is taken to the motion, it cannot be submitted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I would suggest to my hon. friend that it is a question which may receive the consideration of the House at the next sitting. Therefore, I do not think it would be advisable to press the motion at this moment, when it cannot receive the consideration which it ought to receive, and when it may lead to controversy.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Civil Government—Department of Customs —Further amount required for contingencies $1,700

Mr. FOSTER. This item, then, wipes out the economy that was made in the Estimates as brought down first, in the civil government contingencies for that department.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It will bring them back to where they were.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know under what item of contingencies this amount is to be added. Is it to be added to the whole lot or is it for sundries ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I can give the hon. gentleman the particulars. The extra clerks are as follows: Miss Daws, a salary of $450; Miss Young, a salary of $400; Madame Jolivet, a salary of $550; Miss Gauthier, a salary of $300; George Rathbone, messenger, a salary of $180; and John Bain, who is my private secretary, a salary of $600. Then, there are six months' statutory increases to the first five, at $30 per year. This brings the amount up to $2,555. The main estimate is $1,500, the additional amount required for printing and stationery is $500. The main estimate is $1,500, or $500 less than that of 1895-96. The expenditure for 1895-96 amounted to $2,021.74, and for 1894-95 to $2,158.39.

Secretary to the Speaker of the Senate—	
Two sessions at $500	$1,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the first item?

The PRIME MINISTER. We think that the Speaker of the Senate, as well as everybody else, is entitled to a secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend proposes to introduce a new system into legislation and provide extraordinary expenditure. The Speaker costs us a good deal of money at present. The Deputy Speaker, against whom hon. gentlemen opposite lifted up an almost unanimous voice, when the proposal to appoint one was made, is continued without a wink of either eye. And, in addition, we have this new expenditure for a secretary for a Speaker of the Senate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I move to strike out this item of $1,000.

Motion agreed to.

Pages	$ 9,000
Sessional messengers	17,050
Charwomen	800
Stationery	5,900
Debates	8,000

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know if this will be the only amount required for the payment of the pages, messengers and charwomen for the session of 1897, or is any portion to be used for making up any deficiency in the present session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My information is that it is all for next session.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it sufficient to carry on next session's expenditures?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no intimation to the contrary. I understand it is sufficient, but there may be some mistake about it. The estimates are forwarded by the Clerks of the two Houses.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to debates, is that for the printing of "Hansard"?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the Senate "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. After the vote we have passed, will $5,900 be required for stationery for the Senators?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of the House of Commons, we proposed a reduction of the vote. I have not given my attention to the Senate. Perhaps a smaller sum would suffice. These are matters which are regulated by the Contingent Committee of the Upper House, and all we could do would be to refuse to vote it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have every respect for the Lords and have been taught from my youth to reverence those in authority, but the Commons have some rights as well. It is proposed by the Government to vote the sum necessary to continue these little douceurs of stationery to the Senators, but to cut off the perquisites from the independent Commons. Does the Government think that is fair treatment? Has the Government used its immense influence in the Senate, through the leader of the Government there, to bring it to a proper consideration and equal treatment of its brethren in the House of Commons?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How will we control that majority of yours in the Senate?

Mr. FOSTER. By sunny methods. I do not want the Government to pass a remedial order, but the great pacificator is in the Senate, the man who was promised a seat in that body, if the party were successful, and who is there to conciliate all parties and remove all difficulties.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have every hope of his success, in every respect but one, and that is, inducing the Tory majority in the Senate to be economical.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In so far as the Government have the power, it is their desire to have the two Houses treated similarly, and that whatever economies be resolved upon by this House, shall also extend to the Senate. Whether or not this vote is too large, I cannot say, as I have not given the matter close attention. I should prefer that the item be accepted on the assurance that it is the desire and intention that both Houses should be treated alike. When we come to the Commons, I propose to make a reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from North Wellington said "Hear, hear," by way of approval. Is he in favour of granting the stationery?

Mr. McMULLEN. My "Hear, hear" was emphasizing the statement made by the Finance Minister that the Commons and Senate should be put on the same footing.

Mr. FOSTER. Now my hon. friend occupies good ground. He will find that, in the end, the stationery will be kept for the Senators, and, in order to have both Houses on an equal footing, it will be given back to the Commons.

Additional amount required for stationery next session $10,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose that this item be reduced to $6.000, and I hope that even a less sum will be sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. Four thousand dollars is the estimated value of the trunk stationery ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the estimate—yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this item is adopted, I wish to call attention to two cases of what I regard as hardship that have existed for a year or two in connection with two hon. members of this House. The first is the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby). As hon. members will recollect he was taken ill last session and was only in attendance some three or four days, and, under the interpretation of the law, he is not entitled to indemnity. The other is the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingston), who had his leg broken and had to remain at home. Had he remained in the city, he would have drawn his indemnity. These cases, I think, ought to be provided for either by being included in this vote or by a supplementary vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Any question of that kind might well be considered in the future, but I think it would be inconvenient to deal wth it now. My attention has not been drawn to the cases mentioned by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. the Speaker if he can tell me why Mr. Samuel C. Moore, who was a sessional messenger in the House, was discharged, and Mr. Chipman Vaughn appointed in his place ?

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to the appointment of sessional messengers, I had to arrange matters in a great hurry when I was elected Speaker, so as to have the necessary staff. I took the recommendations of the officers of the House with reference to the rejection of the old messengers, who certainly were appointed from session to session and were not permanent employees, and I appointed those whose appointment was recommended, and filled other vacancies with those whom I believed to be suitable persons for the positions. I cannot remember the particular case referred to by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). If Mr. Moore was dropped, he was dropped because that course was recommended by the permanent old officers of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to call attention to the case of Mr. Patchell, who was left off the messengers' staff this session after having been fifteen years in the service of the House. So far as I can see from his record, his duties were well performd. I know he was thought a thoroughly reliable man and the chief messenger had, for the last year or two, asked him to take charge of the books in his department, and in every way treated him as a reliable and confidential man.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is the case, I believe, which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) mentioned to me in committee before, and I told him then that I did recollect the reason why Mr. Patchell was dropped and said I would tell the hon. gentleman what it was. I will tell him now if he wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. If you please.

Mr. SPEAKER. He was reported to be entirely above his business and uncontrollable as a messenger. He did not seem to appreciate the position he was in.

Mr. FOSTER. Did not he do his work well ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know. But he considered, apparently, that he was in a position inferior to his merits and acted without due subordination. That was the report given to me, and it was on that account I dropped him. I know nothing about the matter personally.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire to say with reference to Mr. Patchell, that he has been around the House of Commons for the last fifteen years, and I think he has been a most capable and efficient messenger. He was door-keeper in this western corridor, and he always performed his duties very faithfully and very courteously. I was surprised to know he had been dropped from the list of messengers, because, from my observations of him I regarded him as one of the most capable messengers in the service of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. There are two old messengers who, I think, were very good messengers, and whom we have missed this session. I refer to Mr. Gratton, who used to be downstars, and Mr. Samson, whom all the members know as the attendant at this western door. I would be glad if the Speaker would give me the reason why they were left off.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot undertake to give the reasons why the officers of the House recommended that they should not be appointed. I did not appoint a commission to investigate. These messengers are appointed from session to session and the internal discipline of the House demands that we shall have messengers acceptable to the executive officers of the House. A Speaker coming in, as I did, without any personal knowledge of the qualifications of

messengers must rely upon the reports of permanent officers of the House. That is what I did, and I propose, unless there are very good reason to the contrary, to rely upon their report in the future, in fact there is no other way.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand in the case of the messenger referred to by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), a reason was given. I should be glad if I could learn the reason that governed Mr. Speaker's action in this case. The men themselves are asking the reason why they were dismissed.

Mr. SPEAKER. One of these was a similar case to that of Mr. Patchell. I happen to recollect what the reason was in both these cases. It was reported to me that Mr. Samson also seemed to be altogether above his business. That was the practical effect of his report.

Mr. BERGERON. What about Mr. Gratton ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not remember about him at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In some cases Mr. Speaker has acted for cause; and where there is no special cause, the Speaker, as I understand it—and he may be right—claims that as the appointment is not a permanent one he could act according to his own discretion and choice. In justice to Mr. Moore I desire to read this letter, which was sent to him by the Minister of Militia, so that it will be apparent that the reason for dispensing with Mr. Moore's services was largely to give Mr. Vaughn, who comes from the same county and who has taken Mr. Moore's place, a turn, Mr. Moore having had his turn before :

Ottawa, August 12th, 1896.

Dear Mr. Moore,—I have received your letters. Personally I have no feeling whatever in the matter, and I have no hesitation in saying that I have always found you most respectful and diligent, and that I do not in any way hold you responsible for annoyances to which I have been more than once subjected at public meetings by members of your family—minors though they were.

But you entirely misapprehend the nature of your appointment, which is an annual one and not permanent. The notice you received was not suggested by me and was similar to that received by every employee of the House. If you had been appointed a member of the civil service you would have come back as a matter of course, but, seeing your appointment is an annual one and in the gift of the new Speaker, I can scarcely think you can seriously expect to be re-appointed. You have had a good many years of service and ought now to be willing to allow one of your neighbours to have a chance.

Yours very truly,
F. W. BORDEN.

So, I think, perhaps that may cover the whole of the cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want this resolution to pass until we have an explanation of this next item, which either means something in connection with the resolution which was passed here the other day, or the resolution means nothing. This is the item of $5,325 to provide trunks under an order of the House of 1891. Now, the House knows well that several years ago we came to the conclusion to do away with the yearly trunks, and in lieu of that, one trunk was to be given at the first session of a new Parliament, and no other trunk, outside of the stationery, was to be given during the remaining years of that Parliament. While that was still a rule of the House, the Printing Committee, following on the line of that rule, suggested this report and sent it down to the House, the report being of this tenor, that the trunks which had been usually given at the beginning of each parliamentary term, should be given this year, and that report was asked to be adopted in order to authorize the arrangement to be made. Thereupon the leader of the Government arose and made a motion, which was seconded by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce :

That the practice of supplying each Senator and member of the House of Commons with a leather trunk and a box of stationery, be discontinued in future, and the order of the House sanctioning the same, dated 5th May, 1892, be rescinded.

That passed, and it has been heralded throughout the country as a signal instance of the new reign of economy which has been inaugurated by the Reform Government, that at one fell stroke they had done away with the quinquennial trunk, and the order of the House under which, as I understand, it could alone be given, was rescinded. The resolution passed, the proclamation of economy is issued to the country, and here we find the Finance Minister, in spite of the resolution, coming down with a vote for—what ? For the quinquennial trunk. The resolution has passed heralding the great reform, the vote comes down, and the same trunk is given that would have been given if the resolution had not passed at all. What does it mean ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is any difficulty in understanding what it means. I have not had the pleasure of reading many of the interesting reports to which the hon. gentleman refers as having been heralded throughout the country ; but the only reference I have seen about the matter has been to the effect that it was the intention hereafter, after the close of the present session, to abolish that system of providing trunks. That is what I understand has been heralded throughout the country. Now, as a matter of fact the Printing Committee some years ago adopted a resolution under which these trunks had been provided for. We know that as a matter of fact our neighbours in the other place—as it is customary to speak of

the Senate—have received their trunks and are enjoying them. Now, among other things that the hon. gentleman, I think, ought to be most anxious about, is that there should be perfect equality in these matters. I thought he was very anxious a few minutes ago that there should be absolute equality in the matter of paper, and pens, and ink, and stationery; and why he should draw the line at trunks, I do not very clearly understand. But what I believe the House intended—though I have not given great attention to the resolution—was that after the present session this practice of issuing trunks and stationery should be abolished. It is not a very insignificant matter. True, we live in an age when we think in millions, and we talk here of large sums. But a saving of $5,000 or $6,000 is not so insignificant a matter that it can be treated as of no importance. The motion of the leader of the Government was not dissented from, and the whole House resolved that hereafter we would not have the trunks ordered. But I do not think there was anybody in this House or out of it who understood that, as respects the present session, there was to be any change. What we all understood, I believe, was that inasmuch as a portion of these trunks had been ordered for a portion of Parliament, we would complete the order and supply trunks to all the members of both Houses for the present session, but that from and after the present session, these trunks should be discontinued. Whether it is a large or a small economy, is not to the point. Let us be sure that we have the facts correctly before us.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend seems to have missed the entire point, which is this: The resolution, taken in connection with this vote, makes no economy at all for the duration of this Parliament. Another point is this: the Premier moved a resolution, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce sanctioned it, and the ipsissima verba of the resolution are spread upon the pages of our journals. How can you give the trunks now in face of that resolution? That is what I want to ask my hon. friend to explain, especially as the resolution was given as an answer to the report of the Printing Committee that the trunks should be provided. That report was not passed, but this resolution passed in its stead. This resolution states in so many words that for the future the trunks shall not be given, and it rescinds the order under which they could be given by this House. Now, before the Finance Minister votes this, let him call in the Premier and ask him to move a resolution to rescind the resolution of the day before yesterday.

The MINISTTR OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has not stated this matter fairly. In the first place, he says there is to be no economy during the present Parliament. My hon. friend the Finance Minister says that a matter of $4,000 a year is to be saved on trunks and stationery. The reason why I say the hon. gentleman has not stated the matter fairly is this: The report that came down, recommended the purchase of these trunks by this Parliament, and that report was adopted, with a rider added to it in the words which the hon. gentleman read, that while the trunks are provided for this Parliament, in future no trunks shall be provided. That seems to be very plain. The report came down, and it was not adopted, but the paragraph in it recommending that trunks be provided by this Parliament, was assented to by the unanimous vote of the House, and the Prime Minister moved a rider to it that in future this practice should be discontinued. Now, taking them both together they are not open to any but the one construction.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No one deserves much credit, then, for voting such a resolution. We say that Parliament for five years shall have trunks, but the other Parliament over which we have no control, shall have no trunks.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. There was an old rule proposed by the joint committee of both Houses, and adopted by this House, that for all time to come trunks shall be provided by the officers at the beginning of each Parliament. That rule we have rescinded. Now, when another Parliament meets, either in one year or five years hence, there is no order or rule providing for trunks; and in the meantime the annual stationery trunks are abolished, as the Finance Minister told us, at a saving of about $4,000 a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It means that this Parliament has resolved to have trunks, but that there shall be no trunks for the next.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what the old Parliament did say, and we are making it perfectly plain now, that for the future there shall be no rule existing on our books authorizing any officer to incur liabilities for leather trunks, they are done away with for all times. But I was more concerned with the interpretation that my hon. friend chose to put upon the report of the Printing Committee. There is an express recommendation that leather trunks be provided, which he voted for and I voted for. There is a rider proposed by the leader of the Government that in future no leather trunks be provided.

Mr. FOSTER. I see it all. It is a most delightful thing. I was not in the House when this report was brought up, but I did come in when the leader of the Government was on his feet, moving this,

and I thought it meant something. I thought it was a case of real self denial, but it is not. The whole of it pared down is this: That we, the members of this Parliament will have the trunks, but when the next Parliament comes in, we will keep the other fellows from having them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not intend to be here next Parliament, or he would not talk that way.

Mr. FOSTER. On the face of it there is very little gain. The Minister of Finance says that we cannot bind the Senate, and that we will have to give them the stationery, and next year when Parliament comes here it will no doubt be said, that it is rather inconsistent that the members of one House should have the stationery and that the members of the other House should not. Let us know how much there is in it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There is this much in it, that we have reduced the stationery vote from $10,000 to $6,000. If we assume that this is correct, then there will be a saving of $4,000 a year which will be $20,000 for the five sessions, or if we should follow the example of hon. gentlemen opposite, there will be a saving for six sessions. That saving of $20,000 during the present Parliament is not to be despised. As to the argument that we are not unselfish in taking the leather trunks ourselves and not giving them to our successors, I may say that we on this side of the House expect to be our own successors.

Mr. FOSTER. I recollect a celebrated character named Pip who had great expectations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is only fair to the committee that I should state to the House the position we are in with regard to this matter. It is perfectly true that some members of the Commons thought that the time had come when this expenditure should be saved to the country, and that the trunks and stationery supplied to members outside of what was necessary during the session of the House, should not be given in future. There might be some difference of opinion, but it seemed to me that the great majority were indifferent, and it was a matter of very little importance to them. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was present when the matter was discussed in the committee, and the conditions of things we found existing was this: That as it was a rule of Parliament for a great number of years, that two trunks and stationery should be given to the members; on the strength of that rule the officers of the House ordered the small trunk, put the stationery into it, and had it delivered to each member. We found that the Senate had gone further, and that they had not only their stationery trunks, but the leather trunks as well for the Parliament. A large number of the members of this House do not seem to remember that there was no increased expenditure to the country in adopting this good leather trunk for the whole Parliament, instead of giving an inferior trunk for each session—that is five trunks for the Parliament, as formerly was the case. I wish it to be perfectly understood that there was no increase of expenditure by adopting the one good trunk instead of the five poor ones. Having found that more than two-thirds of the expenditure had been made, and all that was left to do was the mere furnishing of this usual parliamentary trunk, the committee recommended that this should be done this year according to the rule. It is only fair that that should be stated. As I have said, a few members thought that the time had arrived when perhaps this expenditure for stationery might be abolished, and no one seemed to be opposed to it when my hon. leader moved that the report of the committee be amended in that respect. I expect that it probably will be a saving of some three or four thousand a year if we abolish the usual trunk and stationery, issued each session. That is all there is in it. As far as I am personally concerned, I believed when this representation was made to the Government, that I was representing the great majority of the members on the opposite side of the House as well as the majority on this side. It was out of deference to that wish and rather than to have a matter of so little importance discussed, that the suggestion was made that the custom should be abolished. The committee did not consider it from a party standpoint at all. The majority of that committee are opponents of the present Government, and in making this recommendation it was after full consideration of the circumstances, and with no desire to make party capital out of it. It was done in order to act in accordance with the wishes of the great majority on both sides.

APPROPRIATION FOR EXPENSES OF NEXT SESSION.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the Government. A very peculiar state of things is shown on the face of these Estimates. It appears we are to have a session of the Senate next year and that the usual legislative work is to go on there, but it does not appear from anything in these Estimates that we are going to have a session of the House of Commons next year, inasmuch as there is no appropriation either statutory or otherwise for it. I would like to ask the leader of the Government, if he proposes to run a one-sided machine next winter and if the Senate is to sit without any House of Commons? It is only an amount of about $400,000, and surely there should be an item in the Estimates for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is not serious in making that remark, because he is well aware that the $400,000 sessional indemnity is provided for by statute.

Mr. FOSTER. I am entirely serious. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is following the bad example of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in saying that I am not serious, when I take objection. I know that the indemnities are statutory, but I know just as well that from 1867 down to the present time no Estimates have ever come down to this Parliament which concealed the fact that about $400,000 was absolutely necessary to be added to the expenditure on current revenue account in order to carry on the work of Parliament. Why is it not done now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Is it necessary to be voted ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is statutory so far as the indemnities and mileage are concerned, but it always appeared in the Estimates—and no criticism of the Liberal Opposition was stronger than the criticism which was devoted against the late Government, because on one occasion I left out a steamship subsidy which had been provided by Bill and was paid under an Act. In all candour the cost of the next session of Parliament should appear on the Estimates. As they now stand, they simply put before the country that what is required for 1896-97 is $400,000 less than what really is necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) can hardly imagine that there was any attempt to conceal the fact that the sessional indemnity amounts to a very considerable sum and must be paid. Therefore, I cannot think he is very serious when he takes that objection. I would defer to the opinion of the hon. gentleman because it should be better than my own in this regard, but my recollection is that in bringing down Supplementary Estimates it is not usual to extend upon them items provided by statute. In one of our Estimates we have done that, but I have been informed that it is not customary and so I did not include it in these Estimates. The larger portion of the sum to which the hon. gentleman refers is provided by statute, and does not require to be voted. Surely no member of the House, or no one outside with any intelligent knowledge of the affairs of the House, is unaware that the session of Parliament has to be provided for. But there are, it is but fair to say, other items which are not provided for by the statute, and which are usually voted ; but I have reason to believe that the sum provided for the present session will exceed the actual requirements, owing to the session being a short one, so that when we come to next session, I hope the appropriation required then will be a small one.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman, in getting out of one difficulty, has got himself into another. Let him look over the Estimates presented to Parliament since confederation, and point out a single instance in which the expenditure required for a regular session has been left out of the main Estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let me ask the hon. gentleman another question. Will he find an instance in which all the sums provided for by statute have been extended in the Supplementary Estimates ?

Mr. FOSTER. Everything has been extended except the subsidies for Pacific steamships, which I had not found extended when I took the position of Finance Minister, and which I did not think of at the time. But when the omission was pointed out to me by my hon. friend, I felt that the criticism was so fair and just that I immediately had those items extended on the pages of the Estimates. But aside from this, and without any attempt to justify or to incriminate, it is only fair and right to the country to spread upon the pages of the Estimates the various amounts you propose to expend, and not to leave out such a regular and absolutely essential sum as $400,000 for a regular session of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). You do not suggest that it is required to be voted.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one part that is required to be voted—the amount for the publication of the "debates." You have extended the amount required for messengers and pages, more than half of which you have taken up for this session ; and the session of next year will be three times the length of this. My hon. friend would make the matter perfectly right if he would extend on the Estimates the statutory amounts required for indemnity and mileage. The other amounts will have to go now to the Supplementary Estimates for next year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As we are dealing with a resolution before the House, we can only extend such sums as we propose to vote. We all agree that the sums the hon. gentleman refers to will have to be expended, and the hon. gentleman's statement goes to the public ; so that they are made aware of the fact just as well as they would be if the amounts were extended on the Estimates, that the statutory allowances for indemnity and mileage have to be added to the amount voted, and at the next session perhaps some additional sums as well. But, as I have already stated, we have been assured that the cost of the present session will fall short of the estimate, and therefore the Supplementary Esti-

mates for next year will not be very large. Meanwhile, I do not see anything to be accomplished by setting out these amounts on these Estimates when we have stated here that they have to be added.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not fill the bill, and I ask the hon. gentleman's candid attention to it. In the first place, his objection to inserting the indemnity and mileage is that it would not be a part of the resolution. It would not, of course. You do not bring in a resolution to expend what is expended under statute; but if, under the resolution by which you take the voted sums, you extend what is required by statute, it has this essential characteristic, that it does not mislead anybody, and it shows the person who reads that page just what is to be expended. But, with these Estimates as they are, what will take place? The Estimates passed this year will be compared with those passed last year. Nobody wants an unfair comparison. In the Estimates of last year you had all the ex penses of legislation set out. Let us have in these Estimates all the estimated expenses for legislation, so far as we can have them. We cannot get them all. There are expenditures of from $40,000 to $70,000 which cannot be spread on the Estimates, but which will certainly be incurred; but I ask, as a matter of mere fairness, that the indemnity and mileage should be spread on the Estimates, and counted in the Estimates for the current year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). My recollection of these matters is that the Supplementary Estimates have always been brought down in the exact form in which my hon. friend brings these.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this such a Supplementary Estimates as has never before been brought down? If the hon. gentleman had been estimating what was absolutely necessary for the current year, would he not have put in the amount required for the present session?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If you had told us that you would keep us here for seven weeks to do what we might have done in a fortnight. But how could we suppose that the hon. gentleman and his friends would have inflicted on this country an extra expense of $400,000? We had too high an opinion of them to expect that. But, as a matter of fairness, if the hon. gentleman wanted to have a true contrast between the various expenditures, it would have been perhaps as well for my hon. friend to have done what is not ordinarily done—introduced a third column, in which he could have stated the fact that the hon. gentleman opposite had put $38,308,000 in his main Estimates, and in his supplementaries—without taking into account anything for Railways and Canals or for Agriculture—$3,160,000 to be charged to consolidated fund, as against about $1,500,000 which my hon. friend has brought or for Agriculture—$3,160,000 to be charged to capital account; making $4,660,000 additional which the hon. gentleman would have taken if the Opposition had not saved the country a good deal of money by preventing him getting his Estimates through.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the indemnity and mileage put down, because it would be a deception practised on the country to omit something that is absolutely spent. My hon. friend's suggestion would be worse than a deception; it would be an actual mensonge, for the simple reason, that the hon. gentleman's statement that $4,660,000 were the Supplementary Estimates we were prepared to bring down, is a statement which has no foundation in fact.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It has this foundation in fact. I have here a document which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were prepared to bring down—the card up my sleeve, as I suppose the hon. gentleman would say, to show that these items had passed Council, under the hand of the hon. gentleman who sits besides him.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, the other evening, when the Minister of Public Works trotted out that card, I explained to the satisfaction of the House exactly what it meant.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not to the satisfaction of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Leaving all badinage aside, this is merely a question of fairness, and I ask if we cannot include in these Estimates all that will have to be absolutely spent.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What is the use? Any comparison will be not between Estimates, but between the sums actually spent, and all these will be fully ascertained.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows as well as he knows that he is not Minister of Finance, that in the by-elections which are now to come off, that $400,000 will be entirely suppressed, and the Estimates of this year will be what will be talked of.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I promise the hon. gentleman that the $4,680,000 he asked for will not be suppressed.

Mr. FOSTER. I appeal to the First Minister for fair treatment in this respect.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If the hon. gentleman had put a fair question, I would certainly be ready to satisfy him at once, but he will permit me to say that he has not done this. He wants to have a foot-note in the Estimates to this effect:

Let the Canadian public beware; besides this amount, which is voted by Parliament there is $400,000 more, which is voted permanently and should be added to these Estimates. Let it be understood that this foot-note exists, let the country know positively that there is this statutory appropriation to be added. It was left out because nobody thought such a question would be raised. These Estimates are brought down in the shape in which they are always brought down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is not the custom in the Supplementary Estimates to include items which have already been appropriated by Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did my hon. friend leave this out of the Supplementary Estimates? We cannot leave out an item like this any more than we could the item for the payment of judges' salaries. Is he, in the first place, to leave out of the main Estimates the item of $400,000 that must be absolutely estimated for and spent in the course of the year, and then bring down the supplementaries, and justify his not putting it in the supplementaries by saying that no such thing was ever seen in them. That is very true, because no Minister of Finance has, up to this date, tried to conceal the absolute and necessary amount for carrying on the business of Parliament. I appeal to the leader of the Government. We are two parties, one on each side, and the financial basis of each different Government has always been a matter of the strongest consideration and comparison and comment. We compare the Estimates of one Government with another, but it is far later when we compare the expenditures. The ground of argument in the by-election and the press will be the Estimates of the one Government as compared with those of its predecessors. It is the Estimates compared with Estimates which my hon. friends opposite have been discussing all through this session. They take, not the expenditure of 1895-96, but the Estimates of 1895-96, and they have been comparing their Estimates of 1896-97 with ours for 1895-96.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are comparing rather the Estimates of 1896-97 with yours.

Mr. FOSTER. Of 1895-96.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, except in the ordinary formal way in which those things are always put together.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly they are compared. What do we find? Here is a Government which comes down and neglects to put in its Estimates an essential expenditure of nearly $400,000, which has always been put in the Estimates hitherto, and which must be expended. When the Supply Bill is toted up, when these Estimates are calculated, the amount of the Estimates will be $400,000 less in appearance, but the amount that must be expended will include that $400,000. You take off the $400,000 and you have a comparison, in favour of these Estimates, of $400,000, against the preceding year. Is that fair? Will hon. gentlemen opposite take the position of denying a fair comparison? If they take this position intentionally, their conduct deserves to be characterized by a stronger epithet than is eminently unfair and unjust, not only as between the two parties, but to the country itself.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The fair thing would be to add to the Estimates we have brought down plus the Supplementary Estimates which the hon. gentleman brought down, and those which we know he had and did not bring down. That would be a proper comparison and we will be under serious disadvantage unless that be made.

Mr. WALLACE. That would be a fair comparison because even if the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce be correct, that Supplementary Estimates were prepared by the late Government and passed the Council no one is responsible for them except the members of that Government. The members of the Conservative party are not responsible. I perfectly agree that the comparison would be between the proceedings of the two Governments and that there would be no reflection at all justly to be placed on individual members of the Conservative party. I was simply speaking of Estimates which were prepared and would have been brought down. The hon. gentleman was a member of the Government at the time, and I have heard these hon. gentlemen say, over and over again, that they would have been brought down but for the unexampled obstruction of last session.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to deny in the most emphatic manner the statement and imputation that we were appropriating and had authorized $4,000,000 by the Supplementary Estimates which were to be brought down. I deny that as emphatically as a man can deny anything. That statement which has been put into the hands of my hon. friend is simply a table of the demands that were made by the Ministers of the different departments and which were printed for the consideration of the Council. My hon. friend knows what the rule is. Every department has claims put before it, and none more so, for Supplementary Estimates, than the Department of Public Works. These are sifted in the department by the Minister who recommends to Council what he thinks ought to be granted. The Council then has to have those printed before they are considered, and they are sent down to the Printing Bureau. No revision is made by

either Finance Minister or Council before they are printed. When printed they are brought before Council, the Council goes through them and decides what shall be brought down to the House of Commons. Last year the Department of Public Works had, as it always has naturally, very large demands upon it. When my hon. friends have come to the end of their parliamentary term, they will find that they will have very much larger demands from the different constituencies in the year before a general election than they will in any preceding year. These demands were tabulated by the Minister of Public Works, and they were printed by the Printing Bureau. They never even came before Council for discussion, and the same was the fact with regard to many other of the departmental Estimates. We commenced the discussion of departmental Estimates, but we found before we had proceeded far that we were not going to get any of the main Estimates, and we decided not to bring down the supplementaries. Part of these were discussed and decided upon, and when they came up on special report of the Ministers or in any other way, a decision of Council was had with reference to a certain number. That was all that was done. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent the case, and I take the opportunity of stating it as it was and giving an emphatic denial to the idea that we were prepared to bring down estimates of $4,000,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not know what particular mode the hon. gentleman adopted, but I do know that when I was Minister of Finance we took extremely good care never to use the words "summary" and "chargeable to capital" and "chargeable to consolidated fund," until the matter had been considered in Council. We always considered them in detail, and when they had been considered in detail, then the summary and these words were introduced. I fancy that in most cases that custom was followed. Now, I know, and the hon. gentleman knows as well, that all through the elections statements were made in a great many constituencies that particular items had been passed upon by the late Government and submitted in Council and approved when the Supplementary Estimates had been before them. I am not prepared to say that in every minute detail the Supplementary Estimates had been before them and had been considered and that these sums contained in the Supplementary Estimates were to be voted. But we have statements, if the hon. gentleman wants them, signed by his own colleagues to that effect. And I must say that when I find that they did introduce, apart from these other matters which I can well understand it was desirable to hold over, and had considered in Council Estimates having at the bottom these words "Summary—Chargeable to capital, $1,480,966." and "chargeable to consolidated fund, $2,680,030." making a total of $4,160,996, and when I knew the information relating to many of the items had been used in the election and statements had been made to that effect, I had a very good right to say that that gave us a fair idea of what hon. gentlemen would have had to bring down if he had been able to get his main Estimates through.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman the explanation. Whatever may have been my hon. friend's practice when he was Finance Minister, this was my practice: I never allowed the Estimates to go out of Council to be brought down to this House until I had set before Council, in the first place, the amount for capital and the amount for ordinary expenditure which was asked, and then discussed the question with my colleagues as to about how far we could go. After we had settled that, the cutting down process took place; and my summaries for capital and ordinary expenditure account were with a view of discussing in Council how high an estimate we could come down with and setting, as far as we could, a maximum limit. In the cases in which it was said that certain things had been decided by Council, I would give an example—the case presented by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Tisdale), the work at Port Dover, which was a special work and the subject of a report to Council. Council took the whole matter up and decided what they would do upon that individual case—decided, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) knows, that if the persons interested would spend a certain sum of money, about twice as much as they asked of us, considering that it was a great commercial undertaking, we would supplement their subscription by so much. We decided that as a government; and the same is true of other special cases. That is entirely consistent with my statement that we did not consider the Estimates as a whole. So far as the Public Works Estimates are concerned, the Council did not even dicuss them. The Minister of Public Works sent them to me, and I sent then to be printed. And there the matter rested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. FOSTER. How about this unfair comparison? Are hon. gentlemen opposite willing to be so unfair as that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How can there be any unfair comparison when more has been accomplished by this five minutes' discussion than could be accomplished by inserting what the hon. gentleman wants in the Estimate. The idea that there is any attempt at concealment is preposterous. The hon. gentleman might as well say that we

are trying to conceal the fact that the House is meeting to-day. The Supplementary Estimates have been brought down the same as ever.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was this vote for legislation left to the Supplementary Estimates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because we have never had these exceptional conditions before. It is absurd to say that there was any intention of concealment; but absurd as it may be, the hon. gentlemen have accomplished more this afternoon than could have been accomplished by having the sums set out in detail. If, in the face of this discussion, any gentleman should attempt to deny that we had to include in our Estimates and provide for the sum total of the year including the cost of a session of Parliament—well, the thing would be so absurd, that I cannot imagine anybody on this side of the House making such a statement and risking the contradiction that would be brought out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we are losing time, and very unnecessarily. It is now admitted by the Minister of Finance that this was an oversight and——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We assume that there is no desire to mislead the House and the country. Everybody admits that there must be an expenditure of $400,000——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not so much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will be there or thereabouts. In round figures that will be the amount. In order to put before the House and the country the means of forming a comparison in future years, this ought to be included. Now it is perfectly obvious that under these circumstances, as we assume, that there was no desire to mislead the House and that this has arisen in part from the somewhat exceptional circumstances that have taken place and I do not see why we should lose time. Now, there is this point to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance, and I think it will be confirmed by gentlemen who have had so much experience in this House and particularly in these questions as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—that it is not a mere question of this matter as it appears before this House and the country at the present moment. No person knows better than the gentleman who was formerly Minister of Finance when gentlemen opposite were in power before that these become public documents and that, for the purpose of fair and just comparison in future years when this discussion will be altogether lost sight of, it is desirable that an omission of that kind should be repaired. And, as there is no difficulty in doing it, as it can be done in the simplest possible manner by merely expanding this amount, why should we lose time in the discussion when there is no desire on the part of anybody to prevent these papers from setting forth not only now but in future time as they actually exist and as they are admitted on both sides of the House to exist and thus remove all chance of misapprehension.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Did my hon. friend ever know supplementaries brought down otherwise ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend surely knows that that question is not pertinent to this discussion. It is not a question as to whether it should appear in the Supplementary Estimates ; it is a fact that it has always been either in the Estimates or the supplementaries. Is the country not bound to find expanded upon the Estimates the expenditure for the year, whether it is statutory or whether it is voted ? All the hon. gentleman's own Estimates, when he was Minister of Finance, presented a fair statement of everything that was to be expended and everything that was provided for by statute, and they covered the whole expenditures for the year. That is all we ask now. It should be in the main Estimates, or, if it has been omitted by oversight, it should be corrected by being in the supplementaries. Hon. gentlemen opposite admitted that, to make a fair comparison, there must be this $400,000 added.

Mr. WALLACE. The Finance Minister said that this item has never in the past appeared in the Supplementary Estimates. I would meet that by another statement : Has the expenditure of a session of Parliament ever been omitted from the Estimates submitted to the House, until to-day ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. You must remember that we are not bound by law to do it.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I think, if it is their present intention to hold another session, it is only fair they should make provision for it, and they should put it in the Estimates, because discussions will take place throughout the country, and men will have copies of these documents for the purpose of making a comparison of the expenditures of the various years ; but they cannot make that comparison unless they have the estimated expense of the coming session of Parliament, so as to make a fair comparison with the past years.

Mr. FOSTER. What is absolutely to be spent, as the hon. gentleman knows, is this: The Senate indemnity of $81,000, and the mileage of $11,900, making $92,900. The House of Commons indemnity, $213,000, with the mileage, $20,000 ; making $233,000 for the House of Commons, or a total of

$325,000 authorized by statute, which has never yet been out of an estimate given by any Finance Minister to this House, and which must absolutely be spent in this current year, if we have a session of Parliament, as we shall have. Outside of that, is the "Hansard," $40,000, with extra accounts for pages, servants, and the like of that. Altogeher, the expenditure is sure to be $400,000 or more. All we ask is that that should be put down in the Estimates. If an actuary, or the responsible financial man of a trust company, or a building society, or any concern that was putting a prospectus before the country, purporting to be a true statement of the condition and prospects of that company, deliberately concealed, by oversight or otherwise, the fact that during the next year, whereas they had estimated for an expenditure of only so much, there was to be $400,000 that they could not escape, what would the people of the country, what would the press of the country, say with reference to a statement like that? They would say it was a trick, or that it was an inexcusable piece of stupidity. We are not allowed by parliamentary language to say that on the floor of this House, but the analogy, to my mind, is perfect.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The fact of the matter is this. We are not bound by law to meet till within twelve months.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you not going to?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not mean to say we are not. There is time enough to make these additions, when we find what is required. If you want the strict letter of the law, that is the strict letter. We are holding now the session for this year. It is quite true that, in all human probability, we will hold, as we have declared we will hold, and it is our intention to hold, a further session of Parliament, and that further expense will be required. Now, the hon. gentleman has no business whatever to say that there is any concealment in the matter. The whole thing is properly set out in these main Estimates. And it was not my hon. friend's duty to assume that there would be two distinct sessions of Parliament, it was not his business, and there was no legal ground or obligation why this extra sum should be stated. I do not think the proper place to put it is in the Supplementary Estimates, and I doubt whether, at this stage, we have any authority to do so, that is, by parliamentary practice. I am not prepared to offer, off-hand, a positive opinion upon it, but my impression is that we have not got power at this moment to do what the hon. gentleman asks.

Mr. DAVIN. It is a most extraordinary thing to hear now from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that we may not have a session for twelve months.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I spoke of what the law was, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we leave this item, I would like to make a request to the Speaker and to the Minister of Public Works. Since we have become so awfully good here, and everybody knows we have abandoned entirely the lower parts of this building, that we are to have no more restaurant and no more bar-room, we shall hereafter have these rooms downstairs for other purposes. They are very commodious, and might be fixed up by the Minister of Public Works for the use of the employees of this House, so that we poor Commoners, having nothing but these small desks to work on, might have the rooms now occupied by the employees of the House. Every hon. gentleman knows how difficult it is to do any work on these desks; it is simply impossible to do work, unless we go to our hotels. I would suggest to the Minister of Public Works that the rooms downstairs heretofore occupied as a restaurant and bar, might be fitted up into rooms for the use of the employees of the House who now occupy a great many rooms in the lobbies, and which would be very good places for the members of this House, in which they could do their necessary work.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce answered himself, when he tried to excuse the Govenrment by saying there was no certainty there would be two sessions within the twelve months, that is, in the fiscal year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I said there was no legal reason.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend afterwards showed that they have no ground for leaving this out, and he instanced their own statements that there was to be a session early in the winter.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Quite true.

Mr. OSLER. Personally, I think that all expenditures for the year should be squarely provided in the Estimates, as a matter of course. I am not at all, however, objecting that the Government should leave out of their Estimates the expenditure for the coming session. I believe they will be their own executors for a year or two, and I think the less they put in the Estimates this year, the more difficulty they will have in contrasting their future expenditures with the past.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman has raised a strong point. In defence of their own reputation for economy, they ought to accede to the request of the ex-Finance Minister and the leader of the Opposition. Take this comparison. Hon. gentlemen have always held that the Government in power should hold them-

selves to the expenditure within their own Estimates made to Parliament. Now, next year the people of the country who do not look into the fine details of this matter, will see that you only estimated for so much to be spent, and that it has taken you four or five hundred thousand dollars more than you estimated. I believe it to be in the interests of the Government that they should adopt the suggestion from this side of the House.

Library of Parliament—To pay for two sessional messengers $250

Mr. GILLIES. Have there been two additional messengers appointed in the library, or are these two appointed to fill the place of two messengers who have been dismissed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I understand these two men were loaned by the Interior Department to the library of Parliament.

Mr. GILLIES. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not think there has been any increase, but I have not sufficient information to answer the question as to the number of messengers employed in the library. I am informed that the number is not larger than usual.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman cannot say whether any messengers have been dismissed from the library to make room for these two?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have heard of no such case, but I will ascertain for the hon. gentleman.

To promote the establishment and maintenance of creameries in the North-west Territories $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the principle upon which this money is to be distributed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I stated to the House some time ago that I proposed to aid the establishment of creameries in the North-west Territories. My idea is that instead of adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), we should proceed as follows: There are to-day in the North-west Territories a large number of creameries which are in financial difficulties, and in some districts there are no creameries. I desire to make an arrangement with such creameries to carry them on by means of the Government Dairy Commissioner, so that the patrons may be protected from any danger of seizure of their products, which has been the case in some instances last season. I also propose, where there are no creameries now, to make a proposal to the people of the neighbourhood that they shall provide the necessary building, the Government providing the machinery and carrying on the business for a few years. The arrangement in that respect will be the same as prevailed formerly in the North-west Territories and in Prince Edward Island. In addition to that, we propose to charge an extra cent per pound on all the butter that is produced in these creameries, which will go to a sinking fund to pay the capital account. At the end of that time, those who have contributed this cent a pound will own the creamery.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the same principle as was adopted by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not quite. The late Government proposed to establish eight creameries, but I expect under this vote to establish fifteen creameries, and six or seven skimming stations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, but the principle is the same.

Mr. DAVIN. I am exceedingly glad to hear the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, because it is very gratifying to me to find that the proposal I made here a few years ago has now fructified.

Two months' gratuity to Mrs. W. McNaughton Jones, widow of the late Dr. W. McNaughton Jones, General Superintendent of Quarantine in British Columbia (salary, $2,500)..... $416 66

Mr. FOSTER. These gratuities can be given only on the stated conditions in connection with the Superannuation Act, and the attempt to vote this is to get rid of the exactions of the law. Occasionally that has been done, but we ought to have very strong reasons for doing it, because otherwise we are undermining the law. This, of course, may be a case which is perfectly proper.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This case is one of the exceptions to which the late Finance Minister referred. If I am not mistaken, we had arranged to ask for this vote before I left the department, because the circumstances are exceedingly sad, and I thought it was a case in which we might well step outside the exact letter of the law to deal in that small way fairly generously to the widow of a gentleman who had been a splendid officer, and who was left in very straitened circumstances.

Cattle Quarantine $3,000

Mr. DAVIN. Would the Minister say whether he has inquired in regard to the cattle that were reported to me to be crowding across the border south of Park Beg.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I have informed the Commissioner of Mounted Police of the facts, and asked him to deal with the case in the usual manner. The explanation of this vote is as follows: there has been an arrangement in the department sanctioned by Order in Council that hogs slaughtered in consequence of the infection of hog cholera should be paid for

on certain conditions, and under certain rates. The item in the original Estimates was only $1,500 for the financial year. We have in my department at present bills to the extent of $3,401.96 which would require to be paid now. The committee can therefore see that the $1,500 originally voted would not cover this amount. I have asked for this additional vote of $3,000, and I must frankly say that if the hog cholera continues at anything like the rate it did last summer, even this vote will not meet the demands for the current year.

Towards providing for cold storage and carriage of Canadian perishable food products, and to secure recognition of the quality of such products in the markets of Great Britain in an undeteriorated condition $20,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I may say that this amount is what I expect to require between this and the 1st of July next. In the main Estimates there is a vote of $20,000, some of which will be required in the course of the ensuing session, but most of which will be used in the work during the present season of navigation, as I explained when that vote went through. The country has been demanding facilities for the placing of our perishable food products on the English market in an undeteriorated condition. The hon. Premier and the members of the Government have declared that they are prepared to try and provide facilities sufficient to meet the demands of the trade now existing, and its probable development within the next few years. Representations have been made to the Government, and representations were made to the House a short time ago by the Committee on Agriculture, in favour of these facilities being given to our farmers. Our butter has, unhappily, acquired an unfavourable reputation in the old land, which we believe is entirely due to the deterioration which occurs in the course of its passage from the maker to the consumer. Under these circumstances, the farmers of the country have asked the Government to take steps to see that the proper facilities for preventing that deterioration are provided; and, personally, as representing, to a certain extent, that great interest in the country, I feel very keenly that this is a justifiable demand. The necessities of the case demand a very considerable outlay. To accomplish the result, it is necessary that there should be a continuous and unbroken chain of cold storage from the point of production to the consuming market. This would necessitate, probably, the establishment of storage warehouses, in which the perishable products could be put for a short time until ready for shipment; and arrangements with the railroads for carrying them in cold storage to the places of Atlantic shipment; possibly, arrangements for cold storage warehouses to receive them while awaiting shipment across the ocean; and arrangements for the necessary appliances in the ships for keeping these products in a cold temperature while crossing the Atlantic. It is easy to see that a very complete system requires to be established; and the Government believe it to be their duty to contribute to this system to such an extent as will enable those who can provide this deficiency in our commerce to tide over the first few years of difficulty, because, possibly, the trade of the first year or two may not pay a fair return on the capital necessary to be invested to provide these appliances. I want to point out, to justify this contribution, that to provide a vessel with a fair amount of cold storage accommodation would necessitate the investment of from $12,000 to $15,000 of capital, that is, for mechanical cold storage. For what is called insulated cold storage, where no mechanism is required, except such walls as the heat will not penetrate, and sufficient ice to keep the chambers at a low temperature, the necessary capital expenditure would range from $2,000 to $3,000. In view of this heavy investment of capital required, it seems right that the Government should contribute a certain amount for a short term of years, to induce steamship owners to make this investment. I may say that last year Professor Robertson, in his capacity of dairy commissioner, attempted to provide such accommodation on one line of steamers sailing from Montreal to Avonmouth, near Bristol, and that he found difficulty in obtaining such accommodation in consequence of the heavy initial investment necessary, and the uncertainty whether the trade would justify it and yield a fair return upon the investment. That arrangement was not carried out, in consequence of the contractors who were to supply the cold storage appliances, failing to supply them. So that we have not yet had any experience of mechanical cold storage. But, in place of the mechanical cold storage asked for at that time, we have had this season an insulated cold storage, which has been so largely availed of by the exporting trade, that in August last a request was made that the space should be doubled. Since that time, this whole double amount of space has been utilized by the exporters of perishable food products; showing that the demand for this accommodation is growing, and that the accommodation supplied has been really in the interest of the traffic. I may say that between now and the coming winter, some arrangements will have to be made by the Government with certain steamship companies, and also, possibly, with those who will put up cold storage warehouses at certain necessary points in the country, by contracts extending over a term of years, which we propose to make by Order in Council, subject to ratification at the ensuing session of Parliament. My expectation is that I shall not require to make any payments on such contracts dur-

ing the present fiscal year, but that by this means I shall be able to provide satisfactory and sufficient accommodation on various steamship lines to carry the likely trade of next season to certain ports in Great Britain. I may say that those ports which are most likely to be utilized for this purpose in consequence of their being the best markets and the most suitable to our perishable products, are the ports of Avonmouth near Bristol, Liverpool, Glasgow and London, and I propose to make arrangements by which vessels will leave Montreal and St. Johns and Halifax in the summer and the two latter ports in the winter, to carry these products to the old land. I may say that this summer Professor Robertson made arrangements with the railway companies by which they are to supply refrigerator cars on certain of their lines to the main centres of shipment. The payments in this matter have been very small this year, amounting to about $1,500, and perhaps two or three thousand dollars would cover the expenditure for this year. During the ensuing season, I expect to much enlarge that service, so that all parts of the country which can fairly ask for it in consequence of their producing these products, will be supplied the necessary accommodation to enable these products to be taken to the points of shipment, where they will be put into cold storage vessels, without the risk of being heated to any extent. In the proposition I have before me, I find that it is very necessary to provide with the creameries sufficient cold storage. For that purpose, I propose to give a small bonus to any creamery which will provide such cold storage accommodation as would meet the views of the Dairy Commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. All creameries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All creameries that would take advantage of it. There are to-day about 400 creameries working in Canada, and I expect that next season about one-half of them will take advantage of this offer, and I would be very glad if they all would. The necessary expenditure likely to be incurred by creamery owners would vary from $200 to $400 each to provide the necessary accommodation.

Mr. WALLACE. What are the conditions?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Simply that the accommodation should be sufficiently ice-cold, that is to say that the building should be properly built, such as ordinary cold storage buildings are. There are a great many creameries which have poor accommodation, which are improperly built and not properly fitted for the purposes of cold storage, but I would require that the creameries which get the grant should furnish really effective accommodation by putting up buildings with such walls and ice in them as would keep the temperature at a sufficiently low point to prevent the butter becoming deteriorated. This would require an expenditure on the part of each creamery of from $200 to $400, according to the condition of the creamery, and what work would have to be done to put it in proper order. I propose to give to any creamery which will adopt this cold storage, $50 the coming season, $25 the following season, and $25 the third season, or in all $100, provided Parliament votes the necessary amount. My object in spreading the bonus over the three years is to secure a proper maintenance of the system and incite the creamery owners to take full advantage of the grant, and also because I expect that the first year some will shrink from the undertaking. In the succeeding years, however, I hope that they will all get the bonus. I would like to give a figure with regard to some sales, made within the last two weeks, of creamery butter from the North-west Territories, from creameries run under the control of the Dairy Commissioner. There are two creameries under his control, one of which is supplied with efficient cold storage accommodation and the other is not. There were sales made in the same week in England of the butter from these creameries, and the article from the one provided with cold storage netted two cents a pound more than the product of the one that had not cold storage. This is a specimen of what I consider would be the results of getting the accommodation to which I have referred in all the creameries of the country. At the same time, I fear that these creameries will hardly be able to give the accommodation unless they get some slight assistance, and it is justifiable that they should, in view of the fact that we are to-day making the greatest effort to improve the reputation of our butter in the English market. I have pretty complete figures in regard to this proposition, but the outline I have given is, I think, sufficient to explain what I want to do.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not mentioned the interior warehouses.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not yet undertaking positively to provide for them. I think it is absolutely necessary that we should have warehouses at the great centres, especially at the shipping ports. If we have an abundant car service from centres of production to those shipping ports, I am not certain to what extent warehouses in the interior will be required. It may be that the trade will find it most convenient to send its products from the points of production, as rapidly as possible, to these great shipping centres. We know, as a matter of fact, that a few merchants in the great shipping centres buy nearly all our dairy products and hold them until they find it convenient to ship them to the old land. That is the present course, and I am not in a position to say whether it is the best

course or not, but if it is continued, it will not be necessary to provide cold storage warehouses in a great many of the different sections of the country. If we should decide to have storage warehouses in the interior, it would be necessary perhaps to provide some assistance, by means of a direct bonus to the warehouses, or by guaranteeing the interest on a part of the whole of the investments for a number of years, during which the expenses will be heavy on them and the warehouses themselves would not perhaps be utilized to such an extent as to give a return on the investment. I think, however, it will be necessary to secure, by one means or another, at once, this coming season, the establishment of cold storage warehouses at the points of shipment where the products are put in the ocean vessels. That I am satisfied of, and I also wish to ensure the establishment of these small cold storage accommodations at the creameries. Of this $20,000 I am asking for, about $10,000 will go to that this coming winter.

Mr. FOSTER. Providing 200 took it up ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In saying that, I am only taking half the creameries in the country. I expect before the 1st of July next to have under the arrangement I propose to make with the railway companies, to spend two or three thousand dollars. I expect that $10,000 will be required for the cold storage in the creameries. And, in addition we will have to do considerable work in connection with the advancement of this system in the English market and thus endeavour to do something to overcome the prejudice against our perishable food products which exists there in consequence of the fact that those products have been arriving in bad condition. I know that this may require a good deal of work, and a good deal of—I do not think "advertising" is exactly the word—but a good deal of propagandism ; and it may even involve some slight assistance to parties who may wish to send trial shipments of various kinds of products. I do not strongly favour that idea ; at the same time, it is quite possible it may be necessary in order to encourage trade immediately. Especially is this the case with eggs. At present our egg trade with England is comparatively limited. We send large quantities of eggs to Boston and other American markets. My information leads me to believe that eggs sent to England and arriving there in undeteriorated condition would be very profitable to the exporter, and therefore it would be a trade to which it would be desirable to afford facilities as soon as possible—as soon as the cold storage is provided. There is, no doubt, a splendid market in England for our dressed poultry also. This is one of the things in which the ordinary prices there and here differ most. The margin between the English price and ours seems greater than in anything else we are likely to send to the British market, and I think it is very advisable that our people should be encouraged, and perhaps aided not only by cold storage, but by arrangements made by trial shipments, to make an effort to send dressed poultry to the English market. I also ask a certain amount in this estimate for investigation. But before I proceed to other points, I may say that perhaps $1,000 will probably be used before 1st July next in assisting or, perhaps, in some instances, paying the necessary cost of the cold storage to stimulate the proper collection of the eggs and placing of them on the English market in a fresh condition. I think I have thus explained pretty well why I ask this amount of $20,000. But I want to state emphatically and clearly that the completion of the project to secure the future success of this cold storage business, will involve contracts of a nature which I trust will be satisfactory, in connection with the steamship companies, and possibly in connection with warehouses in this country, which will extend over a short term of years. From my information at this time, I think the term will be from three to five years. I do not wish it to extend over a long period ; at the same time I think it will be necessary, in order to establish the business on a firm foundation, to give some such guarantee as that to which I allude. The amount which will be asked in order to carry out these contracts must vary somewhat according to the nature of the contracts. Propositions have been made involving an annual expenditure for a term of five years ; other propositions, especially relating to the steamships, have been made under which the greater portion of the amount would have to be advanced the first year. The reason is that in their case so great a preliminary investment might have to be made that special advantages would have to be offered to induce them to undertake it. For my own part, I favour a proportionate sum extending over five years, so that we would not only assure the establishment but also assure the proper carrying on of the service for five years. It may be that it would require four or five years before this service will be so thoroughly established that it would run without assistance. I think, however, as a matter of fact, that less than that time would be necessary to put it on a firm basis. If the expectations of the development of the trade which to-day exist in the minds of the farmers and shippers of the country are at all justified, this trade, in three years, will be in a position to carry itself without Government assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. I must congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) on the clear and business-like statement he has made and also on the general outline of his plan, with

which, from my limited knowledge, I thoroughly agree. I do not propose to discuss the whole question, but there are two things I wish to say. First, as to the point touched in the concluding remarks of my hon. friend. If I were he, I would go very slow on long-term contracts with warehouses in this country, and somewhat so with reference to long-term contracts with steamship companies. The hon. gentleman himself mentioned excellent reasons for that. It is not only an advisable thing for the farmers of this country to take advantage of the cold storage system, but it seems to me an absolute necessity. The farmers themselves are aware of that. What becomes an absolute necessity, from the farmer's standpoint, becomes so from the buyer's or shipper's standpoint. So that when the hon. gentleman is stimulating these two interests, as he will by that part of his scheme, he is really building up a portion of the work which, if it ought not to be taken up at first, certainly ought to be carried on after a very short period by private capital and enterprise. A three years' contract is what I would strongly urge him to have. With reference to the contracts he proposes to enter into without a previous appropriation of the necessary money by Parliament, I would rather, for my part, that he should ask the House for the money. This House will not refuse to vote a pretty large sum for the stimulation of this extension of the business of the farmers in these trying times. We only want to know that the basis and the plan are sound; and I would rather he should bring the estimates before us than to intimate that he would enter into contracts without having the money appropriated. If he makes contracts for a short time, he will probably find that the vote is sufficient to enable him to carry on the work until Parliament meets again. In some cases, of course, it may be advisable for the Ministers to assume the responsibility of making contracts without having the money appropriated by Parliament; but, as a rule, to decide in advance that contracts are to be entered into without Parliament having been consulted is hardly the best way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I desire to explain that it is not because I wish to give myself a freer hand that I take this course. I hope to be able to do without contracts; I hope to be able to accomplish what we have in view without binding ourselves. But I did not want to ask Parliament for a grant of money when I could not explain exactly how I was going to use it. So far as the contracts are concerned, I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that I will make them as short and as little onerous to the country as possible. To tell the truth, I feared that if I put a large sum in the Estimates, our friends with whom we want to make the contracts would take precious good care to find a means of enabling us to spend the money.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on the consideration he has given to this matter in bringing down an additional amount to provide for cold storage, and extending it to other articles than those provided for in the main Estimates. In the main Estimates it will be remembered there was a grant of $20,000 in aid of cold storage for creamery butter and cheese alone. I felt that it would be unfair to the dairy butter makers and to those who could produce other articles, to limit cold storage to these two items, and for that reason I placed upon the Order paper this motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, provision should be made for storage and transportation—in cold storage—of all dairy products, fresh meats, fruit, eggs and other perishable goods to the markets when sold.

I am glad that, on reconsideration of this matter, the hon. gentleman has covered this motion by bringing down a further amount for that object. I also agree with the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that the amount, if anything, is rather small. I am quite certain that hon. gentlemen in Opposition would be willing to expend a greater amount than $20,000. It is a very important matter for the farmers of this country that provision should be made of the kind which has been so well explained by the Minister of Agriculture, for delivering in good condition in England, the perishable products which can be produced on Canadian farms. When we take into consideration that the English people require from outside countries, $115,000,000 worth of fresh meat, and that there is no provision for delivering fresh meat in safe condition in England, and that our cattle are scheduled and must be killed as soon as they arrive on the other side, it becomes a matter of serious moment to the farmers of Canada that they should have some means of disposing of their cattle to better advantage. In the first place, if we have cold storage provided for delivering meat in fresh condition in England, it will not cost nearly as much for freight, as for live animals, and it can be safely held until sold. When we send cattle to England they have to be slaughtered on arrival, and have to be sold at once, or the meat will spoil. This is an important matter, and I regret the amount has not been made larger. I find that for meats, butter, cheese, eggs, fruit and poultry, England pays $273,000,000 in cash yearly to outside countries. What we want is to be placed in a position to compete with other nations, and to that end provision should be made whereby we may deliver these products in good condition on the English market. There is another matter, and I think I know something of the feeling of the Minister of Agriculture in respect to it, although it has not been

mentioned yet, and that is the article of margarine. It might be well for the Minister of Agriculture to consider that article as a matter of export, although its use is prohibited in Canada. But margarine might be profitably produced in this country, and exported to England. I think that the way to overcome the prejudices of the English people in respect to these perishable products, is to deliver them in England in good condition. I am quite sure we can capture in that way the Englishman's palate, as well as the Englishman's purse.

Militia—Royal Military College—To provide for two months' pay, $527.22, and travelling expenses to place of abode, of Major General D. R. Cameron, C.M.G., late Commandant of the Royal Military College, Kingston $1,600

Mr. BRITTON. In connection with this item, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to a case which is deserving of his consideration. On the 11th of February last, a pair of horses belonging to "A" Battery were attacked by dogs and ran away. In doing so they ran against a carter's horse and killed it. The horse was all the man had; the dogs were all that the other man had, and the dogs were the real cause of the accident. This man presented a claim to the late Government. His names is James Keenan. The Government submitted the question to the Minister of Justice, and he considered that there was no liability on the part of the Government. Now, I do not dispute the opinion of the Minister of Justice. I suppose there is no doubt about it. If there was what the law calls scienter on the part of the owner of the dogs, I suppose he would be liable for this man's horse. If you value the dogs at $10 each, that would show that the owner of the dogs was worth $20. He had nothing else, but the claim is a small matter for this Government to pay, and I think they might pay it when I see that they are allowing compensations to this woman, Mrs. Burns, in the preceding item, for the loss of her husband, as a compassionate allowance. If the department are going to make such allowances as we see in the case of Mrs. Burns and another case provided for in item 42 in these supplementaries, I think the Minister of Militia ought to allow pay for this man's horse. The claim has been established to the satisfaction of the late Minister of Justice. He was not adverse to paying the claim, but there is a question of legal liability. I submit if the Government are making these compassionate allowances, a small sum ought to be paid to this man who is sadly in need of the money.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr Borden). My hon. friend has stated that my predecessor was favourable to paying this man for his horse, but I think there is no record that the late Minister of Militia was of that opinion. In fact the record, so far as I remember, is that he could not see his way clear to allowing a claim of this kind, because it was no fault of the Government. The fact is the Government suffered by the fact that the horses belonging to the battery were frightened by these dogs, and as a consequence this other man lost his horse. If the Government begin by paying claims of that kind, it is difficult to tell where it will end. I do not think there is any analogy between the case of Mrs. Burns and the case my hon. friend mentions. In the case of Mrs. Burns, her husband had lost his life in the service of the country, and it is claimed that it is only right that this woman, who is left in extreme poverty, should receive a slight compassionate allowance. I cannot see any analogy between the two cases. However, I will say to my hon. friend that I never had the case before me, and have not gone fully into it. I have looked over the matter casually, and I will promise him that I will take the case up, and examine it thoroughly.

For a loading platform and siding at St. Francois Station $350

Mr. HAGGART. Why charge a small sum like this to capital account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There are a number of similar works in the preceding Estimates which are charged to capital account, because there are so many of them. They are in a sense just as much a part of the original construction as any portion of the road that has been built.

Welland Canal, differences in value of land exchanged with the Grand Trunk Railway $2,226

Mr. HAGGART. Is this part of an agreement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). This exchange took place under Order in Council made as long ago as 1884. It has been kept open until the present time. Since I came to the department the deeds in accordance with the Order in Council have been delivered to us, but they had not prior to this date been finally executed. Competent persons were sent to the locality to determine the value of the land on each side, and the difference between the value of the land which we had exchanged for theirs, amouted to $2,226 against us.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman certain that an agreement of that kind was made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not seen the Order in Council, but I do not entertain the slightest doubt about it. There is a bundle of papers sufficiently voluminous to take five or six hours to read, but the Order unquestionably passed as I am informed.

Halifax Dominion Buildings $1,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the Minister had time to look into the subject I mentioned in connection with the Intercolonial Railway terminal facilities at Pictou? I mentioned some time ago, in reference to the item of $5,000 in the main Estimates, that I was led to believe by the late Minister that a further sum would be put in the Estimates to provide for the improvements that has been recommended by the officers of the department. I asked the present Minister if he would inquire into it, and see whether it would not be in the interest of the service to bring down a supplementary estimate to do the work at that point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I do recollect the hon. gentleman having called this matter to my attention, but I did not understand him to express a wish that it should be dealt with in the Supplementary Estimates this session. I have not had time to pursue the inquiry to which he directed my attention.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will take time before next session, and see what is necessary.

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

After Recess

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Ottawa Post Office—Asphalting esplanade in front of building $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether he has considered the advisability of putting asphalt there, or granolithic, and the relative cost of the two.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It will be asphalt. My information is that asphalt will last a great deal longer, there being a great deal of traffic at that point. The cost of asphalt is about $3.50 per square yard, while that of granolithic is from $1.25 to $1.50. I am informed that asphalt will last about three times as long as granolithic. My officers tell me that it is guaranteed for fifteen years.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been stated to me that granolithic pavement is guaranteed for fifteen years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that granolithic cannot be guaranteed where there is a great deal of traffic. Of course, I am not a specialist.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia $16,300

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). There is an appropriation for Nova Scotia which I would have liked to see here, that I do not see. I thought I had impressed the hon. Minister of Public Works with the importance of a certain public work in Inverness county—that is, a wharf at a port called Whycocomagh. I regret indeed that I appear to have failed to impress the hon. Minister with the importance of this work. I would ask him whether it is his intention, in the near future, to see to this very important and necessary public work being protected.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has strongly pressed upon me the great importance of the work to which he refers. I am very sorry indeed that the Government have not been in a position to appropriate for the work an amount, which we will certainly give in the near future.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Do I understand the Minister to say that there will be a vote for this work at the next session of Parliament?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I must take some of the blame for the omission of that item. I can testify that my hon. friend urged it very strongly, in the interest of the people of Whycocomagh, and my own desire was that his wish should be complied with. But, owing to a misunderstanding, it was not included in the list, which I certainly regret. It is a mistake that ought to be corrected next session, and my full expectation is that the hon. Minister of Public Works will place that item in the Estimates next session, and I will endeavour to persuade him, as well as I can, to do so.

Harbours and Rivers, New Brunswick.. $2,500

Mr. McALISTER. I regret that there is no provision made in these Supplementary Estimates for the wharf at Campbellton. I find, as I said the other evening, that other places of less importance have received grants, while this place, which is one of greater importance, is entirely omitted, though it is of urgent necessity that a wharf should be placed there. The public wharf is of no practical value to the town because its only connection with the shore is over a private property, and the owner may stop the people from passing over it at any time. Besides those who want to use it for shipments will have to pay tolls to the owner of this wharf for the privilege of passing over it. This not only adds to the cost but to the inconvenience of shippers as well, and I had hoped that the Minister of Public Works would have provided in the Supplementary Estimates for this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I have not had time to look into this question which was brought to my notice, but to have a general vote of $10,000, and if there are immediate repairs required they could be met out of that vote.

Mr. McALISTER. Repairs would be of no use until the work became the property of the Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not ready to buy the wharf, and as it has been in its present condition for a long time past, I think it may remain so for some time yet.

Mr. McALISTER. A grant of $8,000 was recommended by the late Minister of Public Works to purchase and put this property in repair.

Prince Edward Island—Belfast—Dredge repairs to pier..... $500

Mr. MARTIN. That is a small sum. Where is that pier ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is near Halliday's Wharf, where the steamer touches.

Mr. MARTIN. I am sorry indeed that the Minister of Public Works has not thought proper to make the expenditure on Bell River and the other works which I mentioned a few nights ago. It is very necessary that these expenditures should be made without delay. I see that the hon. gentleman has rewarded the province of Nova Scotia very well by giving it an item in the further or second Supplementary Estimates of $16,000, while the province I have the honour to represent is offered only the small sum of $1,000. The hon. Minister must have taken his cue from his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who told us last evening that he would not advise the Minister of Public Works to spend money indiscriminately in Prince Edward Island, and I presume his advice is being followed out. I hope that the Minister of Public Works, if he has decided not to make the expenditure I recommended this year, will promise that he will do something next session. Otherwise only one conclusion can be arrived at, and that is that there is a disposition on the part of this Government, at the very outset, to discriminate against certain sections of the province from which I come.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Bell River is not our property, and I am not inclined to spend money on property which is not ours.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not then see why the Government engineers were sent down to make surveys. I believe the Government have just as much authority to spend money on these piers as on provincial exhibitions in different parts of the Dominion. I may point out that money has been expended in different parts of the Dominion on works which were never assumed by the Dominion Government. I am not bringing this question before the House for the first time. I believe that the Minister of Marine, or if not the present Minister, his late colleague, brought this very important work to the notice of the present Government. I know that some years ago this work was pressed on the attention of the late Government, and that it had the support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What change has come over the spirit of his dream I do not know, but certainly this work is very necessary to the shipping interests of that place, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will give his promise that next year some money will be spent on it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I desire to please my hon. friend, but I think it would be going a little too far to spend money on property that is not our own. The hon. gentleman says that the surveys have been ordered. I know that, during the last election, Senator Ferguson ordered surveys. But it seems to me that these surveys should not be in vogue in this Parliament. They are simply election surveys.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman says surveys were ordered during the last election campaign. I can tell the hon. gentleman and the House that surveys were not held or ordered during the election campaign, or for election purposes. The surveys were made, I think, about two years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Examinations or surveys—we will not quarrel about the word.

Mr. MARTIN. Surely they were not election surveys, when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) told me, the other day, that he would order the engineers down there. We were discussing public matters, and I do not suppose I am unfairly revealing any secrets, when I say this. He said he would press this matter upon the Minister of Public Works. But, strange to say, last evening he turned around and said he would not like to press an expenditure like the one I propose. There is something that requires explanation, and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can explain the change. How can he now condemn an expenditure which a few days ago he said he was pressing for?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is most unjust. I do not think the House will justify a rediscussion of a matter which was discussed only a few days ago. I told the hon. gentleman that, as $10,000 had been spent on the Wood Island breakwater, a few miles away, and it had not yet been decided whether the work would give us a good harbour or not, we could scarcely expect the Government to vote money now for a harbour so near. When the hon. gentleman spoke to me privately, I said that I would speak to the Minister of Public Works about it, and urge it upon him. But, surely the hon. gentleman did not suppose I was going to do that this session, with the Supplementary Estimates already down. The hon. gentleman talks about injustice to the Is-

land. In the main Estimates are items aggregating $46,000 for Prince Edward Island, and only $41,000 for the large province of New Brunswick, alongside. Does that look as if we were being discriminated against? These two sums are given to the hon. gentleman in his county, and I have not a dollar in my own county at all.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the sums spent upon the breakwater near this harbour. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that expenditure will be comparatively useless until this harbour is dredged out, that great difficulties must be overcome before this can be made a good harbour for vessels of any size. He knows, also, that with a very small expenditure the harbour of Bell River could be made a good harbour. But, for some reason, he puts his foot down, and I suppose we are not to have the money.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I regret that there are no estimates for the repair of Campbell's Cove breakwater. For many reasons it would be well to have this work done this season. There is a large population depending upon the precarious business of fishing, which has been almost a total failure this year. This expenditure would have been a great benefit to the people during the winter. Again, the work could have been done more cheaply during the winter than at any other season. I trust that the hon. Minister will give this his attention, and that on another occasion he will be ready to propose this expenditure, since he has not been able to provide for it now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) is too hard upon me. If I remember well, I have proposed expenditure of $36,000 in his county. And yet he is not pleased. I am caught between two fires. The ex-Minister of Finance declares we are spending too much, but every hon. gentleman behind him says we do not spend enough. If hon. gentlemen want the money spent, let them give me the money.

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—Rivière du Sud—Protection works $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a work near the railway—a necessary work.

Mr. FOSTER. What county is it in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Montmagny.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that it is a protection work on the Rivière du Sud. What is the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to protect the road alongside the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman going into the business of protecting roads for the municipalities?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend forgets what he himself has done. This work was begun by the late Government, and I am simply going on with it.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be all right, but we want to know the reason. Is it contended that the road is endangered by the building of the bridge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. WALLACE. This is a most extraordinary expenditure, and we ought to have some further explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the repair of the protection wharf built in 1885 alongside the Intercolonial Railway, Montmagny. The wharf was built to prevent the erosion of the banks of the river and restore the road. It was held that the building of the pier of the Intercolonial Railway was the cause of the destruction of the road. The work was begun by the late Administration, and I am following in their footsteps.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Government should have given some solid reasons for an expenditure of this kind. The explanations the Minister has made are no justification at all. It is simply that a public roadway requires protection, and the Government of Canada are stepping in to assist the municipality.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that he has made a personal examination of the works, and that the destruction of the road was caused by the building of a pier for the Intercolonial Railway. Personally I do not know much about it, and I do not know why the work was begun by my department.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister might discontinue the work until he finds out whether they are justified in going on with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of my officers has convinced me that the work ought to be done.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman say the work was commenced by the late Government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I think there is a report in the department over which I presided, saying that the railway was not at all liable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed there was a special warrant to provide for the cost of the work, a Governor General's warrant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to allow me to go back for a moment, as I was not in the House when Nova Scotia matters were being passed. I want to ask him if his attention has been drawn to the Cow Bay breakwater, in the county of Cape Breton. The Cow Bay breakwater, as my hon. friend will find in looking into his department, is a work upon which a large sum of public money has been expended; and the late Government were prepared, if they had been able to pass their estimates, to grant a sum of money for the repair of that work. A very severe storm occurred, and did great damage to that breakwater, and I am afraid that if some means are not taken to protect the work, a very large loss of public money will ensue. I would like the hon. gentleman to look into that matter with a view to ascertaining whether it is not a case of pressing necessity, requiring a prompt expenditure in order to prevent a serious public loss.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will certainly look into this work during the recess.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Will this sum of $4,000 for Rivière du Sud complete the works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this amount will cover the whole expenditure, although I cannot say positively.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend knows the work as well as I do, from having gone over that section on the Intercolonial Railway. I am not prepared to attack this vote of $4,000, though I supposed that, coming from a Government who is going to repair the errors of the previous one, it is somewhat of a poor excuse to say that this work is carried on because it was begun under the late Government. I would like to ask my hon. friend, knowing the work as he does and as I do, whether he does not think that $4,000 will be more than sufficient to satisfy the wants of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that the pier has been under discussion for years and years. The same question has come before Parliament on more than one occasion; and the hon. gentleman knows that it is a moot question whether the building of the pier he refers to, interferes at all with the road. No doubt this work will be very useful to the municipality, but I hardly think it can claim to have the support of the Federal Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I said, I am not in a position to state whether that amount will be sufficient, but I hope it will be. As to undertaking to repair all the errors of the previous Government, I am afraid the contract will be too heavy for me to undertake.

Mr. WALLACE. I am still at a loss to understand why this work was undertaken, and why it is continued. The Minister of Public Works stated it had been begun in 1895. Well, I have the Estimates for 1894-95, and there is no provision in them for any such expenditure. I have also the Estimates for 1895-96, and there is no item there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained that the work was done under a special Governor General's warrant, and of course he will not find it in the Estimates. My officers inform me it was done under Governor General's warrant obtained in 1895, and the work has been paid for.

Mr. WALLACE. If so, that warrant must have been laid on the Table of the House at the beginning of the succeeding session, and I see no record of it. The late Minister of Railways has informed the House that this matter was brought before his department and was investigated by their engineers, who disclaimed any responsibility on the part of the department which would justify the expenditure. I think that before the item passes, the Minister should be able to give this House a complete justification for the expenditure of this money before he asks us to sanction it. If this is allowed to go, I do not know where the expenditure of public money will stop. The Dominion Government, for the first time in its history, that I ever heard of, have undertaken to do a work which belongs to a municipality, or, at all events, one in which the local government might be interested. We may fairly ask the Minister to produce the evidence to the House which would justify our expending money to make a local road through a municipality. The evidence of the late Minister of Railways is contrary to the assumption that the Government are in any way responsible to do this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) wants is evidence that this work was undertaken by the late Government.

Mr. WALLACE. That was only one request I made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) asks whether the work is necessary. If the present Minister of Public Works found that his predecessor had begun a work of that character; if, on inquiry from his engineers, he was assured the work had been begun and that some money was needed to complete it; and if the Minister himself had no knowledge that it was an improper expenditure; then, I think there would be ample cause to justify the Minister in asking for the appropriation. I understand that the statement of the Minister of Public Works with reference to this work having been begun on a Governor

General's warrant is questioned. It is but natural that my hon. friends opposite should question that, in view of the very strong remarks that have been made in certain places recently about Governor General's warrants. It might naturally be assumed that no warrant would be obtained by the late Government for such a purpose. I find that on the 29th October, 1894, a Governor General's warrant was obtained, in these words :

For construction of dry wall, Rivière du Sud, St. Thomas de Montmagny..... $5,000

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Finance has stated that, if the previous Government had expended certain money, and that the works were under way, that would be a good prima facie case for continuing the expenditure. These conditions are exactly applicable to the Trent Valley Canal, and yet the present Government has not considered that they were bound to expend more money, but they rather wish to take time to consider it. I am not finding fault with that, but I believe that the same rule applied to the Trent Valley Canal should be applied to this work, which, apparently, has not a particle of justification for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that, because a work had been undertaken by the late Government, therefore, it should be continued ; but I said that, if a work had been undertaken by the late Government, and if the Minister was advised by his engineers that it was a proper work to be completed, and the Minister had no knowledge to the contrary ; then, there would be a good prima facie case. But, if the Minister did not consider that it was a proper work and that the money was being wasted, that would be ample justification for not going on.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is the report of the officer to that effect ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) said the other night, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) should not think that this is all wrong because it comes from the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that myself. It was the language used the other evening, in my hearing, by the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron), when he said that everything that comes from the province of Quebec was not dear to my hon. friend. I know that. I have here the report of the engineer on this work, which specifies what should be done in regard to it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Might I trouble my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to say what he stated about the manner in which I viewed the amounts of money which were voted for the province of Quebec ? I did not quite hear what the Minister of Public Works said.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was saying that, while we were discussing the Three Rivers exhibition, the other night, the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) stated that his friend (Mr. Wallace) should know a little more than he does about the province of Quebec. I am just expressing the same desire.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course, the Minister knows very well that it is not allowed to refer to a past debate.

Mr. WALLACE. No such insinuation as that which the Minister of Public Works has made will deter me, at any rate, from expressing my opinion on any question that comes before the House. It is simply a piece of impertinence, Sir, in my opinion, to refer to any member of this House as being unwilling to express an independent and honest view on any subject that comes before us. The assertion by the Minister of Public Works that this work is in the province of Quebec, and, if you oppose it, you are opposing the whole province of Quebec and are unwilling to give Quebec fair-play, is an assertion that is not worthy of being made in this House. The report read by the Minister says that it is not necessary to raise this wall 2½ feet in order to keep the ice from going over the road. That does not justify it as a public work, nor does it justify the Parliament of Canada in prosecuting this work.

St. Valentine, new wharf and approach.. $5,500

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The wharf is on the Richelieu River, and St. Valentine is one of the parishes of the county of St. John and Iberville. It is greatly in need of this wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. How far from the mouth of the river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 70 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) undertaking to build all the wharfs in the province of Quebec that are on the small rivers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I am not undertaking to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. This is most certainly a precedent for doing it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows very well that this is a navigable river, and there is a great deal of traffic there, especially in shipping hay. The farmers are in great need of that wharf, and, if that county had not been represented in the past by an opponent of the late Government, that wharf would have been built long ago.

Mr. MARTIN. The Minister of Public Works takes a very different ground with regard to this wharf from what he has done with regard to the wharf I referred to a few minutes ago. All he wants now is that a river must be navigable. In the case I mentioned, a Government expenditure had been made. It appeared that there is one rule regarding Quebec, and another rule regarding the province from which I come, at least.

Harbours and Rivers, Ontario..... $3,600

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the Minister providing anything for the interprovincial bridge at Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I am not in a position to give an answer to my hon. friend. His question is one which does not come within the scope of these Estimates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a public work for the Dominion, and I understand that a promise was given of a grant for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that the question has been brought to the attention of the Government, but I am not in a position to give an answer to the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That my statement may not be misunderstood, I read from the organ of the Government in the city of Ottawa:

> The promise of the Premier as to Governmental aid to the interprovincial bridge was so emphatic and in such unmistakable language that it is perhaps superfluous even to refer to the subject.

Then the newspaper goes on:

> The public may rest assured, as we said the other day, that the work will be substantially assisted in accordance with the promise given.

But then the paper adds, in a tone not quite so confident:

> Some little anxiety and doubt has been excited in certain quarters in consequence of the Supplementary Estimates not having contained any sum for the purpose.

The matter is in the hon. gentleman's department, and I think I may fairly ask him to say whether he proposes to assist that work before Parliament is called together again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case, as I understand it, the question is whether this Government will give help to a railway corporation to build a bridge, and I say again that I do not think it comes within the scope of these Supplementary Estimates to say whether or not we are going to give $250,000 to that object. What would my hon. friends on the other side say if we were to-night to come to them and ask for a quarter of a million more?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is perfectly satisfactory. The hon. gentleman says the question has not been considered by the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think not. He said it was not considered as coming within the scope of these Estimates. He did not say the question had not been considered.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think "Hansard" to-morrow will report the Minister of Public Works as saying that the subject had not been considered by the Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I said that a sum of money to be voted for a railway corporation does not come within the scope of the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will say whether the matter has been considered by the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to answer the hon. gentleman's question. The matter has received some consideration, but it is not to be dealt with in the Estimates of the present session.

Port Stanley pier—Repairs..... $2,000

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to find this item in the Estimates. Port Stanley is a very important harbour just on the border of my constituency, though not in it; and, as the riding within which it is situated was not fortunate enough to elect a supporter of the Government at the last election, I feel bound to say a word about this item before it goes through. I spoke to the department some time ago about the necessity of having some temporary repairs made to the existing piers at Port Stanley, to prevent them being seriously damaged by the fall storms, and I am glad to see in the Estimates an amount which may accomplish that end. At the same time, I think it proper to notify the Government that the large district interested in the future of Port Stanley will expect something more permanent to be done in the near future for that important port. A good beginning has been made at Port Burwell at the other end of the county by the item of $15,000 in this year's Estimates, and something of a similar kind will possibly be asked for Port Stanley. But I thought it was sufficient to press the Government this year for a sum which would prevent damage to that very valuable and expensive public property by the storms of the coming season.

I hope that the Government, when they send engineers to decide as to the expenditure of this small sum, will instruct those engineers to look into the whole question of how the harbour of Port Stanley can be permanently improved at the least cost; for something in the line of permanent improvement must be done. This harbour has been sadly neglected for the last eighteen years,

though represented durng a considerable part of that time by friends of the late Government. Mr. Mackenzie's Government spent $7,000 or $8,000 on it, and the late Government some $5,000, but that is all it has had since it was first constructed 40 or 50 years ago. A large amount of public money was spent on it at that time, and it is not in the interest of the country that that large amount should be allowed to go to waste. I understand that there has been some hesitation in the department in regard to spending money there under the impression that the harbour was under the control of the Grand Trunk Railway. I have moved for a return which will show the exact state of the case, but I have not yet seen that return, though I hope it will be down to-morrow. At all events, when prepared, it will be a useful memorandum for the information of the Minister and the department. Whatever state of affairs may be found to exist in regard to any entanglement of that kind, I hope it will be cleared up, and that the Government will see their way next session to do something to put this important harbour back where it should be, in the list of the most important harbours on our great lakes.

To provide tug for winter mail service between Cape Traverse, P.E.I., and Cape Tormentine, N.B..... $10,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For years we have been trying to establish better service between the capes. It has been conducted for many years back in open boats, which cross at the risk of life, and the service could be very much improved if a powerful tug were put there. I have visited the place and crossed many times myself; and every time I went there, the necessity was impressed upon me of having this experiment tried. After consulting Capt. McElhinney, the nautical officer of the department, and the best authorities I could get in Prince Edward Island, I determined to advise my colleague to put in a sum to enable the experiment to be tried. We have the offers of three tugs under consideration, and in addition we are considering the propriety of putting the "Bayfield" there instead of hiring a tug. She is up on the lakes on a hydrographic survey. She has to go into dock to be recaulked and repaired, and if sheathed all over, she would be a better boat than any of the tugs offered us for hire.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the objection to the "Stanley?"

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She never could be risked there.

Mr. FOSTER. She could lie at Tormentine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no harbour on the Island side to lie in at all. A small tug 100 feet long and of 50 horse power would make a harbour for herself in the ice. There is no wharf there, and to build one, it is estimated, would cost $300,000. We do not propose to ask for any such sum, but if the experiment be successful, it will be of great benefit to the travelling public and give us a ferry which ought to run, on most days, twice a day, as the distance across is only eight miles.

Mr. FOSTER. If this succeeds, I suppose the ice-boat service will cease?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will depend on how it will succeed. When the ice makes and this boat goes over, we will always require on her deck two ice boats in case of accident.

Mr. FOSTER. The question is whether, the passage being so short, more than one harbour is required. She could always get back to the Tormentine side, and if the weather was too bad, she would not start. In nineteen days out of twenty she could cross and make her harbour at Tormentine, and only touch at the other side to unload passengers and freight.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman were over there in the winter, he would understand that the Tormentine wharf, although very long, is not long enough to go outside of the board ice, which forms a mile or a mile and a half from the shore.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the experiment being tried. It is one I always thought should be tried.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) On a previous occasion there was something said about bringing the "Stanley" and trying her on the route. The Minister of Marine agreed that it was objectionable to utilize such an extensive boat for an experiment of that kind, and I suggested that a powerful steam tug should be procured with which to make the experiment. I doubt very much whether a boat of sufficient capacity and suitable for the purpose could be got at a moment's notice. There are many things required that will not be found in the ordinary run of vessels. So far as the "Stanley" is concerned, she is as near perfection as anything in the shape of an ice-going vessel to be found anywhere. She performs her work exceedingly well, but there are times when she is not able to make her voyages with that regularity required, particularly for the mail service. I would suggest to the Government the advisability of getting another boat such as the "Stanley" built, and thus making a regular connection at all times. I hope the Minister of Marine will get a boat that will give this experiment a fair test, as otherwise he would only throw a damper on that route. For my own part, I am very doubtful if any boat can be found that will suc-

ceed in crossing at these two points. Certainly early in the winter season and early in the spring, there are times when there is a good deal of open water and when, in a strong breeze, the small ice boats are not able to cross, and at such times a tug would render valuable assistance. There are many things to be considered in procuring a tug for that purpose. She has to be sufficient draft, so that her propeller will be below the ice, and therefore prevent the ice interfering seriously with it. Again she has to be of very great strength to resist the ice which runs with a very powerful current at that point, several knots an hour, and if she got squeezed in between the running ice and the board ice, she would be in a very tight fix. I hope the hon. gentleman may be successful, but I doubt very much that a boat can be procured which will give the experiment a fair trial.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The difficulties are fairly stated by the hon. gentleman. He is quite correct in saying that it would be out of the question to put a valuable boat like the "Stanley" on that route, and I would not care to ask him to vote $100,000 for another "Stanley" until I have tested the feasibility of carrying out the winter service in the way I suggest. Capt. McElhinney was sent some time ago by me to Quebec, Kingston and Montreal, to examine all the different tugs there, and I communicated with all the ship-owners who had tugs suitable for the purpose, and Capt. McElhinney made personal examination of these also, and reported to me on the subject. Some of these boats, one particularly, is a very strong, steel-built boat with about 45 or 50 horse power. In many respects she seems to be a suitable boat, but I am now considering, under his advice, the desirability of fixing up the "Bayfield" instead. She seems to be a better boat even than the tug. I do not wish to be too sanguine, but the hon. gentleman knows how strong and deep the feeling is both in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island with regard to this matter. I pledged myself, if I had the power I would give it a fair trial. I am only carrying out my pledge, and I hope for the best.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P. E. I.) I have no doubt that under Capt. McElhinney the thing will get a fair trial, for no one knows the route better than he does. There are very many points to be considered in the construction of the boat as well as in her capacity for resisting the ice.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions —Additional to the item of $5,000 provided in the main Estimates—The whole amount ($8,000) to be applied as follows :—The service to be performed by two approved steamers thus, daily service between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Cape Canso ; four trips a week between Port Mulgrave and Guysborough; two trips a week during the season of navigation between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood, and one of such trips to be extended to Margaree..... $3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose that we carry these items with the understanding that the whole matter may be discussed on the item in the main Estimates that has been reserved. I would like also to announce that on concurrence we propose to reduce the amount in the first Supplementary Estimates for the line from St. John to Liverpool, commonly called the Beaver Line, from $25,000 to $20,000. I make that announcement now so that, in case the hon. gentleman may have any remarks to make he may know that such a reduction is contemplated.

For steam service between St. John and Halifax and London (pending negotiations respecting the fast line) in addition to the $25,000 provided in the main Estimates; the whole sum of $40,000 to be applied as follows :—In the summer months a service between St. John, Halifax and London as hitherto ; the winter months direct services from St. John to London, and from Halifax to London $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is evidently to be an addition to the number of vessels. Will the hon. Minister tell me what is the character of the new vessel as to size and speed ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We propose to have vessels at least as good and probably better for the service. The hon. gentleman notices that the proposition now is to have a direct service from St. John during the winter at least. Heretofore those services have been to St. John, then calling at Halifax, to which the St. John merchants object very strongly ; and we propose to subdivide and have one from St. John and one from Halifax, but during the summer season the services are to be continued as at present.

Mr. FOSTER. And with reference to the new disposition of the service. Does the hon. Minister intend to impose conditions, as to the winter service, such as were imposed upon the Beaver Line last year, in the matter of the regulation of freight charges and the absolute guarantee that they should take at least maximum cargoes ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What particular regulation does the hon. gentleman refer to as to cargoes ? As to the freight, these matters are now under negotiation with these gentlemen, and I propose to have maximum rates such as we exacted in the case of the Beaver Line. As regards the proposition, to which perhaps the hon. gentleman referred, with respect to the quantity of cattle——

Mr. FOSTER. Quantity of freights.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is subject to cattle being allowed to be imported freely into England, which, unfortunately, is not the case. I am not quite clear how far we could enforce this. That is a matter we are discussing.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. Minister tell me whether he intends to carry out the policy of the late Government with reference to the change from Portland to St. John as the terminus of the other line of steamers that are subsidized. I understand an item is reserved so as to allow general discussion, but perhaps this subject might be dealt with now.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would suggest that as we are to have a general discussion it would be hardly worth while now to enter upon a consideration of other matters than those arising out of the item before us.

For steam service (pending negotiations respecting the fast line) between St. John, N.B., and Glasgow during the ensuing winter $7,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any particular line in view for this ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Donaldson Line.

Mr. FOSTER. Just for the winter trips ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How many trips ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not less than ten, and probably thirteen.

For steam service (pending negotiations respecting fast line) between St. John, Dublin and Belfast during the ensuing winter $7,500

Mr. FOSTER. What line is this ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Head Line. Similar regulations are to be made with those made with the Beaver Line. However, these are tentative propositions and it remains to be seen whether the lines will acquiesce in them. The St. John people, as the hon. gentleman knows very well, have made very strong representations on the subject, and no doubt it is important to do all we can to favour the development of winter traffic from that port now that it has become the terminal port of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Provided we don't cut it off at the other end.

Amount required to refund to Mr. James J. Foster, of Birtle, Manitoba, the bonus paid by him for a timber berth in what was known as the disputed territory..... $225

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). The Department of the Interior is a legacy left me by my hon. friend for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). A certain timber limit was granted in what is known as the disputed territory between Canada and the United States. It was granted under the condition that if no timber was cut, and it was found that these lands were in the United States, the amount paid for the license would be returned. There is a solemn declaration by Mr. Foster that no timber was taken off that lot which the Government had no right to grant, because it was found to be on the other side of the boundary line.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not territory in dispute between Canada and the United States, but between Ontario and Manitoba.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, I beg your pardon. I am sorry to say that my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) did not tell me exactly where the disputed territory was.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I want to express my regret that an amount was not placed in the Estimates for the landslide at Quebec. I understood that the First Minister had been interviewed, and he expressed, according to the report I read, great sympathy with the sufferers from that accident, as we all do in that section of the country. I understood that an amount was going to be placed in the Estimates for the purpose of indemnifying those who suffered, after a commission appointed by the Government had gone into the claims to ascertain what amount it would be fair for the Government to pay to the sufferers by the landslide.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman has himself just now given the reason why no amount has been placed in the Estimates. In the course of his previous remarks, he said he had understood, and he understood correctly, that the Government intended to appoint a commission to investigate these claims. There is no need of a commission to ascertain the cause of the accident, as that is known beyond peradventure. But the Government did not feel justified in placing any sum, whether $25,000 or $50,000, or any other sum, in the Estimates, until the claims had been carefully investigated, first, as to the amount of loss of real property ; and secondly, as to the loss of life—which, however, is already known—but the condition of the relatives of those who lost their lives by that accident. We have not yet any such data upon which we could decide what sum to put in the Estimates. It is the intention of the Government during recess to make a careful investigation, and I am sure that if we bring down an appropriation at the next session of Parliament for the purpose of meeting those claims, we shall have the support of my hon. friend.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman intimates that the inquiry will be as to the amount. The Government commit themselves, so to speak, to assuming the liability, and this inquiry is only to assure the amount of the payments to be made. Am I right ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not exactly. My hon. friend knows there is no legal claim against the Government, there is only a moral claim, and it is impossible to commit ourselves to make up all the losses which have been suffered. But the Government think that, after the judges who had that case in hand were forced to the conclusion that there were no legal claim for relief, they would meet the requirements of charity and of compassion, in asking Parliament to come to the relief of the indigent sufferers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the Government is disposed to grant something ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But before deciding, they desire to ascertain how far these claims go ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It would be a misfortune if we were to acknowledge legal liability. I understand it is to be a compassionate allowance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that the Government, while not recognizing legal liability, before committing themselves to a claim, wish to find what amount they could fairly ask Parliament to grant. But, substantially, they intimate now their readiness to pay something ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Amount required to recoup the North-west Mounted Police for assistance to destitute Half-breeds during the years 1895-96 and 1896-97 ..... $500

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). Part of this amount has been paid already by the officers of the Mounted Police in order to relieve the half-breeds. The whole amount has not been spent, and the remainder is to meet such cases of need as may occur during the winter. The condition of the half-breeds is now very painful in the North-west. Father Lacombe has obtained from the Government a grant of land, and is trying to get those who are most in need, to settle upon it. But in the meantime, some of the half-breeds are exposed to want and misery, and it has been agreed that the North-west police should be allowed to relieve them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is an unusual item, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is something done every year. In cases of great destitution, the officers are obliged to meet it out of their own pockets from time to time. As my hon. friend has explained, a part of this money has been already expended, and has to be recouped.

To provide for another expedition by water to Hudson Bay, to settle, if possible, the practicability of the route for commercial purposes $35,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, the item speaks for itself. I was disposed, in the first place, to ask a sum of money equal to what the first expedition under Commander Gordon cost : but it was not thought by my colleagues that we could advance sufficiently for this year to justify us in asking that amount. But the preliminary arrangements can be made with $35,000, and if we go on far enough to send an expedition next spring, we can get a further amount if it is found to be required next year. I may say the expedition which went out under Commander Gordon the first year, cost $72,000 : the next year he went it cost $30,000, and the third year $10,000. It is possible we may be able to fit out that expedition in time to go next spring, and, if so, we shall have to ask a further grant next year. If this matter is going to be done now, it has to be done thoroughly. It has got to be done in a manner that will leave no possible room for doubt, and if it is done in that thorough way, it will undoubtedly cost more money. All I ask for now is this amount to make preliminary arrangements.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Minister state a little more in detail what he proposes in this connection ? Does he propose to charter a special steamer and to engage a special staff as in the case of Commander Gordon ? Has he arrived at any conclusion as to the officer to be in command. Lieut. Markham, now Admiral Markham, went with Commander Gordon—I do not know whether he was there in his private capacity or not——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Entirely in a private capacity.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. Minister considered how this expedition should best be conducted ? There was a great deal of discussion over the report of Commander Gordon. I had great confidence indeed in that officer's judgment and ability. The hon. Minister will recollect that there was a dispute carried on for years between Admiral Markham and Commander Gordon as regards the result of that investigation, and as to the navigability of these waters for a certain period. In view of that, has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) considered any scheme which would produce a more satisfactory report as to the actual condition of navigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not thoroughly considered it. I have contented myself with reading from Commander Gordon's reports to ascertain the lines upon which he made his investigation. I have talked the matter over generally with my colleagues, but we have not come to any definite determination yet, nor has any name been mentioned. I realize that in the selection of a man, the greatest possible care must be taken; and that only a first-class man, such a man as would give general satisfaction to the whole community, should be appointed. The matter will receive early attention at the hands of my colleagues, as soon as we can get a moment of time to consider it. The question is very important, and I am posting myself from time to time by reading Commander Gordon's report, so as to be in a position to consider it intelligently. We have not thought out yet where the boat is to be got, or what the proper and best boat is to be, but we are being advised in the matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can do much effective work with $35,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not hope to do more than to make necessary preliminary preparations. I do not expect that $35,000 will meet the expenses of that expedition. To tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) the real facts, my colleagues put down the $35,000 because that was the amount suggested by the late Government in the estimates submitted to them. It did not pass Council, but there was a departmental estimate sent in for that amount. In all human probability, if the expedition starts next spring, a further grant will have to be asked from the House next session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This seems to be comparatively a nominal sum, and therefore means the postponement of anything like definite arrangements.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not necessarily.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I feel almost confident that if that estimate had been submitted to Council with a view of putting it before the House on the previous occasion referred to by the hon. gentleman, it would have been materially increased, because I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot spare any of the vessels under his departmental control.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are not fit for the work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so. Practically, all this vote seems to involve is a friendly opinion on the part of the Government towards the project of an investigation. I do not think anything will be done between this and next session.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will deal with perfect frankness with my hon. friend. It has been suggested —and nothing more than a suggestion has been made—that quite probably the Imperial Government might assist us in the matter of a vessel, and steps will be taken to ascertain that more definitely. At the present moment, I cannot say more.

Mr. CASEY. I hope that this investigation will be undertaken in a spirit different from that which characterized the last investigation on the same subject. There is no doubt that it was the desire on the last occasion to find that the Hudson Straits were not navigable, and in fact I am inclined to think that hints to that effect were given to those who conducted the expedition. I merely wish to throw out one suggestion now, as we will have plenty of time to discuss it before anything is actually done. I have more than once urged in this House that the only way to make a full investigation of the navigability of the Hudson Straits—and this is really the point at issue—is to get a full powered vessel capable of sustaining the pressure of ice, and keep her sailing in and out of these straits as long as she can during the season. When she is stuck in the ice she should be let stay there until she gets out again. In the course of two or three seasons of that kind of exploring, which is the only practical way it can be done, we would get some idea as to how long these straits are navigable during the year. It is not to be assumed that the colder months of the year are the worst for passing in and out of these straits. We had explorers left out for a winter or two on the shores of Hudson Straits after the last expedition—and some of these gentlemen I know personally—but what they were able to ascertain was very indefinite. They could not tell whether or not there was open water out in the channel during the winter. I hope that whatever is done now will be done thoroughly, and it will be cheaper in the long run to do it thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. It would be a great pity to have this enterprise undertaken in a manner which might result in creating the impression for a great many years that these straits were not navigable, when by thorough investigation we could perhaps find that they were navigable. It would be the greatest possible benefit to this country at large, and specially to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, if it were found that Hudson Straits can be navigated with success, for such a number of months in the year as would enable commerce to be carried on by this route.

Towards the expense of the meeting of the British Medical Association at Montreal	$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. We should have some explanation about this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The British Medical Association, a very distinguished body representing the medical profession of the English-speaking world, is to meet in Montreal, and this vote is to assist our Montreal friends in making the occasion a notable one. I do not believe there are any men who would be more useful to Canada in making its resources known than these medical gentlemen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The point is not as to whether the aid should be given; but is this a contribution to the citizens' committee, who have the matter in charge in Montreal? Is it the travelling expenses of the delegates to this country, or is it for their entertainment, or what?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The travelling expenses, I understand, will be paid by the members of the medical profession themselves. It is to enable the Montreal committee, composed of medical gentlemen, I believe, to give the association a proper reception. There will be many expenses incidental to a large undertaking of that character. The committee is composed of medical gentlemen, and I am quite sure we can rely upon it that the money will be applied in the proper direction. The hon. member for one of the divisions of Montreal (Dr. Roddick) is the president of the committee, and together with Dr. Lachapelle, of Montreal, both very distinguished members of the profession, will have charge of the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the policy which was laid down by my hon. friend in reference to internal economy downstairs will prevail in this case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The medical men will be the best judges of that.

Payment of transportation expenses of His Excellency Li Hung Chang and suite through Canada from Niagara Falls to Vancouver..... $3,000

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation of what this is incurred for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If any particulars are desired, my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue will be happy to furnish them. My understanding is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company bear a considerable portion of the expense, and this is our contribution. The balance will be paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. FOSTER. What does this cover?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Transportation and maintenance during the journey.

Mr. FOSTER. What about Dr. Horsey?

The FINANCE MINISTER. His expenses, I presume, will be included in the general bill. At any rate, they will be very trifling. We give this sum to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and they settle all bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue any statement to make?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). I can only say that we attempted to receive our disinguished visitor with as much hospitality as possble. The cost of the reception at Niagara was quite out of proportion to the satisfaction it appeared to give him. The Electric Railway Company generously placed their cars at our disposal to take Li Hung Chang and his suite over the road, and show them the falls and rapids. The citizens of Niagara also contributed to do honour to our guest. When we went to Toronto, he was very well received at the exhibition there too, and I do not think we shall have to contribute in any way for that part of his entertainment. As to the remainder, I left him at Nipissing, and I am glad to believe, from a telegram received before he sailed from Vancouver, that he was perfectly satisfied with the hospitality he received at our hands.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Although the time is pressing, I think it is only right that even I should say how gratified I was at the manner in which the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue attended to these duties of hospitality on the part of Canada towards this distinguished man. While I have very strong views, and mostly in sympathy with the views of the representatives of British Columbia, in regard to the question of Chinese immigration into Canada, nevertheless we all must recognize that this distinguished man was the guest of the Canadian nation. My only regret in reference to this expenditure is that the Governmnt felt obliged to share it with any corporation, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other transportation company. I think Canada has reached that period when it can be hospitable on its own account, and do such things decently and well; and, so far as the Controller of Inland Revenue is concerned, I think he discharged his duties as a representative of the Canadian Government to the satisfaction of all Canadians.

Collection of revenues—Customs—Further amount required to meet salaries and contingent expenses, Quebec .. $8,850

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to ask the Controller of Customs whether this

item is largely made up of a deficiency which existed at the port of Montreal during the last fiscal year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr Paterson). No. The Supplementary Estimates which passed the other night provided for that. The Estimates we are preparing are with a view to securing enough to pay those at present employed with the contingencies of the various offices. The money is not necessarily all to be used; but the other night the late Finance Minister took the ground that we must confine ourselves to votes by provinces, and that we should not be allowed to do in the future as we have done in the past, apply any saving in one province to the expenses of another. On that account we feel obliged to take a full vote for the requirements of each province, as now ascertained.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think the rule has always been for Parliament to vote a sum to each province. Is it the intention of the Government to make any of these so-called extra officers in the Customs Department permanent? The subject has been one of discussion between the department here and the collector at Montreal, as to whether it would not be wise to make permanent some of these officials who have been known as supernumeraries for many years, and whose work is really of a permanent character. Some of these supernumeraries had been on the staff for twenty years and others for fifteen and ten years.

Mr. WALLACE. I am surprised to see the very large amount which the Controller of Customs is asking for that department this year. I made up the estimates for 1895-96, and went over every report very carefully, and, with a knowledge of all the business requirements, I brought in estimates for $874,000, which I considered quite ample. My hon. friend who succeeded me (Mr. Wood), brought in estimates for $902,000. We have now the main Estimates for $899,000, supplementaries $22,500, and further supplementaries $28,500, making a total of more than $950,000, a larger sum than has ever been asked for by the Customs Department. The highest expenditure on record is $924,000, and we succeeded in reducing that, without impairing the efficiency of the service, and yet we find these economical gentlemen, who have been talking of the extravagance of the Conservative party, not satisfied with spending as much money as was required when the Conservatives were in power, but largely increasing the amount, making it $76,000 more than the estimates I presented, and $48,000 more than the estimates of my successor, the member for Brockville.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot allow that to pass. The hon. gentleman reduced his estimates to $874,000, and he says he thought that was ample for the expenses. Well, I believe he did effect a reduction on paper, but only on paper. He simply made a cut off the estimates, but did not reduce the staff. He left the same staff there, and the fact of the matter is that the $22,000 which was voted the other night in the supplementaries, were voted to pay the accounts of last year, and, when the late Controller, who succeeded the hon. member for York, came in, he added largely to the list, and consequently we have to carry into 1896-97 $11,000, and some of the June accounts are not paid yet. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to charge that to me. Without throwing all the blame on the last Controller (Mr. Wood), he is responsible for his own acts. In the main Estimates for 1895, the amount that was asked for by the then Controller (Mr. Wallace) at that time for the port of Montreal, was $38,000. He was responsible for the expenditure until the 31st December. For the six months ending 31st December, the amount paid for the services of extra officers at that port was $23,394.23, or at the rate of $46,708 per year.

Mr. WALLACE. In the month of December navigation closes, and these temporary clerks are dispensed with, until the following May, so that the next six months would not show one-half the expenditure of the year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Then the actual pay for the whole year was $44,748.94. The hon. gentleman estimated $38,000 and said it was sufficient, which left $6,000 short, and the June accounts were not paid then, but were carried over, and there is money due on the June accounts yet that we have not been able to pay. The vote for extra officers at the port of Quebec, in 1895, in the main Estimates, was $6,500. The amount paid for the services of these extra officers, from the 1st July to the 31st December, 1895, for which the hon. gentleman was responsible, amounted to $5,423, leaving $1,100 to pay for the other six months. That was to meet the pay of the extra staff for the rest of the year, while the pay-list for six months amounted to $3,841. So that his estimate gave $1,000 to pay nearly $4,000. The total expenditure for which hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible was $9,624; yet the hon. gentleman tells us that his estimate of $6,500 was ample. He cut the amounts out of the Estimates, but he left the officers there, and they have to be paid. Some of them are not paid yet. In Charlottetown the amount of the main Estimates for 1895-96 for the pay of acting officers was $150. The expenditure for the six months ending 31st December, for which the hon. gentleman is responsible, was $474.49. At Winnipeg the vote in the main Estimates to pay extra officers was $6,500, and the expenditure for the six months referred to was $5,475.37. At the port of Vancouver the amount appropriated for extra officers,

which the hon. gentleman says is sufficient, is $8,000, and the expenditure for the first six months was $4,710, or at the rate of $9,420 a year. At the port of London, he reduced the vote for permanent salaries to $12.000—it had been $13,000. And he proposed to make a reduction by superannuation, but he never superannuated anybody, and the salaries for the first six months amounted to $6,775, or at the rate of $13,550 per year. It is well enough for the hon. gentleman to say he reduced the Estimates, but he did not reduce the staff that had to be paid out of the Estimates.

Mr. WALLACE. I did superannuate at London.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman did not superannuate the man on account of whose superannuation he expected to make this reduction. Now, in the port of St. Stephen, N.B., he proposed to superannuate one of the officers and thus save $600. But the salary list was left at $6,700, while the vote was only $6,100. He reduced the vote to pay extra officers of the Board of Customs from $19,750 to $16,-200. And the expenditure on this account for the first six months was $10,854. Several were added to the list of extra officers. Of course the hon. gentleman's explanation is that some were to be paid out of the 5 per cent for customs seizures, but the Auditor General held that officers could not be paid out of that fund, but that salaries must come out of appropriations made by Parliament. Here is a table showing the appro priations and the expenditures for six months:

	Amount appropriated.	Expenditure 6 months.
Ontario	$286,475	$145,623 35
Quebec	201,250	107,006 57
New Brunswick	88,035	44,207 29
Nova Scotia	108,250	54,379 66
Manitoba	32,250	17,492 47
British Columbia	60,000	32,816 10
Prince Edward Island	16,725	8,822 16
North-west Territory	3,400	3,144 00
Inspection	21,150	11,189 87
Miscellaneous	15,000	6,939 41
Board of Customs	23,000	14,589 00
Sugar	4,050	2,226 09

The total estimated vote, including $5,000 for unforeseen expenses was $884,785; while the expenditure for the first six months up to the 31st December, during which the hon. gentleman administered the department himself, was $448,499.85. Half the total estimate would be $432,392.50. Thus there was a deficit of $16,000 during the six months he administered the department himself. This leaves out of account the estimate for the cruiser "Constance" because the expenditure is under the control of the Department of Marine, and we never know what it is until the end of the year. The estimate for that was $9,500, and we had to bring down an estimate of $11,062 to meet the expenditure for the year. So the hon. gentleman, while he claims to have reduced his estimates, must see that that reduction was on paper, and only on paper. While he himself is responsible for that, his successor, I think, will admit that what I say is true, that during his six months he increased by Orders in Council the salaries of these men, and added to the cost of the service very materially. That is the position in which I find the department. I am asking for a larger amount in the Estimates. The $22,000 that were voted in the supplementaries were for debts that were due from the past year, and all that has to be taken into consideration in the Estimates we are now submitting, is the amount that is in the main Estimates, and this amount is in the supplementaries now for our own purposes. If they figure up the total of their Estimates for the previous year and compare it with the Estimates we are asking here, and make allowance for the increased amount I am asking in British Columbia, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will be prepared to vote that, as they must recognize the fact that it is possible a larger expenditure will be required—they will say that our Estimates have been prepared carefully. I do not say we will expend it all; but I say that the strong position taken by the late Finance Minister with reference to not allowing in the future what has always been allowed in the past, of savings effected in one province being applied to extra expenditures in another, forces us to take a full vote for the requirements in each province as we find them to be at the present time; and having thus taken an estimate, of course it will be our duty not to expend any of it except what we find is absolutely necessary.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentlemen says that they have been compelled to ask for a larger sum because they are not allowed to do in future what has been allowed in the past. I would like to know what difference there is between the past and the future if the votes have to be given by provinces. He has given us to understand that the vote previously has been one lump sum for all the Dominion. The hon. gentleman himself attempted to pass the Estimates through in one lump sum, and the House objected to it, because it was the custom to vote it by provinces. So there is no excuse for making a demand for a larger sum because they have to vote now by provinces. The conditions are exactly the same this year as for many years past. Now, with reference to the statement that during the six months I was Controller in 1895 the expenditures I made were only on paper, I shall be able to show that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. He states—and of course I have not the figures to verify or contradict it—that the expenditures for the six months exceeded the amount that was appropriated in proportion for the year. Well, I can say that we reduced the expenditure. The ap-

propriation for the city of Hamilton, for instance, quoting from memory, was reduced more than $3,000, as the then acting commissioner, who is also collector at Hamilton, stated, without impairing the efficiency at the port of Hamilton. With regard to the city of Toronto, the expenditure was reduced four or five thousand dollars. These were no mere reductions on paper. He says that for the half year, during which I was Controller, the appropriation being $874,000, there were $448,000 expended, and that the half would be only $437,000. Well, that would be more than $437,000, and deducting the $437,000 which would be the half of the expenditure, from the amount which he says was expended during those six months, of $448,000, it leaves only $11,000 more expenditure than the half of the appropriation.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I stated that I had left that out.

Mr. WALLACE. The Controller of Customs tells us that during the half year $11,000 were expended, more than half of the appropriation. Suppose it was. As I pointed out before, that was largely the half year of the season of navigation. At all the large ports in the Dominion a large expenditure was incurred for the temporary service which was not incurred at all during a large portion of the other six months; and it is a proper estimate to make that $437,000 being the one half, $11,000 more was expended for the six months during the season of navigation, and that the other $426,000 would be ample for the other half of the fiscal year. There was no hap-hazard reduction of expenditure. We went over each port, carefully considering the wants, and getting all the information possible so as to make a reduction without impairing efficiency; and after months had elapsed in the financial year, the chief accountant informed me that the expenditures were being kept within the estimates. The first month or two Parliament was then in session, the proposed superannuations could not be carried out until the session of Parliament had expired, because the funds were not given, but as soon as Parliament closed we proceeded to make those reductions so as to reduce the expenditures from $924,000 to $874,000, or a reduction of $50,000. I repeat that we were keeping well within the estimate, as reported to me by the chief accountant. But what do we find with the present Controller? He is asking Parliament to vote $76,000 more, or $950,000, and he gives as a reason that we had exceeded our appropriation. It is true that Parliament was asked later on during the last session, for further sums. Well, these further sums increased this $874,000 by $28,000, making it $902,000. That was the amount voted as requested by my hon. friend the late Controller of Customs. But the hon. gentleman asks for $48,000 more, or $950,000, the largest sum that has ever been asked for by a Minister of Customs, and a sum which is entirely unnecessary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). What particular sum can the hon. gentleman put his finger on and say is unnecessary?

Mr. WALLACE. The $10,100 for the province of Ontario is totally unnecessary, being $10,100 of an increase in the Further Supplementary Estimates. In the Supplementary Estimates the amount asked for was $22,500.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). My hon. friend is including in the amount that the Controller (Mr. Paterson) asked for, for the present year, the sum which is required to pay for the deficiencies of the last year. I want to set the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) right.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not see why there should be deficiencies for the last year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Settle that between yourselves.

Mr. WALLACE. And suppose there are. This additional $22,000 makes a larger sum than ever was asked for, or expended by the Customs Department. The Controller (Mr. Paterson) says that he may not need all this amount, but then, why should he ask for it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) started in office about the beginning of the fiscal year, and the department should have a very close idea of its necessities because they were not estimating for five or six months ahead as is ordinarily the case. I repeat that when I was Controller, the accountant reported to me—Parliament being then in session and we being unable to make reductions until Parliament had passed the Supply Bill—the accountant reported to me that we were keeping close up to the estimates, and he expected that we would be able to keep within the amount voted by Parliament. I am aware that my hon. friend (Mr. Wood), in the face of the election, perhaps asked Parliament for a further sum during last session, but even so, is that any reason why we should be asked now for a still larger sum, after the elections are over, to reward those who supported the present Government. There is no necessity for such a large sum being voted for the Department of Customs.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot allow some of the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) to pass without comment. The Chief Accountant of the Customs Department informed my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) that he could keep the expenditure within the estimates for 1895-96. Then all I can say is, that the same officer certainly reported to me that it could not be done, as also the acting Commissioner. I have no doubt that the Chief Accountant must have reported the same thing to the

present Controller of Customs. I do not hesitate to say that I found the amount voted by Parliament in the Estimates of 1895-96, not sufficient. Vacancies in some places were left unfilled and they had to be provided for. I also found additional inspection necessary. I am strongly of the opinion that a larger sum of money than has ever been spent in inspection should be voted for that purpose. I do not believe that for the last ten or fifteen years there has ever been a proper inspection of all the ports of this country, and the records of some of the ports will go to show that on that account the department has met some failures. I must not allow another remark of the Controller to pass altogether unnoticed. There is such a thing as false economy, and I do not believe I have recommended any additions to the Customs staff that were not necessary in the interests of the public service. I had protests from almost every collector of customs in this country as to the insufficiency of the contingent vote ; notably from the present collector at Montreal, and all the way through. I do think that the large cut, $50,000 made by my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) in the estimates for 1895-96, was altogether too much. It was the largest ever made in the history of the department. The result was that there must have been a deficiency. I wish to point out the peculiarity of the Customs Department. At the port of Montreal there are some two hundred officers, about half of whom are supernumeraries, or extras as they are called. My experience, and the experience of my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) was, that every day almost applications for permanency were made on the part of some of these officers, and I do not hesitate to say that in very many cases the applicants were perfectly justified, owing to the fact that they had been there for a great many years, and that their services could not be very well dispensed with. During the short time, comparatively speaking, that I had charge of that department, I did make recommendations for the permanent appointment of these officials, and I venture to submit to the earnest scrutiny of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the case of every one of these men whom I recommended for a permanent place. If he will look at the number of appointments made during the five months that I was in charge of that department—and I would remind him that there were three different persons in charge of the department during the fiscal year, 1895-96—if the hon. gentleman will examine carefully the number of recommendations that I made for permanent appointments, he will find that in every case they were necessary in the best interests of what is to my mind, by all odds, the most important service in this country.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS . My remarks with reference to the Controller (Mr. Wallace) who preceded the last gentleman who spoke (Mr. Wood) were intended to point out that it would be impossible for him (Mr. Wallace) to shoulder all the blame upon the gentleman who succeeded him (Mr. Wood), because during the six months that he administered the department there were $16,000 more expended than he asked for.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I mention that in justice to the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). The total estimate was for $864,000.

Mr. WALLACE. The estimate was $874,000.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I left out the "Constance." However, that does not concern me, and I only mentioned it so that the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) might not have to stand all the blame of this increase. When the hon. gentleman says he would be able to meet the expenditure with $874,000, he has altogether forgotten the circumstances of the case. I have pointed out that he made the reduction on paper, but never carried it out. He made provision for reducing the expenditure by superannuation in this case and by dismissal in the other case; but he did not superannuate, he did not dismiss, he did not make his changes. The result was that during the six months he administered the department he was $16 000 short ; and when, on the eve of an election or something of the kind, he found that he could not do as well even as his predecessor, he did not venture to bring down estimates for all he required. Therefore, the $22,000 or supplementary estimates voted the other night were estimates which I had to bring down to pay the debts incurred by these gentlemen in previous years. What I am asking for is the main estimates and these estimates, which together amount to $928,000. The hon. member for West York says he admitted that his successor in office brought down a supplementary estimate. So he did. A supplementary estimate of $25,000 or $26,000 ; but if he were perfectly frank, I think he would say that when he brought down that supplementary estimate, he was bringing down scarcely more than half as much as was requisite, but was afraid to bring down any more. Is not that correct ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No. I am not prepared to say what the further supplementary estimates would be ; but I remember that I intended to provide for a steamer on the Pacific coast, where it was much needed. But I do not think the estimates were as large as those brought down by my hon. friend.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman preferred to have the Government of Canada in the position of being unable to pay its

public servants, and some of them have not received their pay yet. The supplementary estimates he did venture to bring down brought up the total, not to $874,000, but to $902,150.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Speaking from recollection, that included $25,000 for a steamer.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, no. The hon. gentleman is wholly wrong. If he will look he will find that that is not in the estimates at all. Now, in addition to their bringing down estimates for $902,000, there was the sum of $20,000 chargeable against them, which they ought to have estimated for, but which they did not bring down estimates for. So that it would have required $922,000 to cover what they were responsible for—to pay the increases they had laid upon the country, instead of the $928,000 which we have to ask for now. There was an inspector, Mr. McKay, appointed, for whose salary or travelling expenses no provision was made: the miscellaneous expenditure they exceeded by $890; and there was due on contingencies for 1895-96, $10,502. Here is a list, covering some sheets of paper, of officers at different ports that we were not able to pay at all, and some of them have not been paid yet; but all of them have had to wait and be paid out of these estimates now to be voted. For these arrears, amounting to $11,000, the hon. gentleman is responsible. Then there are the three months to the end of the 30th of September, for which I do not hold myself responsible; for I have not had an opportunity of examining the different ports to see where I can effect savings. I have been forced to make my estimates on the basis of the expenditures which these gentlemen have placed upon the country. What did they do by Order in Council? They made increases of salary in every direction, and put men from the extra staff upon the permanent staff, without making any provision at all in the estimates for their salaries. Here are the names, covering sheets of paper, of men appointed to positions for which no provision whatever was made in the estimates. And yet the hon. gentleman wants to hold me responsible because I have had to bring down the supplementary estimates which they ought to have brought down, to pay their debts. If they had estimated as they should have done for all the requirements they placed before the country, their estimates, instead of being $902,000, would have been $922,000; and upon the basis of present engagements and necessities, I am asking for $928,000, the supplementary estimates being entirely due to the hon. gentlemen who preceded me. The $4,600 extra is what I am talking of for British Columbia. The hon. gentleman says I am not required to take the full amoun for each province by the ruling laid dowr here that we must confine ourselves to the votes for the province. That is true; but the other night, when I desired to have this vote taken as a lump vote, without having it distributed over the several provinces, I said that I wanted to do openly and aboveboard what it had been the custom to do otherwise. But the ex-Minister of Finance objected; so that, being tied down to that rule, I have to take care to estimate for each province what is required for that province, though I will save what I can out of the vote. The hon. gentleman says that was always the case. It was not, for I have this letter from the Auditor General to the Commissioner of Customs, in which, after referring to some other matters, he says:

> In the last paragraph you draw my attention to the fact that the appropriations as a whole for the collection of revenue are not overdrawn.
>
> I beg to say, while your view has been maintained by your department ever since Sir Mackenzie Bowell was Minister of Customs, the ground taken by the Minister of Finance in the House, that each sub-head of appropriation was to be taken by itself and was not to be exceeded, has no exceptions. If you desire that there should be an exception in the future so far as your department is concerned, it must be distinctly stated by the Minister of Finance or by some other person representing the Government in the House that the vote is to be taken on that condition.

When the ex-Finance Minister took exception to what was proposed, no statement was made by the Finance Minister, by which alone the Auditor General seems to think it would be possible for me to do in the coming year what he has done during all past years in reference to this amount. That is the reason, therefore, why I am taking the full estimate for each province. I again press on the House the fact that the Supplementary Estimates which we voted the other night, are estimates which should have been presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, but which they failed to present to the House. The obligations they cover were incurred by the late Government, and I cannot be held responsible for them. You can only hold me responsible for the main Estimates and the amount I am asking now

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that the Controller who preceded him, should have provided the supplementary estimates which were passed the other night. We had no chance, no opportunity to do so, and no one knows it better than the hon. gentleman himself.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am not attaching any blame to the hon. gentleman for not having done so, but I was answering the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace), who held me accountable for these amounts that should have been brought down by the late Government.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I asked the hon. gentleman, a short time ago, if he could

name to me the number of appointments made by the outgoing Government and distinguish them from the permanent supernumeraries. The departmental procedure is very peculiar in that respect, and, if the hon. gentleman can point to a number of permanent appointments that were made to take effect from the 1st of July, when we supposed we would be in a position to pay these gentlemen, he will find that the number of permanent appointments thus made is very small. I wish to point out furthermore, that, when you transfer to the permanent staff a supernumerary, you do not thereby increase the estimate necessarily at all.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. At Antigonish, Mr. Hugh Boyd was appointed acting preventive officer on the 15th June, 1896, very near the elections, at $50 per year.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Has that been confirmed ? Are you going to allow it ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot say. I have not yet had an opportunity of examining into it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am asking the hon. gentleman, in all sincerity, because he is coming down to the House and asking as large an amount as I would, and, therefore, I have the right to ask him whether he is going to pay this man ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am going over the department, and intend to make all the saving I can. I am bound to estimate, until I know whether all these appointments are necessary or not. I do not think they are. I think the hon. gentleman has imposed upon me a duty which to me will not be personally agreeable, which a sense of public duty only would lead me to do, and that is, to dispense with the services of certain men. I thought the hon. gentleman wanted me to give the names of those he appointed. At Kemptville, there was an increase from a salary of $250 to $400. These are amounts for which there was no provision made in the Estimates at all.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The moneys are voted in the Customs Department in a lump sum to each province, and you cannot tell whether you are going to have a deficiency or not. The hon. gentleman has said that Mr. McCabe was appointed without an appropriation being made. As a matter of fact, we cannot tell, until the close of the year, what surplus or deficiency we are going to have. There are vacancies created by death or otherwise, and which are not filled, and which leave at the disposal of the department funds sufficient to meet the expense of the new appointments until the fiscal year comes on again. So that, when you say, in the case of Kemptville, that the increase of $200 was not provided for, I take issue with you, and I say that we might have a surplus at the end of the year. We might make up from one province the deficiency in the other. That is what has been done in the Customs Department.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I want to make the point very plain, because the hon. gentleman places the department in this position, that, unless there is a division made in the Public Accounts of next year, I will be charged with the increased expenditure for debts incurred by these hon. gentlemen, that I have had to pay, and I shall have to take steps to have it made plain, or I would be charged with thousands of dollars extra expenses that were paid in 1896-97. I am told that there are some $3,000 not paid yet. I am told that there are men all over the different ports who have been out of their salaries, besides contingencies, printing bills, and so forth.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). For how long before the 30th June, were they not paid ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose that a month would do, scattered all over, perhaps. We have to pay it out of these appropriations voted in 1896-97.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is not that always the case ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, these are salaries to officers, monthly salaries, and the contingencies of their offices.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The printing bills are not salaries.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is only one item.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Very often, accounts run over one year into the early months of the succeeding year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I intend to take a sufficient amount to pay the officers at the end of the month, when the salaries are due.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman was insinuating that there was neglect and carelessness on the part of the late Controller in allowing these to accumulate.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It was his duty to take a sufficient estimate. When he found he had not, he ought not to have added to the fixed expenditure by putting on new officers and increasing the salaries of others. He took no estimate for Mr. McCabe's salary as inspector. Does he want me to dismiss Mr. McCabe ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I simply repeat my statement, that you cannot tell, till the end of the fiscal year 1895-96, the revenues there will be under the——

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Here is a summary of the officers that were appointed, and the increases made without being estimated for. What does the ex-

Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) think of such proceedings ?

Antigonish, N.S.,—3 months salary of Hugh Boyd, appointed as acting preventive officer, 15th June, 1896, at $50 per year ..... $ 12 50
Kentville—C. R. Bill, appointed sub-collector at Wolfville on 1st February, 1896, at $400, estimate, $250 ..... 37 50
Parrsboro'—The main Estimate was in error, made for $25 less than the actual salaries 25 00
Port Hawkesbury—A. E. Waters, salary increased from $60 to $90 from 16th May, 1896 ..... 10 00

Mr. WALLACE. That is a big sum.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Not very large by itself, but it makes part of a large amount.

Newcastle, N.B.—Donald Morrison appointed as acting appraiser 1st May, 1896, at $500 per annum $125 00

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). When was it to be paid—1st July ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). He was appointed 1st May. I suppose he would want his pay from the time he was appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not hold under the new doctrine.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS :

To provide for salary of Thomas Bustin, not superannuated as proposed..... $650 00
Increases of $50 each, John Lowry, T. O. Sandall, John Dixon, J. J. Mullins, 3 months, $50..... ..... 50 00
To provide additional amount for 3 months pay of extra officers employed without estimate, vote in main Estimates being $2,000, cost of extra staff, $3,400 per annum 350 00
St. Stephen—To provide for 3 months' pay to Jas. E. Osborne, appointed preventive officer at Milltown on 22nd May, 1896, at $600 per year 150 00
Charlottetown, P.E.I.—To provide for 3 months' salaries and increases to the following, viz. ;—Thomas E. Flynn, appointed 13th January, 1896, at $500 ; T. F. McDonald, appointed 13th January, 1896, at $75; James Rose, appointed 13th January, 1896, at $75 ; increases of $50 each to the following officers at same date :—Edwin White, D. McNeill, M. J. Moren, L. O. Kelly 212 50
Ccaticook, Que.—O. H. E. Webster, appointed 16th May, 1896, at $400 per annum ; increase to acting officer A. Putney on 1st May, 1896, of $50, required for 3 months 112 50
Potton—3 months' pay to acting officer Alvin Barry, employed at $200 per annum, without estimate..... 50 00
Montreal—Amount required to meet pay of officers for 3 months, who were appointed during 1895-96, without estimates, the salaries of the staff being $87,725 and the estimate, $86,025..... 425 00
Sherbrooke, Que.—Increase of $200 in the salary of B. Heroux, given on 16th May, 1895, no estimate 50 00
Brockville, Ont.—To provide 3 months' pay of acting officer Alex. Price, appointed 12th December, 1895, at $600, and Mary S. V. Shepherd, female searcher, appointed 18th June, 1896, at $360..... $240 00
Cobourg, Ont.—To provide for 3 months' pay of acting officers, not estimated for :—P. Colville and M. K. Lockwood, one at $200 and the other at $100.... 75 00
Chatham, Ont.—To provide for 3 months' pay of acting officer P. Robert, appointed 22nd May, 1896, at $600..... 150 00
Cornwall, Ont.—To provide for 3 months' additional pay to John Bergin, appointed collector at Cornwall at $1,300, the estimate being only $1,000 ..... 75 00
Fort Erie—To provide for 3 months' pay to acting officers G. House, appointed July, 1896, at $400, James Jones, 6th July, 1896, at $600, and J. G. Rathoon, 9th July, 1896, at $600..... 400 00
Niagara Falls, Ont.—Three months' increase to A. Boyle, collector, appointed 1st May, 1896, at $1,800, estimate, $1,000 —$50, and to provide for 3 months' pay to acting officer R. Delano Pew, appointed 8th July, 1896, at $600—$150..... 200 00
Ottawa, Ont.—For 3 months' pay to acting messenger Westwick, put on in December, 1895, at $300, no estimate.. 75 00
Prescott, Ont.—For 3 months' pay to acting officers Andrew Ross, put on 15th February, 1896, at $50 per month, and William Connell at $35 per month, no estimate 225 00
St. Thomas—For 3 months' increase to G. I. Walker, sub-collector at Aylmer, granted 16th May, 1896, at rate of $100 per annum 25 00
Toronto, Ont.—For 3 months' pay and increases to the following :—Increases—James Greer, $100 ; J. Thompson, $100 ; C. Loarden, $50 ; L. Loughrane, $50 on 1st January, 1896, and to J. Beale, $100 and F. Lloyd, $100, 16th May, 1896. Appointments—R. H. Evans, $600, 18th May, 1896 ; F. A. Campbell, $300, same date ; A. Foy, $600, 1st February, 1896 ; O. Pae, $600, 6th May, 1896, and Thomas E. Mitchell, 1st January, 1896, $750 ; the total increases being $3,350—amount required 837 50
Woodstock—Three months' pay to acting officer C. H. Irwin, put on without estimate 137 50
Winnipeg—Three months' increase to Thos. Bennie, salary increased by $200 on 1st April, 1896 ..... 50 00
Additional amount required for 3 months' increase to extra staff, the staff employed costing $11,000, while the estimate is only $8,000 ..... 750 00
One half of this increase being caused by the putting on of two men, Messrs. Flett and Mitchell in June, 1896.
Victoria, B.C.—For 3 months' increases to the following officers whose salaries were increased $100 in July, 1895, without estimate :—H. W. Groves, W. Atkins, F. W. Davey, F. Berry, G. F. D. Simpson and Thos. Waters 150 00

Mr. BRITTON. I notice that there was one appointment that was not read. I do not know how it was omitted. The partner of the late Controller (Mr. Wood) was appointed at a much larger salary than any mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I would

like to ask the hon. Controller whether he has been able to give an increase to a very old officer to whose case I called his attention earlier in the session, Mr. Gibb?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I have not made any increases.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No doubt my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) has a good deal of sympathy with office-holders. He has been one himself and he may be again. No doubt he would make a good judge. I have had the pleasure of meeting him in court, and I know he is a very good lawyer. So far as Mr. Webster is concerned, as his name has been mentioned, he was appointed to a vacant position for which provision had been made in the Estimates. My hon. friend himself will say he was very well fitted for the position as far as his legal abilities went. I have always contended that the Department of Customs required above all other departments, men possessing a knowledge of law, because they are not merely semi-officials, but altogether official. It is an advantage, at all events, that a man should have legal abilities in any reorganization of the department such as was recommended to me by Mr. Kilvert, and it was upon his recommendation I did act. He was appointed before the 23rd of June. There is not one of the appointments read by the Controller of Customs that he will say to-night is not necessary. He has footed up about $3,000, and that goes a very short way towards explaining the large difference in the Estimates the hon. gentleman has brought down and the Estimates that preceded him. I wish to say that some of these appointments are merely filling vacancies, as in the case of Niagara, which had existed for some time, and as in the case of Cornwall, which had existed, I think, for two years. After all that has been said as to the number of officials that were appointed, hon. gentlemen will be surprised to find that the number was so small as those named by the hon. gentleman and made during the period that I filled the office of Controller of Customs. It would be interesting if I were to go over the records of the political party opposite, and find out the number of appointments that were made by the gentleman who filled the position of collector of customs during the six months prior to the defeat of the Liberal party in 1878. I think we would find more appointments than he has read to-night. Now, I wish to repeat again that you have no right to say that no appropriations were made for those appointments because they were made in the different provinces, and you cannot tell until the close of the fiscal year whether you are going to have a surplus or a deficiency. You took very well the point that you might better lump together the votes that were granted in all the different provinces, because it undoubtedly is in the interest of the service, because, if necessity arises for a certain sum of money in Prince Edward Island and there is no sum voted by Parliament for that service, there is nothing wrong in your getting that from the same vote from the province of Quebec. But how do you know there will be a surplus in the province of Quebec? Your answer would have been: There may be a surplus. Now, that is my answer to you to-night when you state that these appointments have been made footing up $3,000; my answer is that there may have been a sum left in each province by death or otherwise, sufficient to meet the small number of appointments that were made during the last six months.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. My answer is that instead of being a surplus, there was $10,752 short. There is no "might be" about it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). You don't catch the point yet. How was I to know when I made these appointments? You knew, because when you took the Controller's office, the fiscal year had ended.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I say it is a fact that it was $10,752 short. The hon. gentleman asks why I took these votes. I have taken them because I felt it was my duty to reduce the expenditure if I could. I did what was not pleasant for me to do, but which I thought it was my duty to do. I thought that the services of some that had been employed could be dispensed with, and I have already given notice that we will not be able to continue them. Of course, I might not expend it all unless the public service demands.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman says he has estimated for every one of these men, and still he has given notice to them that he is not going to require their services.

Mr. McGREGOR. There are four new appointments at Windsor. One gets $700, one $600, one $1,200 and one $500, and they are not on the list at all. They were all appointed between the 22nd of May and the 23rd of June.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Am I right in my recollection that you met me in the corridor and told me that the customs at Windsor needed more assistance?

Mr. McGREGOR. No, Sir, never.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then, I will accept the hon. gentleman's denial. But will the hon. gentleman not say to me now that they were badly in need of assistance at that port?

Mr. McGREGOR. They discharged three men there, and better men than those you put on.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The report of the inspector does not say that.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire again to call the attention of the Controller of Customs to the case of Mr. O'Hara in the Montreal customs-house. My hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence Division of Montreal (Mr. Penny) brought the matter up last night, and impressed upon the Controller of Customs the need of paying Mr. O'Hara for the services performed by him after the death of the late collector. My hon. friend thought that the late Government might have done something in the case. Well, those of us who were here last year know that the late Government struggled for four months to get supplies and could not get any. I have something in my hand to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. I suppose it is well known that when the position of collector at Montreal became vacant, Mr. O'Hara, as assistant collector, was recommended for the post of collector, by a great many of the business men of Montreal, who pressed for his promotion. It was decided against him, and he then asked that he should at least be paid the amount of money that would have b a paid to the collector at Montreal had he been appointed. I will read to the committee the answer he got from the Controller at the time. This will be interesting to my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Penny) who says that the late Government did not care to do anything for Mr. O'Hara. The late Government believed that Mr. O'Hara deserved some recognition. The letter is dated 7th January, 1896, and is from the Hon. J. F. Wood to Mr. O'Hara. It says:

Before entirely severing my connection with the Department of Customs, I desire to convey to you the very high estimation in which I feel that the Government should regard your services to the Department of Customs during the time you had charge of the duties of acting collector at the important port of Montreal. I bespeak for Mr. White, who has within the last few days been appointed collector of customs, your hearty assistance, etc.

On the 29th January the Hon. Mr. Wood Controller of Customs wrote to Mr. White the collector of customs at Montreal as follows:—

I appreciate what you say about O'Hara's claim for a gratuity. In fact I intended to bring the matter up before this, but there has been such a pressure on my time that I have been unable to give it the necessary thought. I shall take the first opportunity of conferring with the Finance Minister on the subject.

Then, in transmitting his official request, Mr. White, the new collector of customs at Montreal, wrote the hon. the Controller of Customs, at Ottawa, as follows:—

You will remember that I have already written you on the subject urging the common justice of providing this session for the payment of the amount really due Mr. O'Hara, and I sincerely hope that an item will appear in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year (30th June, 1896) dealing with the matter. I have written to the Finance Minister on the same subject.

To this letter the Controller of Customs replied:

I have placed an amount in the Supplementary Estimates for this and shall hope to arrange for its passage through Council and Parliament, etc.

My hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Penny) will therefore see the late Government had not forgotten Mr. O'Hara's claim. Then again the collector at Montreal, writing to the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, urging what he called "the common justice of the request of the three years difference of pay," added:

There is a widespread feeling here that this remuneration should be promptly made.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce replying to the official application of Mr. O'Hara, said:

I am quite convinced of the justice of your demand. * * * I have asked Mr. Wood to put the matter in the Supplementaries for next year, which would enable you to be paid after the 1st of July. * * I hope the payment of any amount which may be voted, until after the 1st of July, will not incommode you seriously.

That letter will show my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Penny) that the late Government, recognized the claim of Mr. O'Hara and intended to pay it. Now, the following are some of the precedents for paying the salary of the higher office to officers filling it, for the time being, during a vacancy:

The late John Lewis, surveyor, Montreal, acted as collector from 23rd May to 1st August, 1866, interim between the death of the late Collector Holme and the appointment of the late Collector Delisle—and was paid the collector's salary instead of his own, from month to month by authorization. John Douglas, surveyor, Toronto, acted as collector there December, 1879, to April 1881, and was paid full difference between collector's salary and his own for that period—in addition to his own.

There are numerous instances where officers are paid for filling dual positions,—the salaries attached to each. Prior to 1888, the Act 51 Vic., cap. 12., sec. 12, the law (Civil Service Act, 49 Vic., chap. 17, subsec. 2 of sec 51) provided absolutely for the payment of the difference of salary. Since then, it has been the practice to provide for the same in the estimates and to apply it by vote of Parliament. For instance: John Douglas, surveyor, of Toronto, for acting as collector there 2 years, voted allowance in pay while acting, $2,666.66 vide Auditor General's Report 1890-91. Page 244 D. This was not the whole differential salary; it was, however, more than the half. D. D. O'Meara, surveyor, acting collector at Quebec, voted extra while acting, $2,209 vide Auditor General's report 1890-91. Page 249. This claim covered the period of the collector's illness as well as the interregnum between his death and the appointment of his successor; and the award, consequently, was practically the whole differential salary, or nearly so, for the period of

actual vacancy. Mr. O'Hara's claim is only for the period of actual vacancy. Mr. John Conway, assistant superintendent, Lachine Canal, 1894-95, acted as superintendent after the removal of Mr. E. Kennedy, until his own promotion and appointment as superintendent, and was paid from month to month the full difference in salary, in addition to his own. Phillipe Peltier, chief clerk, Department of the Secretary of State, paid in 1891-92, full differential pay for October and November, 1893, while acting as Under Secretary of State.—vide (Auditor General's Report, 1891-92. Page 80 A.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given the present Controller of Customs these precedents which may guide him. I am much obliged to my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Penny) for the position which he took in this case last night, and for the manner in which he advocated Mr. O'Hara's claim. I may add that the business community of Montreal, have had nothing but compliments to pay to Mr. O'Hara for the manner in which he administered the department of customs there.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. I will say more than that, Sir. I am perfectly satisfied with the nomination of my friend Mr. White, an old member of this House. I was satisfied that he was appointed, and I think it was a very good nomination, but in order to show the strength of Mr. O'Hara's case I may add, that had it been left to the business people of Montreal, Mr. O'Hara would have been appointed collector of customs. Mr. O'Hara acted for three years as collector of customs and the sum of $4,000 was voted each year as a salary by this Parliament for the collector at Montreal. Mr. O'Hara's salary was $2,400, and it is only a matter of simple justice to him that he should be paid the difference between the $2,400 and the $4,000, which is $1,600 a year, or $4,800 for the three years. This is the claim of Mr. O'Hara, and I am very much surprised that the Government did not bring down in the Supplementary Estimates a vote of money for that purpose. I was also surprised to hear yesterday my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) say that the matter was under consideration. There is no use of that. This claim has been before the Government for a long time. I admit at once that it should have been paid by the late Government; and if there is an excuse for the late Government not having paid it, that excuse is to be found in the letter I have read from the ex-Controller of Customs, intimating that they had not time to do it. This is not a question of party politics; it is not a question of Conservative or Liberal; it is the question of a man who has been employed by the Government for thirty years, and who has served faithfully under any Government, whether Conservative or Liberal. It looks like an injustice, not only not to have paid Mr. O'Hara before to-day, but to say now that his case is under consideration. I leave the matter with the Controller of Customs, who, I know is a business man and an unbiassed man, and I am sure that he will feel that this claim should be settled. If not paid now, the claim should be taken into such serious consideration as to be paid next session.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to the statement made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I think these sums should only be paid where an exceedingly strong case has been made out. I do not think the hon. gentleman has made out a strong case; and more than that, I do not think it is possible for him to do so, and I do not think the Government, even if they are considering the claim, will very seriously consider it. With reference to the statement, I might say the wild and reckless statement, made to-night by the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), I am free to comment on it, because all the appointments or increases of officials he has named, were made after I ceased to be the Controller of Customs; therefore, I have no connection with them myself. But he makes the statement that these appointments were made without any provision having been made for them by Parliament. Surely, that is a statement which he does not believe himself, or which he made without a knowledge of the facts, because it is simply not correct. For instance, he mentions Thomas Mitchell, of Toronto, who received a salary of $750. Well, Thomas Mitchell was on the temporary staff at a salary of $730 a year, and provision was made for that. The only provision that was not made was for the increase of $20. Then, with reference to the port of Montreal, at the last session at which I brought in estimates, I provided for the transfer of eight supernumeraries who had been in the temporary employ of the Customs Department for from seven to fourteen years, from the temporary class to the permanent class; and I provided in the permanent salaries in the Estimates for every one of them, deducting a corresponding amount from the estimates for temporary clerks. The salaries being within a few dollars of each other, the only real change made was the transfer from the temporary to the permanent list. It was the same with many of the names the hon. gentleman had read. Some of the cases were vacancies. For instance, it is true there was an increase of $300 in the case of the collector at Cornwall. The late collector had died, and a new collector was appointed and given that increase of salary. At Fort Erie, G. House was an old temporary employee of the Customs Department, and he was placed on the permanent list; and so with many others. The Controller of Customs says that his estimates for the service of the Department this year, or what can properly be charged against him, amount to

$928,000, though he is asking the House for $950,000. He repudiates that $22,000, because, he says, it is largely to pay accounts accrued in the previous year. Well, suppose the hon. gentleman is correct—which I do not admit—what has he to say about my estimates? He says I spent for the half year $448,000. Multiply that by two, and it will make $896,000, or $32,000 less than his own estimates for this year. That $448 000, which was spent in the first half of the fiscal year, included the pay of a large number of temporary employees, who were not engaged in the other six months at all; and I can safely say that in the port of Montreal, 30, or 40, or perhaps 50, men are engaged during the season of navigation who are not employed during the winter months at all, so that a much smaller amount will be required for the latter half of the year. But, even allowing that an equal amount would be incurred, that would make, as I have said, $32,000 less than the hon. gentleman finds it necessary to run the department for the present year. I say he is not justified in coming before Parliament and asking for such a large and unnecessary amount. More particularly, as he had told us that he has given notices to many officials that their services will not be required. If that be the case, surely not so much money will be required as last year, yet he is asking just as much, and there is no province where a larger expenditure can fairly be asked for except in the province of British Columbia, and even there scarcely any increase is needed. He says that these appointments which he read, and which were made by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), were not provided for. They were provided for out of the $28,000 additional to the main estimates of the last fiscal years which the hon. member for Brockville asked for. Besides that, there is a sum of $5,000 voted each year for unforeseen expenses, out of which these new appointments could be met.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If they were provided for, how is it I have this $11,000, in round numbers, to pay out of 1896-97?

Mr. WALLACE. I have not access to the figures, but I venture to say that there is a number of items which Parliament voted and which have not been expended, and which could be used for this purpose.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The whole vote was used, and you have those thousands of dollars to meet besides.

Mr. WALLACE. The $28,000 that Parliament voted in the Supplementary Estimates last year provided largely for these expenses.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That has been spent too.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, if the expenditure exceeded the amount appropriated by $11,000, Parliament voted $902,000, and that makes $913 000, yet the hon. gentleman asks for $950,000, and allowing him the $13,000, that still leaves his demand $937,000.

Mr. QUINN. I have just a few words to say in support of the stand taken by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in advocating Mr. O'Hara's claim. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has told us that it is only when an exceedingly strong case is made out that it should be taken into consideration. Well, Mr. Chairman, on this occasion an exceedingly strong case has been made out. Mr. O'Hara has been in the service of the department over thirty years. He has occupied in the service a unique position. He has held the highest positions in it, and gained that position by his exemplary conduct and great ability, and I say without fear of contradiction that he is the most efficient and best posted officer in the Customs service.

Mr. WALLACE. Where does the hon. gentleman get his information?

Mr. QUINN. From my personal knowledge of the man and from the business men of the city of Montreal, and from my intercourse with the Customs Department before the hon. member for West York was connected with it at all. And I got it also from the Minister of Customs who occupied the position for years before the hon. member for West York ever sat in this Chamber. I have great pleasure in saying that the last Minister of Customs (Sir Mackenzie Bowell), who occupied the position, is a very strong and ardent friend and admirer of Mr. O'Hara, and has given him his very strongest support. The hon. member for West York has also said that he does not think the Government has any intention of doing anything in the matter. I regret exceedingly that such an expression should have fallen from his lips, as it indicates exactly his desire and his course of conduct in the matter and indicates the reason probably why nothing was done by the last Government.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. To whom does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. QUINN. I am referring to the hon. member for West York, who said, in the course of his remarks, that he did not think the Government had any intention of doing anything in the matter. That expression of opinion no doubt indicates the reason why the late Government did not act. But I hope that the hon. gentleman has not expressed the intention of the present Government in the matter. I am prepared to take the statement of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), backed up by

the statement of the hon. leader of the Government this evening, who expressed his approval of the remarks of my hon. friend from Beauharnois—I am prepared to take their statements seriously as expressing the intention of the Government to do something in this matter, and not merely, as the hon. member for West York says, a meaningless declaration which will amount to nothing. I take it that the Government have given a serious expression of their intention in this matter, and I only hope that they will carry their intention into effect at as early a date as possible.

Mr. WALLACE. Our hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) says that Mr. O'Hara is the best posted Customs officer in the Dominion. I presume that our hon. friend is not a very good authority on that question. He will not get an approval of that statement from any man in the Customs service who is familiar with the facts. We have in the Customs Department many very able men, men who thoroughly understand the duties of the department, and who faithfully carry out the policy of the Government, and from my experience of the Department of Customs for three years, while Mr. O'Hara acted as collector of the port of Montreal, I cannot add my meed of praise to the statements of the two gentlemen from Montreal, who have not had the opportunity of knowing whether this gentleman has performed his duty properly or not.

Mr. QUINN. My authority for the statement I have made is the late Minister of Customs (Sir Mackenzie Bowell), who has supported Mr. O'Hara. And there is one thing I would like to point out. If the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) found that Mr. O'Hara was an inefficient officer, there was all the greater reason why a collector of customs should have been appointed instead of leaving Mr. O'Hara as acting collector of customs for two years as the hon. gentleman did. Surely the hon. gentleman stultifies himself by the position he takes here this evening in saying that Mr. O'Hara was not qualified for the position when he himself left Mr. O'Hara for two years as acting collector of customs.

Mr. BERGERON. Three years.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. O'Hara was acting collector of customs for one year after the hon. member left the position of Controller of Customs and while the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) occupied that position Mr. O'Hara occupied the position to the entire satisfaction of the merchants of Montreal and the general public; and I think that their commendation is more valuable to him than the commendation of the late Controller of Customs would be. I think Mr. O'Hara would stand higher with the people of Montreal than the late Controller of Customs would because one of the great sources of weakness in my campaign in Montreal was the conduct of the late Controller of Customs in the management of his department.

Mr. WALLACE. As to the statement that Mr. O'Hara is more highly regarded in Montreal than I am, I have nothing to say. I can only say that if Mr. O'Hara had performed his duties as faithfully as the hon. member for Montreal says he did, he would have stood higher in the estimation of the officers of the Customs Department than he does now.

Mr. QUINN. Mention a case in which he failed to perform his duty well.

Mr. WALLACE. He did not stand so high with——

Mr. QUINN. Let the hon. gentleman mention a case, and not merely throw out an insinuation.

Mr. WALLACE. I might repeat what a judge upon the bench said about Mr. O'Hara when he declared that he should have been dismissed from the public service.

Mr. BERGERON. What judge?

Mr. WALLACE. It does not matter?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes it does. What judge?

Mr. WALLACE. He was a judge who tried a case in which Mr. O'Hara was interested. Mr. O'Hara came before the judge——

Mr. BERGERON. What judge?

Mr. QUINN. How long ago was it, and what was the case?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman wants to know the case.

Mr. QUINN. Yes; and how long ago was it, and what were the circumstances?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know the circumstances, but I know sufficient to justify me in the statements I am making.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the name of the judge?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) can give us the name of the judge.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, I know him. Can the hon. gentleman name the judge?

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the hon. member for Beauharnois to name him.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not here to give lessons to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I have made the statement.

Mr. BERGERON. Let him name the judge. I know the judge, and I will answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I am making my own statement, and I do not intend to make it at the dictation of the hon. member for Beau-

harnois. I say that a judge on the bench made the statement that Mr. O'Hara was unfit to remain in the public service.

Mr. QUINN. What judge was it, and where did this take place ?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman knows all about it, and he can make whatever statement regarding it he likes. I am stating what the judge said. I have not the papers with me, but they are a public record.

Mr. QUINN. I think it most extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should make a statement of this kind without having the papers or being able to state some circumstances to support it.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about it, he knows that I am making a statement that is correct. The hon. member for Beauharnois knows that it is correct.

Mr. BERGERON. It is quite the reverse. I know what the hon. gentleman means But it is not correct.

Mr. WALLACE. This is the statement made by the judge.

Mr. BERGERON. What judge ?

Mr. WALLACE. The judge who tried the Ayer case.

Mr. QUINN. There has been no Ayer case tried for over 11 years.

Mr. WALLACE. What has that to do with it ?

Mr. QUINN. Simply this—the hon. gentleman became Controller of Customs after the Ayer case, and if Mr. O'Hara was shown by the Ayer case to be unfit for the public service, why did he not dismiss him ?

Mr. WALLACE. I was not aware of the circumstances in reference to Mr. O'Hara in this trial until recently. I can say further that it was not with my consent that Mr. O'Hara remained collector of the port of Montreal, because I was anxious that there should be no temporary appointment but that a permanent appointment should be made.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has said what he has said. The case he speaks of is the Ayer case, but he does not know the name of the judge.

Mr. BRITTON. You tell it.

Mr. BERGERON. I will. It was Judge Ritchie, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Mr. O'Hara was a witness for the Government, but notwithstanding that he was in the employ of the Government he stated the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know where the laugh comes in. Is it because an employee of the Government tells the truth ? The lawyer for the Government in the case was Mr. Macmaster, who has been a member of this House, and who is one of the leading members of the bar of Montreal and a great Conservative. Mr. O'Hara was brought in as a witness on the Government side, and he was an employee of the Government. But, as an honest man, he told the truth. Consequently, the lawyers of the Government, who thought they had a strong case, found that they were mistaken. There were a great many technicalities in the case, which a man of Mr. O'Hara's experience was able to understand better than the lawyers were. The judge in a moment of——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Weakness.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I will not say that. But he treated Mr. O'Hara very badly, I will admit that. But what is the consequence ? Mr. Macmaster, who is still living, while Judge Ritchie is dead, declares that Mr. O'Hara, in the testimony he gave before the court, was perfectly correct. Is it upon this that Mr. O'Hara is to be condemned ? Now, this committee represents the House of Commons, and I am very glad it has come down to this. It is upon the question raised by the hon. member for West York that justice is to be denied to Mr. O'Hara. No. This is one of the cases which explain something that the country generally has never understood and probably never will understand thoroughly. I refer to what happened in Montreal on the 23rd June last. One of the causes was the administration of the customs-house at Montreal by the Government at a time when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), I am sorry to say, was administering the Department of Customs. What happened in Montreal ? The election of Hon. James McShane and of Mr. Charbonneau—things that were corrected afterwards on the 23rd of June—are an answer to that. The Customs Department was administered in such a way that every business man in Montreal having anything to do with the customs, was angry with the Government. There was no collector, Mr. O'Hara was acting as collector. He was doing as well as he could, he was doing as well as any man dealing with him in Montreal, expected him to do. He must have been doing as well as the Government expected him to do, since they appointed no collector. My hon. friend who was then acting as Controller of Customs, would go to Montreal to meet the business men of that city, whether Conservatives or Liberals. He used to go down there, but would he call the business men of Montreal before him ? Yes, he would say to them by letter : Meet me at the Montreal customs-house at such an hour. But when he went there he would meet the members of the Orange order in Montreal, find out what could be done in the order, and he neglected the commercial business of Montreal. Everything was left in the hands of the man whom he says now

should not be paid because Judge Ritchie rendered judgment against him when he was a clerk, or said that he should be dismissed, a thing that the Government of the day did not believe in. But the Government had so little confidence in what Judge Ritchie had said, that they increased his salary and promoted him to the position of acting collector of customs. This is the way that the business of Montreal has been carried on by the Government of Canada. Mr. O'Hara has been acting three years as collector, doing his duty faithfully, to the satisfaction of the business community, and to the satisfaction of my hon. friend, because when he went to Montreal he never told Mr. O'Hara that he was not doing his duty. But the hon. gentleman would go into a room and meet his friends—not political friends, not the business community of Montreal, but his peculiar friends. And now he comes before Parliament and opposes justice being done to Mr. O'Hara, and I hope for the honour of Parliament, and for the honour of the Government now in power, that they will not listen to his reasons. I speak here in the name of the business men of Montreal. The Prime Minister, I know, is a just man. Let him call any one of his friends in Montreal and ask them if it is not true that Mr. O'Hara administered the business of the customs in Montreal to the satisfaction of every one. I will go further, and I will say that Mr. O'Hara has prevented the Department of Customs from committing blunders, because he refused to listen to the orders he received from Ottawa. He saved them from blunders by his remonstrance, because he knew more about customs than the hon. member for York ever knew or ever will know. This explains to-day the animosity of the hon. member for West York against Mr. O'Hara, which animosity he has carried so far as to try to-day to prevent the Government from doing justice to a man to whom justice is due.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has been speaking about a great many matters of which he certainly can have no knowledge, and which I am in a position flatly to contradict. He says that Mr. O'Hara prevented the Government from committing many blunders in the department. Well, I would invite him, with his vast knowledge, and with his sources of information, to state one case. I challenge him to state one case to verify his statement. He cannot do it. He is simply making reckless statements; if it were not unparliamentary, I would say, statements utterly devoid of truth, but as it is not parliamentary to say it, I will leave it unsaid. He says that when I went down to the customs-house in Montreal, I did not meet the business men. Of course, he has no means of knowing. That I flatly contradict, too. I did meet the business men of Montreal every week, or every month when I went there. I met them in the room of the collector of customs, or more frequently in the room of Mr. O'Meara, the inspector of customs, himself a Roman Catholic, and who was generally present. Mr. O'Meara will not say that on any one occasion I did not meet the business men of Montreal, but met the Orangemen. I never asked a man whether he was an Orangeman or a Roman Catholic. When I was acting as Controller of Customs I treated every man fairly and impartially, and the statement of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has not a particle of foundation in fact. He says that Mr. O'Hara is an excellent collector. Well, I have said but little about him, but I said I did not think the Government were considering seriously to give him the difference between the salary he was getting as assistant, and the salary of collector at Montreal, and I do not think so now. I may be wrong, but time will tell. I said further, that I did not approve of the system of giving increased salaries in such cases. Mr. O'Hara did not perform any more work, nor work any longer hours as acting collector than he should have done in any other capacity. In fact, a general complaint was made that he did not come down to his office until nearly eleven o'clock every day, not a very good recommendation for an increase of salary. I may say that Mr. Kilvert, who was collector at Hamilton, and has been acting commissioner here for a considerable time, and a most capable officer, went down to Montreal repeatedly to set Mr. O'Hara right, and to keep him performing his duties properly. He complained to me particularly when that French treaty came into effect, that all the friction that was caused in any part of the Dominion, originated in Montreal and was caused by Mr. O'Hara. Mr. Kilvert went down to see what the trouble was, and Mr. O'Hara said: Why, there is a gentleman over there who has just been finding fault with the Government regulations carrying the French treaty into effect. Mr. Kilvert spoke to him, explaining our regulation; he was a wine importer, and he said to Mr. Kilvert: I am perfectly satisfied, and I think your regulations for carrying out the French treaty are admirable. The whole trouble was caused, as Mr. Kilvert reported to me, by Mr. O'Hara, who either did not know, or did not take the trouble to find out, what it meant. At any rate, he did not interpret and carry out the regulations which were carried out in all the other ports of the Dominion, without friction. That was the only case I know of where any trouble occurred with reference to the carrying out of the French Treaty. I say that Mr. O'Hara, in my mind, is not entitled to the very high eulogiums passed upon him by those who know nothing of the Customs Department, who do not know what is necessary to make an efficient customs officer, and who, I am free to say, are quite incompetent and unfit to judge whether a man is a good customs officer or not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) said

that I never found fault with Mr. O'Hara. How does he know that? It is not a very pleasant thing to be continually finding fault with a man, but, as I have stated, Mr. Kilvert had to go down to Montreal, on a number of occasions, to smooth matters over at that port, because Mr. O'Hara was not the very best man for the position that he occupied.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, owing to the lateness of the hour, that it would be a very good thing, if we were to finish this item and get ready for concurrence to-morrow, if my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) thinks it better to have a session of the House to-morrow. I do not think we can do anything with concurrence to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would have wished that we could have taken one item on concurrence to-night.

Mr. BERGERON. I have something to say before this matter is passed over.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do not say any more.

Mr. BERGERON. I will not be stopped in saying what I wish to say on this question. We are interested that justice should be rendered to whomsoever justice is due. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) is most unjust to Mr. O'Hara, who cannot be here to defend himself. I can assure the House that, if a commission were instituted, the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) would be found to be entirely wrong. I did not come here prepared with a bag of proofs to enter upon a trial, but I can remember one case which I will submit to the House, and which I call to the attention of the present Controller of Customs. Here is the case. In the matter of the importation of the linings of pants pockets, there was a higher tariff put upon these articles in Montreal than was put on the same articles in Montreal and Halifax. These articles were entered at Montreal by three or four important houses, and they were charged a higher duty than if the goods were entered at Toronto. The merchants came here and remonstrated with the then Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace). They did everything they could to get justice, but they never got an answer from him. Mr. O'Hara, as an honest man, said to these merchants: "You are right; you should have the article brought into Montreal at the same price as it is brought into Toronto or Halifax." That brought the displeasure of the hon. member who was controlling the Customs department, down on Mr. O'Hara. The result was that some importers in Montreal got their entries passed in Toronto afterwards, so as to pay cheaper on these articles. There are very many more cases of the same kind. The Government, last night, took a vote of $3,000 to inquire into the penitentiaries, but I wish they had put in a small amount for examining into the customs-house, and they would probably find things that would startle them, and which would be the best answer to what my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) said.

Now, the French Treaty matter is all the reverse of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) said it was. The merchants of Montreal went to Mr. O'Hara, and asked him what they were going to do, and he told them. He is a man who has been twenty years in the public service, and he cares no more for the Conservative party than he does for the Liberal party. The Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) sent out orders from his department completely contrary to what Mr. O'Hara said, and, when Mr. Kilvert came to Montreal, he found out that Mr. O'Hara was right, and that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) was wrong. I will not drop this matter. I say, Sir, that, as a matter of justice, an investigation should be held into the administration of the Customs Department for the last few years, and I say that the members of this House would be startled at the revelations.

Mr. QUINN. It is exceedingly painful for me to be obliged to trouble the House for so long a time with this matter, but as I would consider myself a physical coward, if I were to allow a friend of mine to be slandered in my presence, so I would consider myself wanting in my duty to a friendship which I treasure highly, a friendship extending over thirty years, were I to allow to go unanswered the attack of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) on Mr. O'Hara. The hon. member (Mr. Wallace) has said that persons who have had no experience in customs or departmental matters in connection with customs, have no right to pronounce an opinion upon a question of this kind. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has acquired all his knowledge from a two-years' connection with the Customs Department, as Controller, from which office he retired, or—I do not know what—either at his own will or at the will of somebody else. He, therefore, sets himself up as the sole judge of what should be done, or what should be said in connection with every matter in regard to customs. I have not the same vanity as my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace); I have not the same record as Controller of Customs; but I have had a connection with the Customs Department of this country for the last fifteen years. I venture to say I have had a very much larger, and longer, and more important, connection with that department than had my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), even taking into consideration his two-years' controllership. I have had experience, not the experience of an office man, but the experience of a man of business, of a lawyer, who has conducted most important cases in connection with the Customs Department in Canada and the United

States. Not only that, but I have had intercourse with merchants in Montreal who know more about customs than the late Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) ever knew in his life, or ever could know. You will see his appreciation of the manner in which this matter should be judged by the very first statement he makes. He (Mr. Wallace) said that Mr. O'Hara had no greater work, and that no more of his time was occupied as collector of customs than as assistant collector of customs; and, because, forsooth, Mr. O'Hara has not worked over-time at nights, he should not be given his salary. Is that the basis upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) proceeds? If so, the labourers in the department worked longer than the collector of customs, and, on that argument, they should have received the $4,000 a year. According to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), it is not for the responsibility of the position that the collector of customs is to receive $4,000 a year, but for the length of time he stays in his office or the laborious work he does. I have only to mention an argument like that to show its absurdity. I am not in a position to contradict the hon. member (Mr. Wallace), when he states that Mr. Kilvert made a report to him, but it is unfortunate that the committee has not that report. I would ask the present Controller of Customs to see if that document exists, for, if such a document does exist, it will be in the records of the department. I confidently ask the Controller of Customs to see that report of Mr. Kilvert's; and if it is not one of those verbal and private reports which the late Controller of Customs has probably been in the habit of receiving in regard to his officers, but an official report, I trust the hon. Controller will examine it and base upon it his judgment in regard to the claim of Mr. O'Hara. The late Controller (Mr. Wallace) after setting himself up as a judge, and setting down everybody else who does not agree with him, says that Mr. O'Hara is not entitled, in his opinion at any rate, to be paid. But the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has read the opinion of the late Controller of Customs, the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) in approval of Mr. O'Hara's claim; and I have no hesitation in saying, what I had from the lips of Sir Mackenzie Bowell himself, that Sir Mackenzie Bowell would thoroughly sanction any vote that would be passed in favour of Mr. O'Hara, whom he looks upon as one of the most efficient officers in the Department of Customs. Furthermore, I have no hesitation in saying that at one time it was proposed, and was nearly being carried out but for the interference of the late Controller of Customs, to bring Mr. O'Hara to Ottawa as commissioner or assistant commissioner of customs. But he does not need my approval when he has the approval of such men as I have mentioned. I say it is only a matter of justice. Mr. O'Hara, since the time of which the hon. member for West York speaks, has received two promotions. He was at that time simply a chief clerk in the Montreal customs-house; that was in 1884. The hon. gentleman speaks of the case of Ayers & Co. I happened to be one of the counsel of the Ayers at the time, and I happen to know something about that case. It is not for me to say whether Judge Ritchie was right or wrong, as his judgment was in my favour. I know the circumstances of the case, and if they were disclosed to this House, they would not be to the discredit of Mr. O'Hara. But since 1885, when this trial took place before Judge Ritchie, Mr. O'Hara has received two promotions. He has been promoted from the position of a first-class clerk to that of pro-collector, as the position was called at that time; and later on, when the change was made by which Mr. Boyer was made surveyor, the then Hon. Mr. Chapleau, now Sir Adolphe Chapleau, created Mr. O'Hara assistant collector of the port of Montreal, in order to occupy a position superior to that of surveyor of the port. This was because the influence was so strong in favour of Mr. Boyer that he was appointed surveyor, and Mr. O'Hara's claims were recognized by his appointment to the other position with an increase of $400 to his salary. After this, so confident was the department over which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) presided, that it did not hesitate to leave the position of collector of customs at the port of Montreal open for two years, and it remained open for a year afterwards, during all of which time Mr. O'Hara occupied the chair of collector of customs. But my hon. friend says that was not at his wish. Probably he would not have any hesitation in telling us at whose wish Mr. O'Hara was kept there. Evidently at the wish of somebody who appreciated his services and understood the wishes of the department, or possibly at the wish of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who was Premier at the time. I do not wish to say anything harsh about anybody. Probably too much has been said already, and it would be well to throw some oil on the troubled waters; but I do ask the Government to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for West York, and hold an investigation, and see whether these charges which are insinuated by that hon. gentleman against Mr. O'Hara are true. If they are proven to be true, I will be one of the first to say he is not entitled to consideration; but having full confidence in his honesty and integrity after an acquaintance with him of over thirty years, knowing well his ability in the position he occupies, knowing well his interest in the public service, after the experience I have had with him in many cases in which he has been acting against me on behalf of the Department of Customs, and knowing well how highly qualified he is

for his position, I have every confidence in urging his claim upon the Government, and asking them to hold their investigation, which I am perfectly sure will be conducted in a perfectly fair and honourable manner.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure the House must be greatly edified with the statements made by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn), in which he has told us of his great legal abilities, his conduct of such great and important cases in the courts, and his very wide and extensive business experience. I do not suppose there was a member of this House aware of these facts until the member for Montreal himself so modestly informed the House of them. We cannot dispute them; why should we? Has not the hon. member himself told us what a great man he is, what a great light he has been in Montreal, and consequently what a magnificent luminary he will be in the Parliament at Ottawa? There is quite a contrast, however, when you compare that eulogy of himself with the statement he has made with regard to the late chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada; I think that was the position held by Judge Ritchie. The chief justice, I believe, was acknowledged to be a gentleman of high legal ability, who was promoted to that position, which I suppose our friend the member for Montreal thinks he is entitled to occupy better than Judge Ritchie.

Mr. QUINN. You will never occupy it or anything like it.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure I shall not, and I am just as sure the member for Montreal will not either. If appointed to a position commensurate with his great abilities, he might perhaps be police magistrate, but I do not think he would. I do not think any governing body that has the power of appointment, except the member himself, would appoint him to any judicial position. I think he has never demonstrated, notwithstanding his high eulogy of himself, his fitness to occupy any position. In reply to what I said, that Mr. O'Hara was not judged so highly by an eminent judge, I am told that was only Judge Ritchie, and I think the hon. member for Beauharnois told us that Judge Ritchie was mistaken in his opinion of Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. BERGERON. I never said that.

Mr. WALLACE. What then?

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman does not remember at all what I said. I said that Mr. Macmaster had said.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, that Mr. Macmaster had said that Mr. O'Hara was not such a character as Judge Ritchie had described him to be. That is Judge Ritchie's opinion, at any rate.

Mr. BERGERON. He is dead now.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, he is dead now.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we leave it all over till he comes back.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, Judge Ritchie after examining this man himself, has put on record his opinion of Mr. O'Hara; that is all I say about it. The fact that Mr. Mcmaster said that he did not think Judge Ritchie's opinion was deserved does not alter the fact that he gave that opinion.

Mr. BERGERON. The Government did not believe it.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know whether they believed it or not. I do not know whether it was called to the Government's attention or not. If it were called to their attention, and the Government did not take some action, they were derelict in their duty. With reference to the statement about myself, I have never posed as a very great man. The hon. gentleman says I will never be a judge of the Supreme Court. I do not suppose I ever will, and I am not going to commence the study of law now. I have not had the benefit of the study of law, except as one studies it in Parliament, and I am very glad of it, for one reason, and that is that I will not have to keep company with the hon. member for Montreal.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. member for Montreal will have something to say about that.

Mr. WALLACE. Both these gentlemen say an investigation should be held into the conduct of the Customs Deparment. If they chose to insinuate anything about my conduct as Controller of Customs, I challenge them to make an investigation. They dare not make a charge, they dare not go further than make a mean insinuation, they dare not make a statement impugning my conduct in any way while I was Controller of Customs, for three years. I challenge these gentlemen to back up their insinuations.

Mr. QUINN. I rise to a point of order. I did not say anything concerning an investigation regarding the Controllership of Customs or the late Controller of Customs. I did not refer to him any more than was absolutely necessary, for reasons best known to myself. I referred simply to the investigation he suggested with regard to Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not raising a point of order.

Mr. WALLACE. As the learned gentleman does not even know enough of law to know what a point of order is, I do not think I need make any reference to a gentleman of such great legal talents and business ability. I say simply what I said before, that I challenge these gentlemen to make a statement or any charge that would impugn my honesty or my conduct while I

was Controller of Customs for three years. Further, he makes the insinuation that I left the department without my own consent. He might have confined himself to the first portion of the sentence, for it was with my consent.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Thank God.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman who made that remark ever occupies any position, I hope he will leave with his consent, and not be kicked out.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want the hon. member for West York to be under the impression that I said or insinuated anything against his administration, as far as his honesty or honour is concerned. Not at all. I would be sorry he would believe that. I said that the administration of Customs, during these years, was not satisfactory to the business men, and I am borne out in that statement by the fact that the business community asked for the establishment of a board, which would see that the same tariff would be imposed throughout every province. But, in saying this, I made no personal charge against the hon. gentleman. Had I thought that he was not honestly administering his department, I would not have supported the Government of which he was a member.

Resolutions reported.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION ACT.

Bill (No. 38) to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act, by dispensing with the preparation of the voters' lists in certain cases (Mr. Fitzpatrick) was read the second time, considered in committee, and read the third time and passed.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS--MEMBERS' INDEMNITY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I propose with the unanimous consent of the House, to move a resolution for a Committee of the Whole on the subject of allowance for days of absence. I propose that, instead of twelve days, which was formerly allowed, it be eight days. The following is the resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that for the present session of Parliament the deduction of eight dollars per day mentioned in section 26 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for eight days in the case of a member who has been absent from the sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some committee thereof, during such number of days, but that this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the said Act, and that in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present session it shall not apply to days prior to his election.

Resolution considered in committee and reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE introduced Bill (No. 40) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, which was read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolution adopted in Committee of Supply, September 29.

Salary of an additional county judge in Manitoba $2,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I would like to add a word or two to what was said when this matter came up in the committee. I now produce the additional informations asked for at that time. I produce a letter from Judge Walker to Attorney General Sifton, and a telegram from Attorney General Sifton when this matter was under consideration a few days ago. The principle upon which judges should be appointed was considered by the House, and the Prime Minister said that as the organization and maintenance of the courts were under the control of the local legislatures, when the appointment of a judge was declared to be necessary, it was the duty of the Federal Parliament to make the appointment. When he made that statement there appeared to be some doubt about it in the House, and I thought myself it was perhaps rather wide in character, that the assertion was somewhat sweeping. But after having looked into the authorities I find that the statement made by the Prime Mnister was practically that made in substance by Sir John A. Macdonald and by Sir Alexander Campbell, when dealing with a matter exactly similar to the present one, that is to say, the appointment of a Supreme Court Judge in British Columbia in 1879. Sir John A. Macdonald used these words, as found on page 118 of the first volume of "Hansard," for 1880 :

But, as has been said before, it is very difficult indeed for the federal Parliament to decide, when a wish is expressed by the legislature of any province, that it should be disregarded. The constitution, organization and maintenance of the courts are left to the provincial legislatures. The costs and responsibility for the administration of justice, excepting the salaries of the Superior Court judges, are thrown upon the different provinces, whose governments are responsible for their peace and good government. So that, when a provincial legislature passes an Act, declaring that an additional number of judges is required for the due administration of justice, it is incurring a great responsibility for the federal Parliament and Government to say : You do not want them ; you can administer justice and keep the peace of the land without them. As a general rule, I think we may safely trust to the discretion of the provincial legislatures in this regard.

Further on, he goes on to say :

The burden of the administration of justice is thrown on the provincial legislatures ; and

when such powers are given them exclusively, we having no right to interfere with their powers, it is assuming a very great responsibility for us to say : Although you declare certain judges are wanted, and have passed an Act constituting a particular court, we refuse you the means as required to carry that policy into effect.

These are in terms almost the words used by the Prime Minister. Another prominent authority, Sir Alexander Campbell, spoke on the same subject. He was speaking in 1880, because the Bill was first rejected by the Senate and came up the second time for consideration. His statement will be found in the Senate debates, page 460 :

The House is, no doubt aware, by the British North America Act it rests with the provinces to make their arrangements about the courts and judiciary divisions and general arrangements of that character in their several localities. The section is 92, subsection 14 of the Act gives exclusive powers to the local legislatures in the administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts. The province of British Columbia, in the exercise of this power, has passed an Act by which an alteration is made in their system of judicature, they have proposed to add two judges to the Supreme Court—and they do that in lieu, I believe, of some local or district judges who now exist. It is the duty of the Parliament of this country to provide salaries for these two additional judges, and that is the object of this Bill.

He goes on :

I should be very sorry to see anything of the kind happen. Whether they have done right or they have done wrong, it seems to me it would be very unfortunate if the legislature of the province were counteracted in a plan of this kind, by the refusal of the Parliament of the Dominion to grant the salaries necessary for the judges. It would be an attack upon their autonomy, which might be attended with very unpleasant and untoward circumstances and which might result in considerable inconvenience.

I draw special attention to the next sentence and to its applicability to the present condition of things in Manitoba :

I should be particularly sorry to see anything of the kind occur just now in British Columbia, where, unfortunately, the people are not over content as matters stand ; and where, in my humble judgment, they have some ground for grievance against the Dominion, without adding anything to it by refusing the salaries of two judges, to establish the court which they consider desirable.

He goes on to say, speaking about the necessity of appointments :

But in my mind, as long as they are there, we must listen to them as representing the views of the people of British Columbia, speaking in a proper and legitimate way. This Bill is brought in to give effect to the Act which they have passed. I understand from some hon. gentlemen, who are good enough to support the Government in this House, an opinion has got abroad that the Government is indifferent as to the success of this Bill, and that they would not complain if it did not pass through this House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand both these references are to the same Bill ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. Now the same matter came up in the House of Commons, and Mr. Edward Blake, who was then a member of the House, spoke on the subject, but he would not go so far as Sir Alexander Campbell and Sir John A. Macdonald. He said it was true that the organization and maintenance of the courts was within the scope of the powers given to the local legislature, but that the Dominion Parliament are trustees for the people of Canada, and we ought, in the exercise of our discretion, to see that when a court is constituted, it shall be provided with judges. We ought to exercise a discretion in the matter. That is the limitation made by Mr. Blake. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said that when reports of this sort came before him when Minister of Justice, they were careful to make an investigation to ascertain if necessity really existed for the appointment. I will draw his attention to two cases I have in my hand. One case was the last appointment made in Manitoba, the case of Mr. Lock. My hon. friend pretends that in this case we had not made proper investigation, whereas I have produced the report of the Attorney General, and the letter of the judge, and I have referred specially to that which was said the other night by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). I gave all this evidence. What evidence had my hon. friend before him in the case of Judge Locke.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What year was that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was to Sir John Thompson, in 1894. What has the Minister of Justice then before him ? He had a private letter written to him by Mr. Daly, saying that he wanted this appointment made.

The PRIME MINISTER. Read the letter.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The letter is dated 21st July, 1894, and in it Mr. Daly addresses the Minister of Justice as follows :—

My dear Sir John,—

I ask to have Mr. Carter Locke, Q. C., appointed return revising officer for Lisgar in the new constituency carved out of the east end of my own.

As Mr. Locke is my nominee, for the new county court judgeship in Manitoba, could he not be appointed county judge previous to his appointment as revising barrister, or the appointments made simultaneously. His appointment would be for the southern division of the eastern judicial district of Manitoba.

That is all there is in the record. There is not a single word, not a single request from the judge, nor any manifestation of a desire on the part of the Attorney General as to the necessity for this appointment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was not that to fill a vacancy ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, this appointment was made because an Order in Council was passed by the executive of Manitoba creating a judicial division. Notice was taken of that Order in Council, and this appointment was made. Now, there is a good deal more than that. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) referred to the Quebec case, and he said that in the province of Quebec new judgeships had been created by the local authority, and that these vacancies had not been filled.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said that application had been made under that statute passed before confederation, and re-enacted afterwards, providing for the appointment of assistant judges, so-called, and the department had not acted upon that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The section of the statute my hon. friend refers to was passed, not for any case that has ever occurred since confederation. The second statute was passed to appoint 'ad hoc' judges for the Superior Court, and assistant judges, but the object in view at the time that first Act was passed was to enable assistant judges to be appointed to replace these judges that had been taken from the bench to codify our laws. As a matter of fact, when the three judges were taken to codify our laws in 1857, two judges were appointed to replace them. Mr. Parkin, whom the members of the Quebec bar will remember, was made a judge; and Mr. Taschereau, afterwards judge of the Supreme Court, was also created a judge. In our province you have 'ad hoc' judges constantly appointed in so far as the Queen's Bench is concerned. As a matter of curiosity I took occasion to look into the number of appointments that were made since confederation under this provision applicable to the Court of Queen's Bench in our province, and there have been no less than forty of them. I have a few of them in my mind now. One was when Judge Ouimet was appointed to replace Judge Baby in the Queen's Bench, and another when Judge Marcus Doherty was appointed to replace Judge Church. This is constantly done in the province of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen opposite consider the system of appointing 'ad hoc' judges a grave scandal, but I may say 'en passant' that the thing is done continually in our province and we have never suffered any inconvenience from it. There is no judicial system in the world where 'ad hoc' judges are not to be found. Let me deal now with the case in the province of Quebec to which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) referred. There are vacancies which might be created in Quebec now; two in the Queen's Bench under the statute of 1890, and one in the district of St. Francis; but none of these statutes are in force and they cannot be brought into force except by proclamation, which proclamation has not been issued. But, Sir, nothwithstanding the fact that no proclamation issued providing for the appointment of an additional judge in the district of St. Francis, what did the late Government do ? They proceeded to prepare for the appointment of a judge of the Superior Court in the district of St. Francis, and notwithstanding that the statute was not in force and could only be brought into force by proclamation, to what source did hon. gentlemen opposite go for information as to the necessity for the appointment of that judge. They applied to Mr. Justice White, then judge of the district, by letter of the 3rd of January, 1896. That is exactly a similar course to what is pursued in this instance. In addition to that they applied to the Attorney General of the province by letter of the same date. These are the two sources from which they sought information, and these are the same sources to which we have gone in this Manitoba case. Let me read the answer of the Assistant Attorney General of the province of Quebec, acting for the Attorney General in this matter :

> The Attorney General has requested me to say in reply to your last letter dated the 23rd inst., in relation to the appointment of a second judge of the Superior Court for the district of St. Francis, that he regrets that circumstances over which he has no control prevented him from answering your favour of the 3rd of January before this.
>
> There is no doubt in the Attorney General's mind that there is enough work in the district of St. Francis to warrant the appointment of a second judge. As to the advisability or possibility of transferring a judge from some other district to the district of St. Francis, this is a question upon which the Attorney General is not prepared to express an opinion.

That is not a very strong request from the Attorney General for the appointment of an additional judge. Far from it. It seems to me that it is a very strong suggestion that there are probably enough judges to do the work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is speaking of a transfer and not of an appointment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am speaking of an appointment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Without statute and without authority.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, yes, I will show you how it is an appointment. I will refer you to what took place after the letter of the Attorney General was received. How did my hon. friends of the late Government proceed ? They did it in this way :

> Mr. Dickey moved that the House do go into committee of the whole on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts by providing for the salary of an additional judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, at a salary of $4,000 per annum.

Whereupon Mr. Dickey informed the House that His Excellency the Governor General having been informed of the subject-matter of the said proposed resolutions, recommends it to the House.

Ordered that the House do go into committee of the whole on Monday next to consider the said resolution.

Here is a resolution introduced for the purpose of giving effect to this appointment. Of course, the matter did not go further, for I presume that it suffered the fate of all the other suggestions of the late Government during the last session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the judge was not appointed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, and why? It seems to me that my hon. friends opposite did their best to appoint him, when their Minister of Justice introduced a resolution asking an amount necessary to provide for the salary of the judge, and the amendment of the statute. Surely the Minister of Justice would not have done that had he not intended to give effect to the resolution. I am mentioning this, not for the purpose of any reproach to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), but simply to show that in this matter we have taken the same precautions that the late Government did when they came to make an appointment for the District of St. Francis. They applied to the Attorney General of the province and to the judge of the district. These are the two sources to which the late Government went. When this present appointment came to be made, we got our information from the same sources upon which hon. gentlemen when in power relied. Further than that, when it came to be a question of making an appointment in Manitoba, our hon. friends made the appointment on the simple request of a Minister from the place, without any reference whatever to the local authorities. Surely, he cannot find fault with the present Government having taken the extra precautions they have taken in this case. Coming now to the other question, as to the necessity for this appointment, my hon. friend made a comparison of Manitoba with Nova Scotia saying that it was not proper that we should have an additional judge for Manitoba, when there were so few in Nova Scotia in proportion to the population. But the hon. gentleman has not made a fair comparison. The conditions are not at all the same. The means of communication, the area of the country, and so forth, are not to be compared at all. But let us make a comparison of Manitoba with British Columbia, and what do we find? The population of British Columbia is about 100,000; it has nine judges, and the expense of maintaining these judges amounts to $31,450 a year. In Manitoba, where this new judge is to be appointed, there is double the population and the same number of judges, and the expenditure will be $28,600. That seems to be a fairer comparison than the other. I do not wish to take up the time of the House any longer. I must express my gratitude to hon. gentlemen opposite for enabling me to make this statement. I give the House these facts and figures, and I place the report I have here at the disposal of the hon. member for Pictou.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I almost regret, though for some reason I do not, that I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House to consider the subject a little further, not at very great length though at too great a length for the present sitting. I have looked carefully into the subject, I have followed the hon. Solicitor General with great interest, and I think there is a little more to be said which may be of some advantage to the House. I, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until two o'clock in the afternoon of this day, and that Government Orders have precedence during the sitting.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 3rd October, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRINTING COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. GIBSON moved that the second and third report of the Committee on Printing be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what became of Mr. Boulet, and who is this Mr. Roger?

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Boulet is dead, Mr. Roger was recommended by the Queen's

Printer to be promoted to Mr. Boulet's place, and his promotion effects a saving of $400 a year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Roger is a splendid man for the work.

Mr. GIBSON. The committee thought that Mr. Botterell was entitled to help inasmuch as his office is kept open until one and two o'clock in the morning. The other man appointed at $500 a year is a new man and a graduate of Toronto University.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation. It will be in the recollection of the House that quite a discussion arose recently in connection with the contract of Mr. Morrison for the mail service between Hawkesbury and Sydney. I find an editorial in the Halifax "Morning Chronicle," of the 30th September, that does myself a gross injustice, and with the permission of the House I will read an extract from that article:

So the distinguished member for Richmond, Cape Breton, had an apparition of political blue ruin staring him in the face something over a year ago, and it cost the treasury, not the exchequer of Mr. Gillies, to scare off the apparition something like $6,300. That is, the mail contract between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney was relet to John Morrison for $9,000, at the very time that there was a tender in the Postmaster General's Department at Ottawa offering to do the work for $2,700.

* * * * * * * * * *

Here was Mr. Gillies, M.P., for Richmond, C.B., able to have a $9,000 contract continued for another year, with an offer in the department to do the same work for $2,700.

I wish to say there is not a scintilla of truth in this statement. There was no tender for $2,700 now or at any other time in the department to do this service. Consequently there was no tender for that amount for me to head off nor any tender headed off by me. The tenders were regularly called for by the department, and two were filled—one by Mr. McInnis to do the work for $6,970, and the other by Mr. John Morrison for $9,000. The former withdrew, and the tender of the latter was accepted. The department could not do otherwise. I can only say that the statement is a base, contemptible, wanton, wilful and malicious perversion of the facts.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions adopted in Committee of Supply, September 23, 24, 25, 28.

Clothing and necessaries, ordinary vote.. $90,000

Mr. TAYLOR. I read a letter here a few days ago from Captain Webster Augustus, who had been sail-maker for some 18 years in the military stores at Kingston. I asked the Minister of Militia if he had been dismissed for political reasons, and the Minister replied that such was not the case. I received a letter this morning from Captain Augustus, in which he says:

I must thank you for bringing my name before the Minister of Militia, who, I understood to have said that I was not discharged for political reasons, but that there was no person needed there. However, there were two men sent to the militia stores this morning to take my place. This is economy with a vengeance.

And he inclosed a clipping taken from the "Whig," which says:

Albert E. Brough and James A. Jaquith have been appointed as assistants at the military stores department, where the return of stores from the volunteer camps has brought a great increase of repairing, assorting and storing. Harvey Chadwick has been allotted the carting for the military college, not for the military stores.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to call the attention of the leader of the Government to the fact that it deprives the House of all the freedom it ought to have on concurrence, to have the Ministers absent. Now, this is an important matter. The Minister made a statement that a certain person was dismissed because there was no work for him to do. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has information from the dismissed gentleman that two already had been sent to do that work, and the hon. gentleman reads, in confirmation of that, an item from a newspaper. The other Ministers, of course, do not know the routine of the Militia Department and cannot give an answer to the hon. gentleman. I have two or three matters with regard to post offices, to which I wish to call attention, and I do not see the Postmaster General here.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Postmaster General will be here in a moment. I am sorry to say that the Minister of Militia has suddenly been called away on urgent business.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he be here on Monday?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, he cannot be here on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. It is awkward that the Minister of Militia is not here, but I suppose, if the business is urgent, his absence cannot be avoided.

Post Office —	
Mail service	$2,336,000
Salaries and allowances	1,223,295
Miscellaneous	207,120

Mr. FOSTER. There were certain questions which the postmaster General was to answer in concurrence on this item with reference to the vending of the stamps at the Toronto post office. I wish to ask, in the first place, what is the gross amount of the sales at the post office under the former tender of Mr. Dixon, and what does the

commission amount to per year? I would like to know, also, who Mr. Hewitt is, as to whether he is a resident of the city of Toronto, or where he comes? Also, whether the Postmaster General is assured of what he said, that Mr. Dixon is a member of a wholesale house in the city of Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). If I have not the answers to all the hon. gentleman's questions, I hope the hon. gentleman will excuse me, because I have been working in my department and did not know this question was coming up at the moment. I had a letter from my deputy on the subject, which, I am sorry to say, I did not bring with me. Speaking from memory, the letter informs me that Mr. Dixon's profits from the office amounted to something over $1,300 a year, and at 1 per cent that would represent gross sales of about $30,000. I have the precise figures in the letter, but I dare say that is close enough. Mr. Dixon is a member of a wholesale firm, as I learned in a communication directly from himself. Mr. Hewitt is a resident of the city of Toronto, and has been a resident.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He is not a resident.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a resident. I think he is a gentleman about seventy years of age. I observe in the morning's "Citizen" that he is described as the private secretary of His Excellency the Governor General. I was not aware of his having that position. He was at one time a hardware merchant in the city of Toronto, but was unfortunate in business many years ago, and has never since been able to recover himself. Being advanced in years, he has been in very straitened circumstances all this time. I may tell the hon. gentleman, and I think he will find it to be the case, that public opinion in the city of Toronto wholly acquiesces in the action of the department. I would say that since that letter was last before the committee, Mr. Dixon communicated with me, stating that he had devoted nearly all the proceeds of the office to works of charity; and on that point I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of his statement. He stated further that he was willing to undertake to devote all the profits of the office to charity, were he allowed to retain it. So the House will see that no pecuniary loss was occasioned to Mr. Dixon by the transfer of the office from himself, he having devoted, and being prepared to continue to devote, the proceeds generally to charity. So that the Government in selecting a most worthy object of charity, Mr. Hewitt, have really lived up to the spirit of Mr. Dixon's views.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the $1,300 profit over and above what he paid for clerk hire?

Mr. FOSTER.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have no knowledge of that. The deputy gave me that as the profits on the business out of which he would pay the expenses. I would further say, and I am not disclosing any breach of confidence in saying it, that reference has been made to Mr. Samuel Blake, and my colleague in the Senate was asked the question there as to whether the department had or had not received a communication from Mr. Blake strongly protesting against this transfer. I gave Sir Oliver Mowat the answer on that point which, perhaps, I may repeat here, and it was that there had been no letters of that character received from any Liberals or from any person. I have received something of the nature of an inquiry on the subject from Mr. Blake, for information, and when I replied, I received yesterday another letter from Mr. Blake, which I do not happen to have in my pocket at the moment, expressing his entire approval of the course taken, and his belief that Mr. Dixon would also acquiesce in it. So I think it will be found, ultimately, that Mr. Dixon wholly approves of the course I have taken.

On this point I may perhaps be allowed to say, in corroboration of the statement I made when we were in Supply, that these licenses were not regarded as creating permanent claims, that a similar instance was brought to my knowledge a few days ago in the case of the Montreal post office. On the defeat of the late Mackenzie Government, a Mr. Perry, a most worthy man, aged about seventy years, at that time enjoyed the license for vending stamps in the Montreal post office, and promptly on the defeat of the Government, that license was rescinded. I have seen the official letter, and I think it was read in the Senate, and will be found on record. But speaking from memory, I think he was called upon to resign his insignia of office inside of a couple of weeks, and that was a case in which I think the action of the Government provoked some criticism. I think this Mr. Perry was, like Mr. Hewitt, a man in straitened circumstances, and his only source of revenue was derived from the license for vending of stamps in the Montreal post office. So that the action of the Government in rescinding Mr. Perry's license practically took the bread out of that man's mouth, while in the case of Mr. Hewitt, my action has resulted in putting bread into his mouth.

Harbours and Rivers—Collingwood harbour, improvement of; and improvement of navigable channels, Rainy River $35,000

Mr. FOSTER. I was not in the House when the item passed the committee, but I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance to the items 320 and 322 on page 193. I want to ask my hon. friend the Minister

of Finance if he will not agree to substitute the word "income" for "capital," with reference to these two. I find that Collingwood Harbour, Rainy River and Nanaimo Harbour are being paid just the kind of expenditure we have been doing for years out of consolidated revenue fund, and as to their circumstances exactly on a par all through these estimates—I find they have been charged to capital. The reason why I make this request is two-fold. In the first place, because there seems to be no reason why they should be differentiated from other expenditures of like kind. It entirely vitiates all possible comparison that can be made. When I was Finance Minister, I found when I went there, two items of the kind which were put to capital. One of these was the St. Lawrence River. My hon. friend will remember that a few years ago, out of that capital which we had expended under the harbour commission, we assumed two or three million dollars. That was considered a great work, and it was done out of capital, of course. After it was turned over to the Government there were still two or three years' expenditure in order to complete it. I had an understanding with the Minister of Public Works then, that just as soon as it was completed the maintenance thereafter would be put to the consolidated revenue fund account. I do not know whether this little sum of $3,000 is for the completion of the main channel, or whether it is for the yearly maintenance. If it is for the yearly maintenance I would ask my hon. friend to charge it to income, and if it is for the completion, of course it is right to charge it to capital account. For some reason or other the Kaministiquia work had been started on capital account, and I agreed with the then Minister of Public Works that in order to keep the comparison it should be so charged until it was finished, but what the Public Works Department intended to do seems to have been completed now. My hon. friend will see that these three items should all go to income for the sake of comparison. Of course in the end it all comes out of the one pocket but it is better that we should have it right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I took office I found that in the Supplementary Estimates which were left in the department by the late Government, Collingwood harbour had been put down for $50,000 charged to capital account. I followed the same practice.

Mr. FOSTER. If these Estimates had been discussed in Council, I woud have suggested that they should be placed to income as they always have been.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the same in the case of the two other works also.

Mr. FOSTER. If the suggestions meets with the approval of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) it can be easily changed in the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was done in the past and I do not see why it should be changed now.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that it is vital that he should not pick out some of those and charge them to capital account, without following the rule. We cannot have any comparison at all if that is done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the Supplementary Estimates prepared by the hon. gentleman's predecessor to be submitted to the House, these works were charged to capital and the Minister of Public Works followed what was the usual course.

Mr. FOSTER. Not to be submitted to the House, but to the Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to assume that the former Minister of Public Works in preparing these Estimates intended that these works should be charged to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. We have rigidly kept to the rule of charging these to income. If Collingwood harbour is to be charged to capital what reason in the world is there that another harbour should not be charged to capital?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have been informed by my officers that works of a permanent character costing large sums of money should be charged to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not referring to this in any party sense at all. We have spent from $30,000 to $60,000 a year on Victoria harbour and it has always been charged to consolidated account. In your own estimate, harbours and rivers also all through are charged to income. Take the telegraph extension line below Quebec and it is the same thing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will admit that, as to the question of cost and permanency, there is no comparison between these works and the works that are now charged to capital account. I had no other object in preparing my estimates than to follow the precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has done just the opposite. We have been building a post office in Vancouver, a permanent work which will cost $200,000; we are building a drill shed in Halifax, and we have built drill sheds in Montreal and Quebec which cost $250,000, and they have always come out of income. There can be no solid rule if my hon. friend does what he is doing now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The statement made by the Finance Minister as to the nature of these Supplementary Estimates which the Minister of Public Works found in his department, is calculated, although unintentionally, to mislead the House. I happen to know something about the Public Works Supplementary Estimates, because I had a conversation with Mr. Ouimet, and what he stated to me was this—and every gentleman who had a seat in Council at that time will remember it perfectly well—he stated that that list of expenditures which he brought to Council was simply a list of the requests which had been made to him by gentlemen in various portions of Canada. He had put down every item that he was required to, but simply for the purpose that these gentlemen could have the privilege of having their requests discussed by Council. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) also stated that he was prepared to recommend certain items, but certainly not nearly all the items which were placed on the list which he brought before Council.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that. At the same time hon. gentlemen opposite must not forget that nearly every member on the other side of the House has risen in his seat and stated that he has been promised such and such an amount for works in his constituency. I know myself that these Estimates have been placed in the hands of members who have made their elections on them. On many occasions members belonging to the other side of the House have called on me, and have stated that they have been formally promised all these amounts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be no question about the course to be taken in this matter. We are all anxious, I hope, that there should be the means of furnishing to the House and the public a fair comparison between the Estimates of one Government and another. My hon. friend, the late Minister of Finance, has shown that there has been an invariable practice pursued in relation to this matter, and he has asked that this estimate shall be so corrected, which can be done by a stroke of the pen, as to enable us in the future, as in the past, to have a fair and legitimate means of comparison. Why should there be any difference of opinion about that? If that suggestion, carrying on its face such perfect fairness, is refused, what will be the result? Why, Sir, all confidence will be destroyed; and it will be a matter of discussion, and complicated discussion, which ought not to arise at all, as to whether hon. gentlemen have made out the Estimates in a fair and honourable way, so as to admit of a comparison of one estimate with another, or whether they have changed the system in such a way as to present a comparison of an entirely deceptive and illusory character. I cannot imagine any gentleman on either side of this House having a moment's hesitation in maintaining the principle so far carried out, of placing these Estimates upon such a basis as will admit of a fair comparison being made. I hold that there is nothing that will be more disadvantageous to hon. gentlemen opposite, or will afford a more solid ground for attack upon their mode of conducting public business, than to take, without precedent, large sums of public money which have been chargeable to consolidated revenue in the past, and make them chargeable to capital. Why, Sir, there would be an end to all fair comparison and legitimate discussion; and I do not think there ought to be a moment's hesitation on the part of the Minister of Public Works, when the matter is called to his attention, in acceding to the suggestion. Otherwise the question will arise whether any person can place any confidence in the Estimates put before the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not think the matter is of sufficient importance to justify delay. The items are not large, and at this stage of business, when we are all anxious to bring the session to a close, the question is of so little importance that I do not feel disposed to adhere to the contention; and, therefore, in order to avoid delay, if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works does not object, I would be willing that the word "capital" should be erased, and the word "revenue" inserted in its place. But I must demur to the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition that the hon. Minister of Public Works has pursued an unusual course to justify in any way the suspicion that he desired to afford an opportunity for unfair comparison.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not suggest or insinuate anything of the kind; but I pointed to what would be the result or the impression. I take for granted that it was purely accidental, and I am very glad the Minister of Finance has consented to put it in the right shape.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must add that the Minister of Public Works, in putting this item under capital account, did not pursue an unusual course. He simply followed the example of the Minister of Public Works in the preceding Government, who had prepared an estimate in which this item was put down to capital account. Whether or not that item was ultimately passed in Council does not, at this stage, seem to be a matter of importance; but it is perfectly clear that the Minister of Public Works in the last Ministry understood this to be a capital charge, and placed it in his Estimates as if it was a capital charge. Perhaps he made a mistake. Perhaps, when the item came before the Minister of Finance of that day, he would

have advised a different policy; but the Minister of Public Works, in putting this item down to capital account, did not pursue an unusual course, but merely followed the example of his predecessor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was not suggested that it was anything but an accident.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). As regards Nanaimo harbour, I think in all probability the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is right. As regards Rainy River, I am not quite so sure. I think this is in connection with what is known as Fort Frances lock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I rather think the original expenditure on that was charged to capital.

Mr. HAGGART. Fort Frances lock was part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. This is for the improvement of navigation in the rapids of Rainy River.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think Fort Frances lock was considered as part of the Canadian Pacific Railway in rerum natura. I never myself approved of the way the hon. gentleman opposite divided capital from income, as he knows. For instance, a great deal of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway was charged in that way which ought to have been charged to ordinary income. As a result, under him and his successors the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, on which capital we get no interest, was increased by $20,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And it seems to be going on to-day in these Estimates.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I objected to that process. I am not quite sure that I would not object even now to some extent, as to some of these items. But it is a question of fact, and not of argument. If these items were formerly charged in that way my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would be quite right. Kaministiquia harbour stands in pretty much the same position, and several of these expenditures in the North-west were charged to capital, and I think also the expenditures at Cape Tormentine.

Mr. FOSTER. No. I will give my hon. friend an instance in point. We have been spending for the last ten or twelve years from $30,000 to $50,000 a year on the Fraser River, for the purpose of securing and keeping open the channel and making it navigable for ships of large depth. The whole of that has been chargeable to income, and not to capital. The improvements on the Rainy River will come under the same definition. On the St. John River also, there have been improvements by dredging and blasting, from confederation up to the present time, all chargeable to income. But there is another case still more in point, that is, the Negro Point breakwater at the city of St. John. That has cost $300,000 or $400,000, and it has been constructed entirely out of income. I do not want to discuss this in any other spirit than from the merely financial point of view and for the purpose of keeping regularly the account. The hon. gentleman has brought down $100,000, added to the $40,000 of last year, to the new post office at Victoria. That is a large amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not affect the principle, as to whether you should apply it to capital or income. Take another case, the Negro Point breakwater, $20,000. That is not under contract. My hon. friend may get that done by contract or not, as he pleases. Then, you find Owen Sound harbour, where there is an improvement on which we have spent a great deal of money. That has all gone to income. My hon. friend has $20,000 in the Estimates for that same purpose. On the Toronto harbour works we spent altogether over $500,000, every cent of which was charged to income. We have in the present Estimates $50,000 for that work, chargeable to income.

Mr. SPEAKER. As a result of a conversation, rather than debate, which has been going on, I understand it is agreed, with reference to these three items, 320, 321 and 322, that item 321 shall stand where it is, under the head "Chargeable to capital," and the other two "Chargeable to income."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I observe, in the Supplementary Estimates which the hon. gentleman intended to bring down, Collingwood harbour was charged specifically to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. That is to what the Minister of Public Works charged the two in these.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may add that I observe Cape Tormentine harbour was charged to capital in the Estimates, which were acknowledged, at any rate, by the hon. gentleman's colleagues.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My hon. friend's experience will confirm what I say, that it was not unusual for departments to submit estimates in that form and have them changed before Council. This was never submitted to Council, and, no doubt, it would have been changed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The works which were charged to capital

as follows:—Geological Museum, $20,000; Cape Traverse, $300,000; Cape Tormentine harbour, $200,000; Rimouski harbour, $50,000; Collingwood improvements, $80,000.

Commission for investigating the affairs of the penitentiaries of Canada $3,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am opposed to this item being adopted, and I would like to say to the Government that I consider the explanation given as to the necessity for $3,000 being appropriated for a commission to examine into the affairs of penitentiaries entirely unsatisfactory. I put a fair proposition, I think, and a fair test as to the necessity of an expenditure of this kind, to the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the other evening. The hon. gentleman had brought down a comparative statement, showing the cost of maintenance of the different penitentiaries, particularly, contrasting with the expenditure in the central prison, Toronto, with the expenditure in two penitentiaries. For reasons which occurred to me at the moment—I had not the opportunity of making an examination into his comparative statement—I thought I saw an explanation of the discrepancy. But, at the end of the discussion which took place, and an interesting discussion it was, I put to him this proposition, which he curtly refused to entertain. I asked him whether, if this amount were passed, he would undertake to ask his inspector of penitentiaries for a report on that statement that he had submitted to the committee, and in respect of which he was not able himself to give a satisfactory explanation, before appointing the commission. I cannot understand at the present moment why he refused to entertain so reasonable a proposition. But he said that he would give no such undertaking. He said, in effect: I have not consulted my inspector, who has examined these penitentiaries, and I will not, at your suggestion, ask him for a preliminary report or explanation as to the discrepancy of these figures, before going into this extraordinary expenditure. I think that a very unsatisfactory position for the Government to assume in connection with this matter. Since that discussion, I have had put into my hand an explanation from a gentleman who followed the discussion. The reason that the expenditure in the Dominion penitentiaries seems so large per capita of the prisoners, appears to be the difference in the way in which the accounts for the central prison and the accounts for our penitentiaries are kept. For instance, in the published reports, to which the hon. gentleman, no doubt, had reference, the returns in the case of the central prison leave out the salaries, while in the case of the other prisons the salaries are included. The contrast, of course, would be most adverse to the penitentiaries. But, taking into account the salaries in both cases—I refer to Sessional Papers of Ontario, 1896, Central Prison report, page 22, and the last report of the Department of Justice—the central prison cost per capita, in 1895, $166.59, or, leaving out salaries, $102.52. In 1894, including salaries, it cost $159.47; excluding salaries, which amounted to $60.46, the net cost was $99.01. Taking from the figures the hon. Solicitor General gave the salaries, amounting to $116.61 per capita, we find that the average cost per capita in the St. Vincent de Paul was $115, instead of the figure which the Solicitor General gave, of $234, to compare with the central prison, $99.01. And of this, $9.40 per head was the extra cost of heating. So that in the St. Vincent de Paul, with the long-term convicts, the cost really compares favourably with the central prison, being only about $6 per head more. Then, in Manitoba, taking from the gross of $541 per head which the Solicitor General gave, the salaries and revenue, as they are deducted in the case of the central prison, the expense is found to be $197 per head, as compared with the central prison, $99.01: and of this, $50 was the extra cost of heating in the colder climate of Manitoba. It must be noted, also, that there are only 82 convicts in the Manitoba penitentiary, as compared with the overcrowded central prison. I am not going further into these figures, but I may say they corroborate the strong opinion I hold, from careful study of the subject during the time I was in the Department of Justice. These are the reasons that prompt me, even in the absence of the Solicitor General, before the formal approval of this vote, to ask the leader of the House that such a proposition be not entertained. It is surely not an unreasonable proposal to come from this side, or from either side, that, before spending a dollar of that money, this officer, who was appointed for this very purpose, shall have an opportunity of making an official report upon that statement of the Solicitor General. Then, if it is found that his answers to the questions so suggested are not satisfactory, and it is found that further investigation is necessary, then, and not until then, they should appoint their commission for further inquiry. I have shown that the comparison made by the Solicitor General, one of the chief reasons he gave for the inquiry, was in no sense complete.

While opposing strongly the granting of this sum, I would withdraw that opposition, on the assurance from the leader of the Government that they would not issue the commission until the inspector had made a report on those questions which were put to him by the Solicitor General.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not object much to the proposition just expressed by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), but I have a decided objection to the length to which he carries it. It may be advisable that, before this money is expended, the present inspec-

tor of penitentiaries should be asked to make a report, and it may be, that, after this report is made, it will not be necessary to go any further. But the question whether the Minister of Justice should afterwards decide to have the inquiry or not, must be left entirely to his own judgment, as he is responsible for the administration of the penitentiaries. At the present time we enjoy the advantage of having at the head of the Department of Justice a gentleman who has been for some twenty years Attorney General of Ontario, and in that capacity has obtained great experience in the management of prisons and institutions similar to penitentiaries. After having had this long experience in the administration of prisons, he comes to a new department, where he has to administer a similar class of institutions, and he finds that there is such a discrepancy between the cost of the former and those he has now to administer, that he thinks it necessary to have an investigation. The hon. gentleman said there was no occasion to have this investigation, because the discrepancy can be explained in the manner he has suggested. I am not prepared to say that there may not be a good deal in what he says; but I am sure my hon. friend must agree that if the Minister of Justice still thinks it advisable to go on with the investigation, it is proper that this provision should be made for his doing so. I need not say to my hon. friend that Sir Oliver Mowat is a gentleman whose prudence, caution and experience are well known, and that he may be safely entrusted with the expenditure of the money.

Item concurred in, on division.

Steam communication, fortnightly, between Liverpool, Great Britain, and St. John, New Brunswick, during the winter season of 1896-97 not less than ten round trips $25,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In our arrangement of the steamship subsidies, we have decided to reduce this amount from $25,000 to $20,000. I, therefore, move that it be reduced to $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend able to assure the House that we shall have just as good a service for $20,000 as we formerly had for $25,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expectation is that we shall have the same service. There has been no communication with the line on the subject, but we assume they would not object to the rearrangement. They would much sooner have $25,000, I am sure; but we expect the same service will be provided.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must remember—or perhaps he is not familiar with the history of this line—that formerly we gave this line $30,000 for monthly trips, or what were very nearly so. Some five or six years ago, we got a very greatly improved service, and gave them $25,000 for it. They were anxious to have a long-term contract under that improved service, with a lessened subsidy, but the contract was not made for a long term, and has been continued from year to year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the Beaver Line.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was the Furness Line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am increasing the Furness Line appropriation, but this item refers to the Beaver Line.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be sorry if the deduction of $5,000 would make a less efficient service. The very essence of a service is that it should be good. I supposed that communication had taken place between the department and the line. They were to give ten trips for $25,000, and they really gave fourteen.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Thirteen.

Mr. FOSTER. Ten were paid for, and they gave three or four extra trips. That was a great convenience, because these extra vessels took full cargoes away.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Under the propositions that are made, the St. John people get a great deal more than they had before. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact, which he will appreciate, that freights were very low last year. Freights this year, I am happy to say, have largely increased; I am not prepared to say how much, but I think I am within the mark in saying that freights to-day are probably 50 per cent better than last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid you are getting optimistic all at once.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I am speaking of facts. If I found freights were not rising, I would say so.

ADDITIONAL COUNTY COURT JUDGE —MANITOBA.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding for concurrence in the resolution for salary of additional County Court Judge in Manitoba, reported from Committee of Supply on Tuesday, 29th September.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate I desire to point out the curious manner in which this proposition happens to come before Parliament. One of the hon. members for Halifax (Mr. Russell) assumed, as I at the moment assumed, that there had been a considered action of the Manitoba legis-

lature preparatory to the request for this vote for an additional judge for a county court in Manitoba. His argument, the House will recollect, which was a very ingenious one, went to the length that the proper time for revising the action of the legislature was when the Acts were being revised by the Governor General in Council in connection with the power of disallowance. But, after the subject had been more fully considered, and the Solicitor General had made his last statement, it appears that this proposition has not even been considered by the Executive of the government of the province of Manitoba, but that there happens to be a general Act in that province whereby the Governor in Council may carve out and add to the judicial districts for county court purposes. Apparently, from the Attorney General's telegrams and the papers laid before the committee last night, the Executive Council may, in the future, so decide, and pass an Order in Council creating a new judicial district in the county court organization for that province. But they have not even done that. Therefore this particular proposition is absolutely without precedent, so far as I am able to discover, since 1867. The records show us that after the legislatures—as in most of the provinces they are in the habit of doing—have dealt with such a matter by a positive and final enactment, intimating a desire for the creation of a new judicial office: then that subject is considered by the Executive of the Federal Government, and action taken under the circumstances ultimately by this Parliament. There are, I think, only one or two exceptional cases of this kind, when, after that legislative action, this Parliament has irregularly and without warrant in law, as I shall show, asked for an appropriation for the fiscal year in order to pay a judge to be appointed for some new district at the time actually created. But here is a case in which the legislature has taken no action, in which the Executive of Manitoba has taken no action, and yet the Solicitor General proposes that we shall provide the salary for one year, for a judge who may be appointed, if the Manitoba Executive carry out the intention of the Solicitor General as intimated by this telegram, and add to the judicial districts in the county court organization of that province. I say that the position of the hon. the Solicitor General is without warrant, without precedent, contrary to the statute, and contrary to that well understood rule in connection with the organization of courts and the appointment of judges, which aims to make judges independent entirely of the Executive.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman say there is no judicial district now?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. None at all. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) is interested in that point, I will show, independently of what the Solicitor General indicated last night, that the Attorney General of Manitoba wires to him:

If Government appoints additional judge the intention is to readjust county court divisions, &c.

I need read no more of that telegram, but I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the statutes of Manitoba which I have examined, and he will see there the power which is given. Their system is unique and does not prevail in the other provinces. The statute says:

That the Lieutenant-Governor may from time to time alter and increase the limits of these various judicial divisions for county court purposes.

It is under that and other similar provisions that the Attorney General of Manitoba in this case proposes to act, as in the case to which I will refer later on, the Attorney General had acted when that appointment of Mr. Locke was made. A new additional judicial district was made in that case, but in this case they have not had the subject before them, except under that old Act giving these large powers to the Executive Council. In this case further, no Executive action of any kind whatever has been taken, but it is simply intimated that this is to be done, and pell mell, and in the most irregular manner, the Government at Ottawa rushes in—whether any discretion rests in them or not—to say: the moment this action is taken by the local authorities we must act. Even that ground is cut away from under their feet for the local authorities have taken no action whatever. I therefore say that this proposition is entirely without precedent and is fraught with the gravest possible danger.

The one or two exceptional cases—and they came before me when I was Minister of Justice—were, instead of proceeding in the regular way (which is by Bill asking this Parliament for the authority to appoint a county court judge, and on the constitution of his office by an estimate taken.) The moment the subject was brought to the attention of the department, I came down with a Bill and frankly explained that an irregular course had been taken apparently without the notice of any one, and legislation was immediately granted to put the matter on a proper basis. If we vote this money it is merely a vote until the first of July next for the full fiscal year, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to point out any authority under which they can issue a commission to a county court judge. There is no authority that I can discover. The general Act will not permit it, because that Act requires that the commission shall have a character of finality. In our Revised Statutes, chapter 138, there is this provision:

Every judge of a county court in any of the provinces of Canada shall, subject to the pro-

visions of this Act, hold office during good behaviour, and his residence within the county.

And so on. There should be ad hoc legislation in a case of this kind, but the Government have not promised to proceed by a Bill. They are taking an unusual course. In the procedure by Bill, there is the action of this Chamber, reviewed by the Senate. But tacking on a provision of this character to a Supply Bill practically means that there shall be no consideration of the subject whatever in the Senate; and I submit that after you have voted the salary for a county court judge for one fiscal year, you will search in vain for any authority under which a commission can issue to that judge. Whatever we may say as to ad hoc judges, no lawyer will contradict the statement that in order to create such an office there must be legislation. We need not enter into a consideration of the principle of such appointment, for the simple reason that there is no proposed Act under which a temporary judge may be appointed in the province of Manitoba or anywhere else. There was a proposition, which I understand has been withdrawn, in relation to the Supreme Court of Canada. Moreover, we have in this case no action of the Governor in Council of Manitoba. But suppose there had been any such action, as in the case of Mr. Locke, there would have been an Order in Council under the statute of Manitoba, creating an additional judicial district, and then the executive would have been in a position to deal with the subject. I say, then, that the practice has been for the local department of government to advise the Executive and Parliament as to the sufficiency of the facts, and as to the strength of the case, to warrant the Executive in adding to the annual expenditure of this country by making provision for an appointment. I find, after careful search since the last debate, ever since I have been in Parliament, that practice has not been disputed or questioned by any one in this House, but that the long concatenation of precedents is in favour of it. And so the Solicitor General, as I will show, had to go before the year 1882 to a debate which took place in 1880, when he got some countenance, not from gentlemen who act with him now, or who acted with the Liberal party then, but from the late Sir John Macdonald. But Sir John Macdonald, as well as all the other leading members on either side of the House, after 1880 acted on the principle for which I contended the other day. We have no evidence of the creation of a judicial district. There has been no vacancy, and no position created into which to put this man. Even if we were proceeding by a Bill, no action has been taken by the local council, by which he can be given a position at all. The Attorney General has reported his desire, and the county court judge certainly says he is overworked; but I submit that is not enough under any circumstances for this Parliament, even supposing all the preliminary proceedings to have been taken regularly. The Act of the legislature presupposes inquiry by the Attorney General, a report from the judges, and a most exhaustive examination; and, therefore, in this case, even if the other proceedings were regularly taken, we should have, not the conclusion of the Attorney General nor the conclusion of the judge, but the facts and the statistics upon which they reached such a conclusion. We have been creating a good many additional judges in the province of Manitoba. It was only in 1894 that we made provision, after the regular steps had been taken, for the appointment of Judge Locke. What we want is a statement of the arrears of judicial business, the state of the docket, the actual state of litigation in the district concerned. Certainly this Parliament has heard of no general complaint. This matter is suddenly, and in the most precipitate manner, thrown into this House. It comes here, as I have already pointed out, without the regular and ordinary consideration of the local authorities. The matter is, in the most extraordinary and suspicious manner, launched upon us; and for all this haste and this irregularity there is no warrant in law. As the Solicitor General was compelled to say the other night, as reported in "Hansard," this is a request for a provision for a temporary judge; and he endeavoured to make the proposition more palatable by saying that we could suspend this judge practically at the next meeting of Parliament by refusing to vote his annual salary, or the Government could refuse to bring the item down. For such an appointment, however, there is no legislation on the statute-book, and none is proposed; and we have the authority of the present Minister of Justice, that where there is no action taken other than a vote in the Supply Bill, the Government has no authority to take action in regard to that except for a limited period, the period of the fiscal year. Therefore, if we pass this item in the Estimates, there is only authority to pay this judge the sum of $2,000, and there is no authority to make his engagement extend over the year itself. I have contended, and I am strong in the contention, that, even with the Supply Bill, there will be no authority to issue a commission to him as a county court judge for the limited period of one year; and any act he should do, and any business he should conduct, would simply produce confusion and detriment to all the litigants who came before him. Now, what was it the Solicitor General proposed to do? I refer to this in order to show how absent has been all the careful consideration which has hitherto been given to the important question of adding to the expense of the administration of justice in this country. I want to call the attention of the House to what the proposition was when it first took form

before us. The Solicitor General, who had charge of the item, said :

It will be found necessary to amend our own statutes with reference to judges in Manitoba, and in that interval opportunity will be afforded to make the necessary inquiries to be in a position to give the information required.

What was the information required ? It was as to the necessity of this judge, and we were asked to make this appointment just for the year, as a temporary provision, and during this year an inquiry would be made into the subject. But to make clear what was the ground upon which the Solicitor General was acting, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked :

In effect the appointment can be made provisionally until there is more legislation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he says in effect that it is provisional.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

I need only refer, in addition to what I have said on the subject of such an appointment, to the absence of warrant of law, and to the fact that it offends the very idea on which the constitution of our courts throughout the country is based, namely, the absolute independence between the Executive and judiciary, but I shall refer to the opinion of a former Minister of Justice, the Hon. Edward Blake. In 1876, when a proposition of that kind was made in this House by Mr. Taschereau, then a member of this House, Mr. Blake gave a good sound constitutional reason against admitting the principle of temporary judges, thus creating uncertainty with regard to decisions besides introducing a new practice. And the First Minister, who was in the House when the Solicitor General had explained that this was a provisional appointment, as it is in every sense of the word, said, in debate, the other day :

To my mind the Solicitor General could never have said that the appointment contemplated in the vote was a provisional one, because there is no such thing under the law and the constitution of the country as a provisional judge. A judge, when appointed, is appointed for life, and can only be removed in the manner we know. Therefore, I think my hon. friend is quite mistaken in the views he attributes to the Solicitor General.

I call the attention of the First Minister to the language he then used. It is in accord with the statement that I have made that our laws only recognize, in all the statutes we have in regard to our courts, these life appointments. In the case of the county court judges, a removal is obtained in one way ; in the case of statutory court judges, it is obtained in another ; but they are both permanent appointments, for the best of all reasons, into which I need not go. There is no authority under which these judges can be temporarily appointed. There is no special legislation giving that authority.

That disposes of one view of the case. But we come to an important issue, which is not generally understood, and that is that when all things are rightly done—I do not admit that in this case they have been rightly done—by the local authorities, and there was an office created of a judge of a county or superior court, there was no discretion in this legislation, and our only duty was to make the necessary provisions and appoint a judge to the proposed office, and on that account it is important to call attention to the exact language of the Prime Minister. In the debate on this subject, he said :

It is our duty to take the action of the legislation in any province in these matters unless—there must be some limit to that—unless there is a case of absolutely gross fraud or something of that kind. Otherwise, this House has no power to revise the discretion of the local legislatures.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has not this House again and again declined, and properly declined, to provide the salaries for that local legislatures have provided judges ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware of any such cases and would be glad to hear of it.

Again he says :

I lay it down as a doctrine of safe government that it is not open to us to question that statute.

Again he says :

I tell him it is not open to him to question the provincial statute.

And again :

I shall be able to convince him by the debates of this House that the view I now take is not new but has been taken again and again by gentlemen who, at different times, have filled the office of Minister of Justice.

The statement, however, as the First Minister will see, is predicated on a position that does not exist here, namely, that if there be the necessary action, if there be a statute of the local legislature, then it is for this legislature, except in the case of gross fraud, to vote the money. This is not the case in this instance. There is no vacancy. There is a proposed office for Manitoba, but the local authorities have not assumed the responsibility of forming a new district where this judge will preside. Let us look at the authorities. The Solicitor General confined himself chiefly to cases which occurred in 1879-80, and, as I have said before, it was necessary for him to do so. But the subject has come up again and again since 1880, and after the last creation, whereby I am in a position to show that, with that qualification my statement was accurate, that the traditional practice and the regular procedure has been to consider carefully the reasons, whenever an appointment was challenged, and that the duty of the Department of Jus-

tice was to see that the Government was armed with the reasons for a judicial appointment, whenever it was proposed to recommend one to this Chamber. But in the case of 1880, what happened? The hon. gentleman did not give us the whole history of that case. He contented himself with the argument used by the late Sir John Macdonald in debate; but he did not point out that the Liberal party never hesitated, with regard to their view, until this extraordinary occasion, when no action has been taken by the Executive or the legislature. The Liberal party have hitherto always steadily opposed the idea or suggestion that this was not a matter where the Executive was responsible, or not a matter which appealed to the discretion of the legislature.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not I.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And the hon. gentleman who says "not I," as I will be able to show by his vote, has placed himself on record on my side of the case and no other. I shall give him the proofs. He will see that he sympathized in this view, and that the first time he opened his lips in the direction of the other, so far as a careful search on my part goes to show, was on this occasion; but on all previous occasions he either by silence gave consent to the other view or by his direct vote, as on the occasion in 1880, when he voted that the legislation of British Columbia, which contemplated the appointment of three additional Supreme Court judges, should be ignored.

And that though that legislature had said by a statute that they required that reorganization and required these three judges, he voted for an amendment that the Bill should not be read but should be voted down and that these judges should not be appointed. And I will give him the authorities on that point. Let us begin with 1877. (At that time, I think the present Prime Minister was a member of the Government, At any rate, Mr. Blake was Minister of Justice, and the county judgeship of Leeds and Grenville had been vacant for two years. Here was a position created by the legislature of Ontario. In the organization of the courts as settled by the statutes of Ontario, two judges were required for the county court district of Leeds and Grenville. In 1875 one of these judges died. And after the vacancy had existed about two years, on the 19th February, 1877:

Sir John Macdonald asked when the office of judge of the county court for the counties of Leeds and Grenville became vacant, and whether it was the intention of the Government to appoint a successor, and if so, when.

Mr. Blake said he was not in the Government at the time of the decease of the late judge of the county court for the counties of Leeds and Grenville, but he understood from the papers on the 11th of January, 1875. He was informed that two or three months after his decease, the First Minister received a letter from the junior judge informing that a settlement had been arrived at by which the duties of the district could be discharged. He did not think it in the public interest at that time without further complaint of the inefficiency of the administration of the law, to appoint another judge.

So that at that time, it is quite clear, the fact that there was the provision by the local legislature for the appointment of a judge was not regarded as sufficient of itself to enable the Government of the day to ask for an appropriation for this purpose. Then, in 1879, came the case to which the Solicitor General only partly referred. I may say that there was a very interesting discussion of this whole subject, and I would point out that, instead of the Government of that day, the Government of Sir John Macdonald, resting their case on the language which the Solicitor General actually quoted from Sir John Macdonald, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Macdonald went fully into the reasons for the legislation that had been passed in British Columbia. What was the case? The first reorganization of the judicial districts after the union, in a province that was being developed, was undertaken by the provincial legislature. All the questions of distance, all the statistics connected with the work of the judges and all the reasons that induced the local legislature to make that arrangement of the judiciary were put before the House. It is quite true that Sir John Macdonald leaned towards the view which Sir Alexander Campbell adopted in the Senate, that because the province of British Columbia had taken that action and passed that statute, as they had the right to do, practically all there was for this Parliament to do was to make the necessary provision so as to carry out the will of the local authorities. But let us see how that was considered. In the first place he admits that the Senate acted quite within their right in refusing to accept the views of Sir Alexander Campbell and rejected the Bill providing the salaries for these judges. When the question came up Mr. Mackenzie, who was leading the Opposition, and with whom the present Prime Minister was working in unison, said:

He desired to know if the Government considered this demand of the legislature of British Columbia as a reasonable one.

Later on in his speech—and I am not making these references brief for the purpose of unfairly helping my own case, for I shall give Sir John Macdonald's language, which to some extent, is against me—Mr. Mackenzie said:

He did not think that because the local governments had the power to create courts, we have nothing to do but fill these courts as soon as created.

And then to make a point against Sir John Macdonald and the view he was supporting at the time, he said, and I think with great force:

The Nova Scotia Government passed an Act establishing county courts in that province, which was brought to this House and he did not think the Act was an unreasonable one, but it created great divergence of opinion, and the Bill was ultimately defeated in the Upper House, though it subsequently became law. This House should not agree to a proposition of this sort, merely because the local government of British Columbia thought it necessary to have two more judges appointed to act in that province. Some grounds should be given on which this House should exercise its wise discretion, and he looked to the Minister of Justice for further information.

I think the Solicitor General did not fairly represent the views of Sir John Macdonald, though they come nearer his position than the views expressed by any other hon. gentleman at that time, except those expressed by Sir Alexander Campbell. But those views were never adopted, and Sir John Macdonald himself, apparently dropped them in 1880, because on subsequent occasions, as I shall show, he and his colleagues and successors yielded to the view which Mr. Mackenzie expressed in the words I have read. Sir John Macdonald is reported as follows :—

This argument was taken before, when this question arose, shortly after confederation. Mr. Blake, he believed, then took the ground that it was not a matter of necessity that the Dominion Parliament should sanction the legislation of every province with respect to the increase of judges, and the consequent expense of the administration of justice. That was assented to as a general principle, but it was argued, and he argued so himself, that when the responsibility of the administration of justice rested on the local governments and legislatures, it would be a very grave responsibility for the Dominion Government to take to oppose a solemn act of the local legislature, declaring that additional judges were required.

That, of course, is strong as far as it goes. Nevertheless, Sir John Macdonald on that occasion recognized the general principle that we have a discretion, which is denied by the Prime Minister on the present occasion. He says that the case must be strong for the exercise of our discretion, because there is an action taken specially by the local legislature. The Minister of Justice said—and I will give only one quotation, though I might give more, because the hon. gentleman went fully into the case :

Irrespective of increase of expense, the local legislature gave very strong grounds on the point of necessity, showing that parties charged with crime, had to undergo, often, twelve months' imprisonment before they could be tried, and, in many cases, then proven innocent of the charges.

There could not be a stronger reason given than was given on that occasion when the House asserted its right to look carefully into all the facts ; and I shall show where the present Prime Minister voted against the Bill then, though the promoter of the Bill was able to point out to him without being challenged in the statement that in British Columbia innocent men were practically imprisoned for months owing to the way in which the administration of justice was handicapped. Mr. Anglin, a leading member of the House on that side said :

He was not at all disposed to accept the doctrine, and he contended that before they consented to provide the salaries, they should be satisfied of the necessity that existed for the additional judgeships, and he did not think that they ought to be satisfied merely with the statement made by the local authorities, or made the provision because the local legislature created the office.

What was the action in the Senate to which the hon. gentleman referred briefly, and to which I wish to refer at a little more length ? When that Bill finally got through this House in 1879 and went to the Senate, it was warmly opposed by members from British Columbia. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall, after a long speech moved the six months' hoist. One of the members of the present Government, the Secretary of State, the Hon. Mr. Scott, and all the Liberals in that body, to a man opposed that legislation. Mr. Scott, in supporting the six months' hoist, said :

It does seem to me, that the Government is yielding probably to local prejudice in this particular case—to the fact that the legislature of British Columbia passed this Act, and sought to change the system ; and they have yielded, I think, rather too lightly in face of the large expenditure which has been entailed on the country in the administration of justice of that province.

For that six months' hoist the Liberals voted, including the present Secretary of State, the late Hon. George Brown, the present Speaker of the Senate, Mr. Pelletier, and other leading members who are now in the Senate. Without doubt, the Liberal party, without an exception, were consistently opposed, following evidently the lead of Mr. Blake taken early in confederation, to any idea obtaining whereby this legislature should be deprived of its full right to exercise discretion, and to review all these applications for adding to the expenditure for the administration of justice in any of the provinces. Now, then, the Bill came up the second time. It was defeated in the Senate, and in 1880 the Bill was re-introduced into the House of Commons, and again an interesting discussion took place. The Minister of Justice, on that occasion, no matter what the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald may have stated in debate, put his case on no such ground as the Prime Minister on this occasion ; but he argued again at great length for the Bill, and examined the reasons for the action of the legislature. He goes into the question of expenditure, he shows the great distance, the time taken in traversing the country in the absence, at that time, of transportation facilities. On that occasion, Mr. Blake spoke as follows :—

I have always maintained, while I had the honour of sitting here, that we are not bound, simply because a provincial legislature proposes the appointment of a judge, to provide a salary.

This was Mr. Blake answering the argument of the then Minister of Justice. He goes on to say :

I think any other view of our duties would result, in the nature of things, in a very expansive motion on the part of the local legislature, as to what the judicial requirements were. When you find one body creating judgeships, whose occupants are to be paid, not by their creators, but by another body altogether, it is natural that the creating body, not being checked by the consideration of the expense should be extremely liberal, and it is necessary that the scale of judicial requirements should be carefully scanned by those who are to bear the burden of paying the officers.

Then he says :

I quite agree that, as a general rule, unless there are good reasons the other way, great weight ought to be attached to a proposition deliberately made by a provincial legislature.

I will quote what Sir John A. Macdonald said on that occasion for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, because, in 1880, we find the last statement of such an opinion by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, although he was in this legislature for many years afterwards. He says :

The Act is on the Statute-book, and we think it is our bounden duty, as there is no evidence that the legislature of British Columbia acted through any improper motive, or any other motive than duty to the province, in the organization of the courts of justice, not to refuse it, by saying they were altogether mistaken, and thereupon refusing the salaries required.

To that the Hon. Mr. Mills answered :

The right hon. gentleman has taken a somewhat different view of this from that which he expressed on another question lately. He thinks the House must assume that the British Columbia government acted properly, unless it can be shown it acted improperly in this matter. I think the burden of proof lies the other way. I think the House is exercising an independent power ; it has undertaken to vote this money and when the hon. gentleman asks us to provide for payment of additional judges, on him devolves the responsibility of showing that additional judges are necessary.

Now, Mr. Mills refers to this case :

Certainly when county courts were wanted in Nova Scotia he did not take exactly the same view as the functions and duty of the House in the appointment of judges and in providing for their salaries, as on the present occasion. I remember that, then, the friends of the hon. gentleman in the other House rejected the proposal to provide for the payment of the judge in a court which the people of Nova Scotia thought necessary for the due administration of justice.

Now, then I pass over that case, the last case on which any such view was put forward by either political party. In 1880 we come again to this long standing vacancy in Leeds and Grenville. Here was a case of a county court judgeship, the vacancy of which occurred in 1875. Mr. Blake, speaking of the time when he was Minister of Justice, said :

It was then my duty to reply that, the administration, having made such inquiry as they could, and having received from the junior judge a statement that he was perfectly adequate to the discharge of the whole work, it was not thought to be in the public interest to make a second appointment.

And so he goes on to say later :

We considered that there was no reason for burdening the finances of the country with a second appointment to fill the vacant judgeship in Leeds and Grenville and I am not aware that there has been any special increase of judicial work in those counties, or that there has been any serious change in the labours and responsibilities of a judge since the time the sole incumbent of the office reported that he was thoroughly competent to discharge the whole duties. * * * Therefore, I thought it right to move for correspondence, and also to ask for a statement in detail of the judicial work in each year since confederation, in order that the House may ascertain whether there exists to-day any substantial reason for the appointment of this judge that did not exist formerly.

The then Minister of Justice in Sir John A. Macdonald's Government, answered :

The Government have made no promise, have made no appointment, nor have they made any selection whatever to fill the place to which the hon. gentleman refers.

It is idle for any one to pretend that the Government which took that position seriously entertained the view that they were bound to fill a vacant judgeship whenever it occurred, or to make an appointment whenever the office was created by the action of the local legislature. In 1880, on the final discussion on the Bill concerning British Columbia, in this House, Mr. Blake moved :

That any change in the judicial system of British Columbia should be based on the utilization of the existing staff of eight judges ; that the proposed legislation will involve the pensioning of five of those judges, in full health and vigour, at an annual cost of $8,000, and will thus increase the expense, while it will diminish the efficiency of the administration of justice in the province.

This was moved on the motion that the Bill be read the third time, and for that, the present Prime Minister voted, and the whole Opposition, declaring the view that Mr. Blake says he had all along expressed. For that amendment, as I have said, the Prime Minister voted, as did also the Liberal party, as a whole. His argument was that we were not in the slightest degree bound by the action of the local legislature, that we were responsible here, when voting the money, and he finally wound up with a motion that, if carried, would have defeated the Bill and prevented provision being made for the salaries. It is the strongest evi-

dence that can possibly be given that the view of the Prime Minister expressed in the House the other night, can find no support from the records of the Liberal party. The only view in the line of his argument which I have been able to discover, was given in debate by the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, in 1880, but never subsequently. His colleagues in the Liberal-Conservative Government after that, as I shall show, went upon what I consider the sound interpretation of the constitution which governs this case. In Sir John Thompson's time, as Minister of Justice, in 1894, there is an interesting reference, which shows the ground which that gentleman took. In the province of Quebec, there was a provision for the appointment of judges, and, on the 23rd of April, 1894, Mr. Lépine asked whether any action was to be taken under that law, which had been passed in 1891. It provided for the appointment of two additional judges for the Court of Queen's Bench. Mr. Lépine asked Sir John Thompson what action he proposed to take, no action having been taken up to that date. And the Minister of Justice replied :

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Act was left to its operation, although the Government did not concur in the statements made in the preamble thereof, as to the insufficiency of the Court of Queen's Bench, as now constituted, to perform its functions, and it was expressly stated that such action was not to be taken as an expression of opinion on the part of the Dominion Government that the appointment provided for by an Act should be made. The French Canadian senior member of the Montreal bar presented a petition in that sense, and also asked that the claims of their nationality be considered in any appointments to be made.

There is another, and even a stronger case in Sir John Thompson's time, and I find the First Minister was present in the House, and that he did not demur to the doctrine that was announced on that occasion. It is the case of the county court judgeship for the Kootenay district in 1894. The legislature of British Columbia had, several years before, provided a much stronger case for the appointment of a judge than has been made in the present instance. There is no creation of a judicial district now. There is simply the intimation of the Attorney General of Manitoba that they intended to create one. But the legislature of British Columbia had, three or four years prior to 1894, passed an Act creating a judicial district, and the Federal Government was asked to make an appointment. Sir John Thompson came to the House in proper way under resolution, on which he afterwards founded a Bill. He was asked in committee by the First Minister (Mr. Laurier), who was then leading the Opposition :

Mr. LAURIER. What is the increase ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of this resolution is to provide for another county judge for British Columbia, in the Kootenay District. That district was created a county court district by the provincial legislature several years ago. It has not been thought necessary to make the appointment, but it is deemed expedient to take the powers now, owing to the increased population of the district, and the population going there is of a class that requires the attendance of a court of justice.

The then Minister of Justice gave other reasons for the appointment than that the legislature had taken action in the matter. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) evidently did not share the view expressed by the leader of the Government the other night, because on this occasion, when in committee, he said :

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not wish to interfere in matters which, perhaps, belong more peculiarly to the legal members of the House ; but it does seem to me that an allowance of ten judges—five for the county court and five for the Superior Court—for a province with the population of British Columbia, is an extremely liberal provision for the administration of justice there, even after taking into account the largeness of the district. I understand that the population is not generally diffused over the province, but is chiefly found in certain districts or along the course of certain rivers.

Sir John Thompson went into the question at once, so as to vindicate his Bill, and he said :

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The number of judges would be quite out of reason if it were not for the fact that the population of the province is very much scattered, and the means of communication very difficult ; and the attendance of the judges at very distant places is absolutely necessary if we are to keep up civilization and the organization of the courts of justice in the country at all. These increases in the number of the judges in the province have been made very gradually. About ten years ago one or two additional judges were appointed for the Supreme Court, and about that time provision was made by the provincial legislature for six or seven county judges. Four of these, those of Cariboo, New Westminster, Yale, and Nanaimo, were appointed four or five years ago. Only after the lapse of four or five years have we decided to add one to the list, and that, as the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) stated, is really in consequence of an increase of the mining population in the Kootenay district.

No one will question for a moment that Sir John Thompson, at any rate, not only took the responsibility of delaying action after the local legislature had taken action, but he felt that the responsibility lay upon him in every case to satisfy Parliament that, in the interests of a more effective administration of justice, there was necessity for the proposed appointment, before asking for an increase of the financial burdens of the country. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), not being able to refer to the authority of any public man in this House since 1880, relying upon Sir John Macdonald's opinion in that debate—although other reasons were given by the Minister in charge

of the Bill—and finding himself opposed by the whole phalanx of the Liberal party upon this ground from 1867 down to the present time; the Solicitor General refers to one or two things which have occurred lately, and the inference he drew was that there was no such traditional practice in the Department of Justice as that to which I referred, and that I was mistaken, when I implied, the other evening, that that department had always regarded it as its duty to inquire thoroughly into the matter before any appointment was made. He first cited the case of Judge Locke, in Manitoba. Let me call attention to what was done in that case, and the House will see that the proceedings were entirely different from those in the present instance. Did the Government then come down and ask for provision for a judge because they heard there was action to be taken in Manitoba, or because the Attorney General of that province had sent a telegram or a letter saying that they proposed to create a new judicial district? Not at all. The executive in Manitoba having created a new judicial district in 1894, then Mr. Daly, who was a Minister in the Government from Manitoba—and I may point out that the present Government have no representative from that province who could settle almost in five minutes this whole question, and who would give us the particulars that I have asked, and which, I think, this House should demand before this expenditure is made—Mr. Daly, being in his seat in this House when Sir John Thompson introduced in the regular way the resolution for the appointment of this judge, rose, before any question was asked, and gave an explanation for the action—not that the Order in Council had been passed in Manitoba; but, speaking as a representative of Manitoba, as the Minister of the Interior, and as a member of the Manitoba bar, his explanation was:

> This is for the southern division of the eastern judicial district of Manitoba, along the American boundary, taking in the counties of Dufferin, Derby and Louise, one of the most thickly settled districts of Manitoba.

No question was asked, and the matter ended there. So far as "Hansard" tells us, nothing else was said. But the Solicitor General picks up in his office a letter written after the executive action in Manitoba, after parliamentary action here, even after the explanation of Mr. Daly, when the Government was not pressed for further information—a most natural letter from Mr. Daly, written on the 21st of July, in which he nominates, as of course was his right, Mr. Locke for the position, and suggests that before being appointed, Mr. Locke should be made revising officer; and on August 25th, Mr. Locke was duly appointed. Everything had been regularly done. Provision was made in Manitoba, and the explanation was given by the Minister of the Interior in advance of any inquiry. The Solicitor General said last night that all this was done without any manifestation of a desire on the part of the Attorney General as to this appointment; yet, strange to say, a moment afterwards he knocked that ground entirely away, by saying that this appointment was made because an Order in Council was passed by the executive of Manitoba creating a judicial position. I say it was nothing of the kind. It could not have been made without that order; but that order having been made, the Minister of the Interior, a member of the bar of Manitoba, being present in this House, gave all the explanation that was required at the hands of this Parliament. So that that reference assists him in nothing. Then, the hon. gentleman dealt with a case which I thoroughly understand myself. He spoke of the case of the district of St. Francis in the province of Quebec. That case is entirely against him. If he had been as conversant with that case as I am, he would have understood that when I spoke of the responsibility that rested upon him, I had that place in my mind. The most extraordinary pressure was put upon me from the district of St. Francis to have appointed, first, an assistant judge. I set my face against that, upon information which I obtained from the officers in my department—and I agreed with them—that that practice had not been followed in the past, and that it was not a practice that should be encouraged. Great pressure was put upon me; the batonnier of the district urged me to make the appointment; and I received memorials, which are no doubt in the department, pressing me to appoint another judge for that district. I declined, of course not abruptly, on the ground that until there was before me from the judges and from the Attorney General of the province information that satisfied me that no re-arrangement could be made by which the existing judges could deal with the business and the arrears in the district, I would not take the responsibility of recommending to Council such an appointment. My successor, Mr. Dickey, some months afterwards, went so far as to introduce a resolution into this House. I had started the initial inquiries; I had insisted on full information being given as to the condition of judicial business in the district; and after reports had been got, it appears that the Minister of Justice, Mr. Dickey, felt warranted in proposing a resolution in this House, though it got no further, whether for one reason or another I do not know. That is a case in point, and it is a case entirely against the position of the Government; because if that is the rule, how is it the present Government has not proceeded with that case? We heard of the case of the district of St. Francis long before we heard of this case in Manitoba. In the one case there is the local action and the pressure for years; and

yet there is no proposition to go on with Mr. Dickey's resolution. If hon. gentlemen are bound to act whenever local action is taken, and bound to appoint wherever the appointment of a judicial officer can be made, they stand guilty of the greatest dereliction of duty in that very case of the St. Francis district. I do not know what information Mr. Dickey had. If hon. gentlemen have no more information than I had, they are not bound to take action. But if their action in the case of the Manitoba judge be correct, they are, according to their own showing, guilty of great negligence in the case of the St. Francis district. I say it is not well for the administration of justice that there should be anything in the shape of indecent haste in these matters. Here we are face to face with an admittedly irregular course of procedure. The regular course in the appointment of a judicial officer, is, without doubt, to proceed by a Bill, whether for a county court or for a superior court in any judicial district of Canada. No one denies that; and we are also face to face with the fact that the local authorities have not yet formally moved. In most cases a special Act of the local legislature is required; in this case, the general Act requires that an Order in Council of the local government shall be passed. This has not been done by the government of Manitoba. The public will ask why this great haste? In a few months we shall have another session of Parliament, when the proper preliminary action can be taken; and yet, without that, the Government are in this irregular manner pressing, and I think most unfortunately pressing, the appointment of this judge. All reasonable men will admit that it is well, where the appointment of a judicial officer is made, not only that great care should be taken that undue expenditure is not imposed on the country, but that the appointment from every standpoint should be considered necessary in the interests of justice. That will be the prime reason of the appointment, and not, as many would think in a case of this kind, in the interest solely of party.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Mr. Speaker, the question before the House involves the appropriation of $2,000 in payment of a judge whom it is proposed to appoint in the province of Manitoba. The question underlying the propriety of this appointment is one involving the exercise by this Government of certain powers and duties bestowed upon it by the constitution in relation to the administration of justice in the Dominion. It is a very important question, and I think earlier in the session the lengthy speech of my hon. friend could not be complained of. My hon. friend was careful, and justly careful, while finding fault with the course laid down by the Premier and other members of the Government as to the course the Government should adopt in cases of this kind, not to lay down any hard and fast rule for himself; but he pointed out that the circumstances under which the Government should act cannot be defined; because the constitution vests co-ordinate powers in this Parliament and in the provincial legislatures with regard to the administration of justice, and it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to lay down in precise language the circumstances under which we should act, and the circumstances under which we should decline to act.

Now, we must, in coming to a conclusion, remember it is not the case of a superior power dealing with an inferior, but of two co-ordinate powers dealing with a question which is divided between them. The jurisdiction for the constitution of the courts is vested exclusively in the local legislature; the appointment of the judges is vested exclusively in this Parliament. When the local legislature, acting upon its exclusive powers, creates a court, the duty devolves upon us of appointing a judge for that court. The late Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell laid down the rule, almost too arbitrarily to my mind, that when once a local legislature had acted, this Parliament is bound to act. In other words, when a court is created by the local legislature, we are bound, by that very fact, to appoint a judge. My learned colleague, the First Minister, adopted that rule, with a qualification which commends itself to my common sense and with which I think my friend opposite hardly found fault. He said: I adopt that in full, with this qualification, that if there is clearly shown a case of fraud in the constitution of a court by the local legislature, or if a local legislature creates a large number of courts, or one court which, it is perfectly plain to a man of ordinary common sense, offends against common sense and against common justice, then this Parliament should stay its hand and pause and inquire. But subject to those limitations, we are bound to act. I venture to say that that condition or limitation which the First Minister put upon our power is the correct one, namely, that unless there has been an improvident exercise by a provincial legislature of the exclusive power which the constitution vests in it, of creating these courts, this Parliament has no right to interfere. If the facts are brought to our notice showing that there has been an improvident exercise of that power, we are bound to pause, as trustees of the people, but who has suggested here that any such state of facts exists? Who has ventured to say that this was an improvident exercise of power? My hon. friend had his answer from the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). He had his complete answer from that hon. gentleman, who is a practising barrister before the courts of Manitoba, thoroughly conversant with the facts, and who told us that not only was the action of the local legislature, in constituting this tribunal, one

that meets with his approval, but that the case is one of urgency.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. All that the hon. gentleman says is correct, except that I am not a barrister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman speaks with such precision and accuracy that I was justified in thinking him a barrister. However, he represents the people in Manitoba, and he told us, from his local knowledge, that he believes not only that the new judge is necessary, but that the case is urgent. What answer has the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) ? He has no facts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no judicial district created.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Having laid down the principle which, I think, ought to guide us, let us see what are the facts. The hon. gentleman says that no judicial district is created. Perfectly true, but how do we stand ? A local Act has passed the local legislature and been approved of by the Governor General. It is now, and has been for some years, the law of the land, vesting in the local executive the power of dividing the country into judicial districts and determining when there shall be additional districts. That is the law of the land. That law was not disapproved of. It was allowed to go into operation. No question was raised as to the propriety of it. Therefore we stand in this position, that the Executive Council of the province of Manitoba can create a new judicial district when and where they please. That being so, what has taken place ? We find that on the 10th of September, Judge Walker addressed a letter in Winnipeg to the Attorney General of that province, which, for future reference, I have placed on record :

Winnipeg, 10th Sept., 1896.

Dear Attorney General,—

You will recollect that soon after the passing of the amendment to the County Court Act extending the jurisdiction of the court, I expressed to you my apprehension that I would not be able to meet the work thereby imposed. Now, after a fair and severe trial, I must in justice to myself, as well as the suitors in the courts, again formally call your attention to the fact ; and respectfully urge your serious consideration of the necessity of ensuring the appointment of a puisné judge.

It is needless for me to specify particulars as I have been informed your attention has been frequently called by members of the profession to the amount of work cast upon me, and I might add it has been only through the kindest indulgence of the profession that I have been able thus far to cope with the same, although not satisfactorily.

Trusting that this may receive your most careful, earnest consideration.

I am respectfully yours,
(Signed) D. M. WALKER.

The Honourable Attorney General.

Two days afterwards the Attorney General of Manitoba addressed a letter from Winnipeg to the First Minister at Ottawa :

Winnipeg, Sept. 12th, 1896.

Honourable Wilfred Laurier,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Laurier,—

I have the honour to inclose herewith a copy of a letter received by me yesterday from Judge Walker, the senior judge of the county court in the eastern judicial district.

In my opinion it is necessary, in the interest of the proper administration of justice in this province, that an additional county judge should be appointed for the eastern judicial district. I may say that I have brought this matter before my colleagues and they all concur heartily in the opinion which I express.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Now, what have we here ? We have a judge recalling to the Attorney General's attention a fact of which he had personally spoken to him before, that he was overworked, that suitors were suffering, and that he had only been able thus far to cope with the business, through the kindness and indulgence of the profession, although he could not do so satisfactorily. The Attorney General concurs in that view, every one of his colleagues concur in it, and they propose to create a new judicial district. Then follows a telegram specifying the district which they intend to create. That telegram is as follows :—

(Telegraphic.)

Winnipeg, Man., 30th Sept., 1896.

Hon. C. Fitzpatrick,
Solicitor General,
Ottawa, Ont.

If Government appoints additional judge, intention is to readjust county court divisions. At present Judge Walker has northern division, eastern district, with fifteen sittings. This includes Winnipeg with its heavy business. Judge Prudhomme, central division, fifteen sittings ; Judge Locke, southern division, twenty-three sittings ; Judge Ryan, central district, twenty-four sittings ; Judge Cumberland, western district, thirty-seven sittings. It will relieve the judge of the western district to take away extreme southern courts at Russell, Shoal Lake and Minnedosa, which can be taken conveniently by Judge Ryan. Courts at Glenboro, Treherne and Carman, now taken by Judge Ryan, with headquarters at Portage la Prairie, could be more conveniently taken by judge with headquarters at Winnipeg. Proposed readjustment would be as follows :—Judge Walker and additional judge, northern division, eastern district, with Glenboro, Treherne and Carman added, and new court at St. Laurent, nineteen courts. Judge Ryan, with new courts at Dauphin, Russell, Shoal Lake and Minnedosa, twenty-five. Judge Cumberland, thirty-four. Judge Prudhomme, fifteen, as before. Judge Locke, twenty-three, as before. This readjustment would be more suited to the railway communication of the province. Principal difficulty arises from Judge Walker being overworked with county court and surrogate business.

CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Now, there is no man in this House, outside the members from Manitoba, who has the local knowledge necessary to say whether this decision is a good one or not. No one challenges it. No one, except those hon. members, has the local knowledge to enable him to challenge it. The hon. member for Pictou does not challenge it. We have the intention of the Government expressed clearly as to the judicial district they propose to create, and the reason why. We have that intention backed up by Manitoba members. Not a member from Manitoba has ventured to hint in this House that the exercise of that power by the Manitoba executive would be improvident or that the judge is not required. To hear the hon. member for Pictou talk, you would think there was no evidence at all. We are not asking the House to appoint a judge to-day. We could not do it, because the judicial district to which he is to be appointed, has not yet been formally established. Therefore it is not necessary to have a Bill. It is not necessary to have a Bill, but it is necessary to be in a position when the judicial district is laid out, which may be to-morrow, to pay a judge. We do not want to get an Act to appoint a judge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think you do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I differ with the hon. gentleman. We appoint a judge by virtue of the power vested in us under the constitution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What commission will you give this judge?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When we know his judicial district we will give him his commission for that judicial district.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under what authority?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under the authority vested in us by the constitution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And without statutory authority?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no other way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then his commission will not be worth the paper it is written on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman may think so. But this Parliament does not give commissions to judges by virtue of power conferred upon it by its own statute, but by virtue of the power vested in the Government by the British North America Act. And when the judicial district is created the judge for it will be appointed by the Government. We ask for the amount of the salary to be granted to him for the year.

It is not constitutionally necessary for us to pass a statute to provide salaries for the judges, but it is a proper thing for us to do. It would be an improper thing to vote that annually only because it would introduce an element of uncertainty into the question and would give the Government a power over the judges that the Government ought not to have. It is right that the salaries paid to the judges should be fixed. But, as the case is urgent, we ask the estimate to pay the judge as soon as the judicial district is laid off, as referred to in the Attorney General's letter. Now, the hon. gentleman intimates that he never would apoint a judge without some judicial inquiry—he would want to know the state of the docket, the number of remanets and so on. I submit that is not the course to take; I think that the hon. gentleman himself, on reflection, would not commit himself to that proposition. When the local legislature sets out a new judicial district and asks for the appointment of a judge and when this is endorsed by the judiciary of the province as it is in this case by Judge Walker and by the Attorney General and every member of the executive, for the hon. gentleman to say that he would refuse the exercise of the appointive power until he had investigated the state of the docket—I venture to say that that is a statement the hon. gentleman would not commit to writing and sign his name to. No lawyer would. I submit that the information which the Solicitor General spoke of and which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) entirely misunderstood him as requiring, was the information he got by his telegram of the 30th September as to the bounds of the judicial district proposed. The hon. gentleman sought to make out a case for himself in the first part of his address by referring to 'ad hoc' judges. It struck me that he had prepared that part of his speech with regard to another Bill, and, as that Bill was withdrawn and the speech was not fired off, the hon. gentleman thought——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; the Solicitor General referred to that, to the extent of about one whole paragraph in his speech.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I failed to see the relevancy of it, because there could be no question of an 'ad hoc' judge appointed here. The judge appointed to this judicial district, if this is legally done, must be a judge under the British North America Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the Solicitor General said this was a temporary appointment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood the Solicitor General.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all; I read his language.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Before we pass the Act we must have the judicial district properly set off, and then we can pass an Act fixing the salary. But once the judge is appointed——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will read the language of the Solicitor General. Mr. Foster says:

He says in effect that the appointment can be made provisionally until there is more legislation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he says in effect that it is provisional.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He says, in fact, it is provisional.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Solicitor General, no doubt, had in mind the fact that Parliament always has the power of refusing to pass any Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will read further:

The appointment is of necessity of a provisional character. I do not say that we cannot proceed to make the appointment after this item has been voted, but it will still remain in the close of the House, because until such time as the statute is passed the appointment is essentially provisional. Therefore, at any time, untill the statute is amended, by dropping this item in the Estimates, the appointment will cease.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman and I do not differ as to the manner in which the appointment is and must be made. There is and can be no doubt about it and there ought to be no argument about it. The British North America Act provides the tenure by which a judge shall hold his office. There can be no doubt about that. And this judge must be appointed as others are.

Mr. FOSTER. If you get this vote you issue the commission and appoint the judge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The moment the judicial district is created you can. If the judicial district had been laid out, we would have brought in a Bill to make his salary permanent, as in the case of other judges.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask for information, as I am not a lawyer. Suppose you get this passed and they lay off the district by Order in Council and the name of the candidate is sent down to you, will you appoint that judge as all others are appointed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Without an Act?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Beyond a doubt.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What do you want an Act for, then?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Act is not passed to give authority to appoint a judge.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) interrupted. He differs from the view I take——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say that every judge in Canada to-day, whether a county judge or a superior court judge, holds his office by virtue of a statute of this Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I say the creation and organization of the courts and the number of judges to be appointed in the courts is a matter entirely and exclusively belonging to the local legislature, and when they organize a court and fix the number of judges, then we, under the British North America Act, are bound to appoint the judges unless it can be shown that there is fraud or improvidence in the passing of their Act; and we get our power from the British North America Act, and not from an Act passed here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then you do not require an Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Act of Parliament is necessary in all cases.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because it is not decent or proper that we should be discussing year after year what salaries we shall pay to the judges. These salaries must be fixed and final. It is to give this finality and remove the judges from political pressure or the power of the Government that the statute is passed fixing their salaries—not fixing how the judges shall be appointed or what their tenure of office shall be, for that is fixed by the constitution, but fixing their salaries, and thus putting them beyond the temporary waves of passion and feeling and the influence of a partisan House of Commons. We all agree upon that. I am only saying that this case is one represented to be urgent; the hon. gentleman's friends on his own side tell him so; and we propose to act in the way we are doing, because it is urgent, to take an appropriation, and, when

the judicial district is set out, to appoint a judge, as all other judges are appointed, and at the next session of Parliament bring in a statute to make his salary permanent, the same as the salaries of other judges.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to point out an error into which the hon. gentleman has fallen. The tenure of office of county court judges is regulated by statute of this Parliament only. The power of appointment vested in British Columbia relates to tenure of office by superior court judges, but the Act that makes the appointment a live one, is in the Revised Statutes of Canada, and nowhere else.

Item concurred in, on division.

Amount required to pay for Ocean Mail service between Great Britain and Canada $126,533 33

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this late hour of the session, I do not intend to detain the House, but I would like to ask my hon. friend if he cannot produce the draft contract between the Messrs. Allan and the Government of Canada. I have just run my eye over the papers laid on the Table, but I do not find the draft agreement which was prepared and submitted to the Messrs. Allan, which they accepted and were satisfied to sign. The late Government submitted a report of the Privy Council to the Governor General, asking for authority to enter into that contract, subject to the approval of the Colonial Office, and to the contribution made by the Imperial Parliament, of £75,000 per annum. That was the position in which, as I understand it, we left the question. I took it entirely for granted, and we proposed the passage of an Act, but we were unable to get it accepted, by the concurrence of hon. gentlemen then sitting on this side of the House, authorizing us to invite tenders and enter into that contract, subject to the approval of Parliament, which, we thought, would enable us, by prompt action, to carry out the idea we held when that Act was passed, practically of saving a year. I may say that, although that Order in Council was not approved, I left a memorandum, or addressed a note to the First Minister, calling his attention to the position the question was in, and expressing the hope that they would be able to save a year's time in carrying the service to completion by promptly following the course which we had suggested. The papers on the Table of the House show that the Messrs. Allan, on both sides of the water, concurred in the proposal suggested, and that, in addition to a first-class steamship service of 20-knot speed, equal to anything crossing the Atlantic, so far as provision for passengers was concerned, ample cold storage should also be provided to meet whatever demand the Government made in relation to that matter. I do not find that draft contract or the report of Council which was submitted previous to our leaving office, among those papers. I think it was very desirable to have the whole position of this question in as perfect a form as possible, as far as it had gone. I need not explain to the hon. gentleman the great importance I attach to the measure, and the great value I believe this measure would be to Canada. But I should like to have all these papers printed, and I should be very glad if this draft contract was included, in order to show the exact position in which the question was left by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I made careful inquiry, in compliance with the request of the hon. gentleman, about that matter, along with my deputy, and my deputy informs me that he had never seen the draft contract. I think, if I remember right, I showed the hon. gentleman his letter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the draft contract was prepared by the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Still, I should have thought a copy of it, or the contract, would be sent to the Department of Trade and Commerce, in the nature of things. But, of course, things were rather hurried, of necessity, and that might not have been done. I did not inquire in the Department of Justice, and it did not occur to me that it might be there. It is possible, however, that it may be there. But I inquired in the Privy Council Office, specially of Mr. McGee, and I think my hon. friend brought down this afternoon some additional papers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I saw them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They give, I think, pretty clearly the conditions on which the Messrs. Allan propose to accept it, and the hon. gentleman will observe that they interpolated certain not unreasonable stipulations, perhaps, with respect to detentions by fog, by icebergs, or by other causes. Neither did they, as I think I pointed out especially to my hon. friend, withdraw apparently, nor through any communication we received from Mr. Dunlop, did they withdraw, the stipulation they made, that, if at the expiry of four months it did not suit them to go on with it, they might withdraw. I think I called attention to that, and the hon. gentleman will find a reference to it in a letter addressed by the Messrs. Allan to my hon. friend beside me, under date of 13th or 14th July. Of course, it is unfortunate for the purpose of this discussion, that we have not got these documents printed. The only parties, I suppose, who have seen them, are myself, and perhaps the member for York (Mr. Foster), and the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition himself. But I think that was the position of it, that the proposal by the

Messrs. Allan imported some stipulations into it. And I think, also he will find that Mr. Chamberlain's acceptance of the proposition was guarded. But, wholly and entirely apart from the question, which I think was properly raised by Mr. Chamberlain, that a contract of that magnitude and importance should be let by the incoming Government—wholly apart from that, as I read the several telegrams which passed between the Colonial Office and the Governor General, I think that Mr. Chamberlain only declared his intention of recommending—at least, that is the construction I put upon his communication to Sir Donald Smith—that £75,000; and I think he also spoke in one or two places of the necessity, in all probability, of having fresh tenders, by reason of the stipulations which the Messrs. Allan had introduced.

I think that on these points the hon. gentleman will find that I am correct as far as the correspondence goes.

Now, it is a matter which is open to some question whether, under the circumstances, such a proposition as the Messrs. Allan made could be regarded as a full tender and acceptance of the contract. It is a question perhaps for my legal friends beside me, more than for either the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) or myself. But I think if parties make a tender in which they expressly declare that, first of all, certain conditions must be understood with reference to the 20-knot service itself; and, in the second place, that they are not to be bound if after a period of four months they choose to withdraw, we can hardly regard it as a full and complete tender. That is the position of the matter so far as I am concerned. Of course the hon. gentleman and the House will understand that this is a question of the very greatest importance and magnitude. It is not a question merely of the expenditure of $750,000 for one year, but it is entering into a contract for a term of ten years for that amount each year, and if I remember aright, a sort of supplementary contract promising to spend $500,000 for each of the next ten years. In any case, while we must fully recognize the extreme importance of the whole business, we feel that we would require to proceed with very considerable caution and deliberation before we committed ourselves to an expenditure involving many millions, and also, which is perhaps more important, we felt that if we made any mistake in this matter; if we entered into a contract for a class of vessels which did not in all respects answer the expectations of the people of Canada, we would be held, and justly held, to very serious account by the people at large for having committed ourselves to such a contract without full consideration. The matter, I may add, has been engaging not only my own attention in the capacity of Minister of Trade and Commerce, but the attention of all my colleagues in so far as they had time to take up the subject. We propose, now that the session is over, to lose no time whatever in endeavouring to obtain such full and complete information on the whole subject, as may enable us to conclude a reasonable arrangement on this subject.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to take advantage of the discussion of this matter of Fast Line, to offer a remark or two. Whilst many advantages may result from a fast line of steamers between the old world and this, in order that there may be rapid transit for passengers as well as freight; still I may say that there are some drawbacks, and they are of no small importance. Perhaps there is no county in the Dominion that suffers more largely in the matter that I am about to refer to than the county of Lunenburg. Scarcely a year passes that we do not lose a number of valuable fishing schooners engaged on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, together with lamentable loss of life. Only a few weeks ago we lost a very valuable schooner with a portion of her crew, and those of the crew who escaped drowning are now in the hospital in St. John, Nfld. This accident occurred through a collision in consequence of these fast steamers taking their course across the Grand Banks of Newfoundland in the very region where these vessels are prosecuting the industry of fishing. This matter has been engaging the attention of the public for a long time, but it has never been brought before Parliament, and I thought this a fitting opportunity to bring the question before this House. On my arrival in Ottawa some few weeks ago, I thought it advisable to address a letter to the Secretary of State asking him to bring the matter to the attention of the various nations that are interested in commerce and in the fishing industry. I shall read the letter which I addressed to the Secretary of State, and which I think will place the matter before the House more clearly than anything which I might say orally. I wrote as follows:—

House of Commons,
Ottawa, August 28th, 1896.

Hon. R. W. Scott,
Secretary of State, Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to direct your attention to a matter of paramount importance or interest to the people of my constituency, the county of Lunenburg particularly, and as well to the province of Nova Scotia and Canada generally.

During the months of May, June, July, August and September, hundreds of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and French vessels visit the Grand Banks of Newfoundland in the prosecution of their calling as fishermen, and each year many are lost by collision, and by being run down, and in many instances never heard from.

The matter is one worthy of the most diligent inquiry with a view to ascertaining what losses of lives and property have occurred and as to how many are supposed, attributable to sudden sinking by ocean steamers without report.

That an international regulation be promulgated relegating all classes of "ocean greyhounds," "ocean tramps," so called, and fast freighters, both sailing and steam, to certain limits during certain seasons, seems to me most reasonable and advisable, and I would respectfully ask that your honour will take careful cognizance of this apparent need and endeavour to obtain conference with the representatives of the great powers interested, such as Great Britain, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, United States and others, in order to have such regulations brought about as will ensure a greater measure of safety to our people than they now enjoy, always keeping the necessities of the trade in view, and commerce of those countries using the great ocean highways.

That the subject has a universal significance there can be no doubt, and I hope it may so commend itself to your mind that you will give it furtherance among the powers interested, and have such facts and arguments adduced, as will show whether another or almost as acceptable a route more free from fog, may not be obtained for liners and sailing craft as will make the prescribed limits of the banks comparatively free of danger to fishermen.

As fishermen, Nova Scotia, New England and France, not forgetting Newfoundland, contribute by far the largest portion, I may say nearly the whole, and my own constituency (Lunenburg) doubtless furnishes more fishermen than any like section on the American continent.

In the common interest of humanity this subject should receive consideration as many are the homes to-day in the countries named which are mourning the loss of dear ones "never heard from."

Science should lay out certain great courses from Moville to St. John, from Cork to Belle Isle, to the approaches of the St. Lawrence, Halifax, Boston, New York, with such divergence as will leave the Banks of Newfoundland free from danger from collision. Especially can this be done with subsidized lines, as it could be made a condition of the contract.

Or if calling at St. Johns or at any other point in Newfoundland that necessitates the crossing of the said Banks; that certain conditions be required of shipping during foggy weather, and at night, as to rate of speed, firing interval signal guns, and sounding of trumpets as to ensure greater safety to the precious lives of fishermen and property.

Fishing vessels on the Banks, or fishing grounds when engaged in actual fishing, ride at anchor and consequently are powerless to avoid danger although warned by sound of fog alarms of the approach of shipping, hence the greater reason for some action to be taken to avoid collision, loss of life and property so liable to occur.

I trust this matter may appear so worthy of consideration that an international commission of inquiry may be called to the end that the subject may receive the full attention which it deserves and demands.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

C. EDWIN KAULBACH, M.P.

Mr. Speaker, you will observe that we do not ask that any divergence from the usual course should be taken at any other season of the year, except in those months in which the fishermen are employed on the Grank Banks; that is, the months of May, June, July, August and September, the fishing season. That this request is a reasonable one can be clearly shown. If they will take the southern edge of the banks, they will avoid the fogs, have a better chance of avoiding icebergs, and certainly the terrible loss of life and property which has been entailed upon those engaged in the industry of fishing by the course they have pursued in the past. It is a serious matter of concern to the fishermen of the county I represent, if this complaint is not recognized; for there are many of those men engaged in the industry of fishing, though possessed of brave hearts, yet not possessed of hearts brave enough to prosecute that industry if this thing is going to be permitted any longer, or no recognition given to this appeal. Numbers of the fishermen have changed their base of operation or have abandoned their voyages to the Grand Banks, and have been frequenting the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Labrador shore, in consequence of the risks they have been running on these banks. Now, I do not think this is an unreasonable request to make, and I hope the Government will take it into their serious consideration when a contract is made, giving a subsidy to such boats, so that we may avoid the difficulties I have referred to. Whilst I am on my feet I may say, with regard to the subsidized lines we have had in the past, that the Board of Trade of my town and that of Bridgewater, also in my county, have met and discussed the matter very carefully, and have expressed their views that it is not in their opinion advisable on the part of the Government to expend any money in subsidies to any vessel which makes its terminal point in a foreign country. They conceive that the voyage between Great Britain and Canada should be direct, and that the Government should not subsidize any steamer that would have a terminal point in a foreign country, for the reason that they conceive that that would be subsidizing a vessel to actually transport passengers and freight to a foreign country instead of to our own; whereas, if the subsidized ships are confined strictly in this case to ports in Great Britain and Canada, we would have not only the advantage of the travel of passengers landed in Canada, but the advantage of the freight traffic as well; and the return cargoes from Canada, the natural products of Canada, as our exports to the markets of Great Britain. We would then leave no cause for friction, and no room for any one to say that we were subsidizing a line of boats to carry the traffic to a foreign country to the detriment of the trade of Canada. The Board of Trade of Lunenburg have taken action in this matter and I will read a telegram on this subject sent to me a few days ago by them, which will speak for itself:

Lunenburg, N.S., Sept. 18, 1896.

Board of Trade disapprove extending subsidy to steamers from Portland to Liverpool. Winter

port should be in Canada. Bring it to notice of Government.

H. B. ROSS, Secretary,
Board of Trade.

Now, if careful thought is exercised in regard to this expenditure, we will reap the advantage of it; but if due consideration is not given to the question of the advantages or disadvantages to be derived, we shall find that we shall not get the returns from the vessels or a quid pro quo for the expenditure which we are seeking. The necessity of having this trade I readily concede, and it should be developed to as large an extent as possible. That it can be developed is shown in a variety of ways. The effort that is now made to provide cold storage accommodation will render our opportunities for shipments of farm products, such as poultry, butter, fruits, &c., from the port of Halifax greater than any we have ever yet had in the past; and I feel assured that the farmers will reap the advantage to a very great extent, should the port of Halifax, which geographically is destined to be the emporium of trade of America, display the enterprise she ought (which she unfortunately lacks), could be made a second New York in a very short time. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I dare to trespass any longer upon the indulgence of this House, for I know all are anxious to get away as quickly as they can. But I do hope that some action will be taken with regard to the very important matter to which I have referred, and that in subsidizing steamers, some measure of safety shall be provided, such as change of route with the necessary precaution when required to cross the banks, whereby dangers such as those I have alluded to, with loss of property and life, may be avoided.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I desire to say but a few words in reference to the question of the fast line. I shall certainly not take up more than a few moments on the very last day of the session, to repeat the opinion which I have already expressed, as to the great interest which the people, not only of the province of Quebec, but all over Canada, take in this great enterprise, which I believe is destined to have such an important effect upon the trade and commerce and also upon the passenger traffic of Canada. I wish especially to express my pleasure at hearing the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce admitting this question to be one of the first importance for Canada, and stating that now that the Cabinet were to be relieved from the duties of the session, they would take the very earliest opportunity of looking into the whole question, with the intention of bringing it to such a point that it can be submitted to the consideration of Parliament when it meets again, and with the view, I suppose, of carrying out the scheme as originally undertaken by the late Government. I cannot hide from this House the feeling of profound disappointment and discouragement which is produced in Quebec, more especially by the utterances of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). That hon. gentleman notwithstanding the professions he made previous to and since his election, sounded quite a different note on the floor of Parliament; and although I did ask the hon. leader of the Government if the hon. Minister from Quebec West had expressed the views entertained by the Government upon that important question, although I was anxious to know whether the statement expressed by the hon. member for Quebec West in the telegram, now celebrated, applied to a line of 17 knots or 20 knots. I did not receive an answer. The hon. First Minister, who has represented a division of the city of Quebec for so many years and has such a strong following in the province of Quebec, must know, as I am certain he does, the wants of that province; and I hope that he and his colleagues will see that the fast line is carried out, and that it will be a line able to compete, in so far as speed is concerned, with the very best lines on the Atlantic coast between the United States and England. This is a question of such vast importance, that it ought to be viewed as outside of party strife. It ought to be viewed absolutely as one affecting the great interests of the country, and I hope that as soon as the session is over, the matter will be taken up, as the hon. Minister has promised, without the least possible delay, because any delay makes the question more difficult of solution, now that we have learned from the discussion to-day that the delay has caused difficulties which were not anticipated. I was under the impression, and am still under the impression, that the Imperial Government had undertaken to contribute the subsidy which was spoken of during the debate; but now I hear from our hon. friends on the other side that there is a doubt in their minds as to whether the project is to be submitted as an Imperial one or in a different shape. I hope sincerely that the question will be taken up just as soon as possible, and I consider, in view of the expressions of opinion which have fallen from the representative of Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) in the Cabinet, that the Cabinet should take the earliest opportunity of quieting the doubts of the people of Canada on that question and bringing it to a satisfactory solution in the interests of the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps I may be permitted to make one or two explanations with regard to these papers, because it is very desirable that the correct information should go to the House and country. In the first place, there is no question about the contribution of the Imperial Government. That matter is distinctly and definitely settled in the report that the present High Commissioner (Sir Donald Smith) has made to the Government on the subject. He said, speaking of Mr. Chamberlain:

He also disclaimed any undertaking on the part of Her Majesty's government to contribute any specific sum to the undertaking, but stated that he thought what the Government had committed themselves to was a general offer of assistance, under certain conditions, the assistance not to exceed in any case, an annual sum of £75,000 for the term of years specified in the conditions.

That was ten years, so that the only point, as I have already explained, was that when the tenders were invited it was understood that the sum granted might not be £75,000, if the tenders obtained showed that the service could be performed for a less sum than £150,000 plus £75,000. That matter having been disposed of, there is no question that the Imperial Government are committed, provided the conditions are met, to one-third the amount; and the lowest tender having been £225,000 sterling, that involves a contribution, according to the statement of Mr. Chamberlain, of £75,000 a year by the Imperial government.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The statement my hon. friend was reading just now is Sir Donald Smith's statement, and not the formal declaration of Mr. Chamberlain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but I say that this confirms the declaration of Mr. Chamberlain to myself, and which had already been communicated in a despatch to the Government here.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would like to understand exactly. Is the hon. gentleman now speaking of the written memorandum that were exchanged between the Colonial Office and the Governor General or of his own and Sir Donald Smith's understanding of Mr. Chamberlain's language?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of both, the whole correspondence.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman has the papers in his hands, and, as I have said, it is unfortunate there was not time to print them, but I do not remember seeing in those documents any formal communication from Mr. Chamberlain precisely in those words, although I clearly understood it was his intention to recommend the grant under certain conditions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so. All the doubt as to what the grant might be depended on whether the service could be obtained for a less sum than £225,000. That is practically the position. With reference to another point, which is very important, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was under the impression that this was not a specific tender because it was qualified by a condition that was not in the invitation to tender, and that condition is that the parties should have four months, without penalty, for the purpose of accepting the contract. That is a very important point. My hon. friend will remember that I said on a former occasion that Sir Donald Smith had informed me, during the very brief interview I had with him on his way from Montreal to Ottawa, during his last visit, that Mr. Dunlop had informed him that the Messrs. Allan were prepared to withdraw that stipulation about the four months, which withdrawal made it an absolute tender, and I may say that the points at issue between Messrs. Allan and the Government here, and which were settled between us, were also referred to the Colonial Office, and the settlement had their approval. So that the only question as to this tender, because it is slightly lower than the other one which had the same stipulation of four months——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think Mr. Huddart asked for six months.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so, and his tender was a little higher, but the only point that remained to prevent the Messrs. Allan tender from being regarded as a complete tender, in response to our invitation, was removed by that settlement. Sir Donald Smith said:

I am happy to say that Mr. Dunlop (who, my hon. friends opposite know, is an extremely able man and represents in the fullest extent the great firm of the Messrs. Allan of Glasgow)—informed me, before my interview with Mr. Chamberlain, that his firm were prepared to withdraw from the stipulation, to be given in the form of a letter, that the contract should be given to them, subject, without penalty, to their succeeding in floating a company in four months.

I communicated this statement to the Secretary of State. So that my hon. friend will see that which prevented this being an absolute tender is withdrawn by the notice given by Mr. Dunlop.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What is the date of that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The date of Sir Donald Smith's letter—July 10th.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a subsequent letter of Mr. Allan to the Premier, in which, if I am not mistaken, this stipulation as to four months, appears.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so. But the hon. gentleman will observe that the representatives of the company on the other side of the Atlantic had given the High Commissioner notice and had instructed him to notify Mr. Chamberlain that they withdrew that stipulation independently of the communication which may have taken place here, owing to that not having been communicated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Still it involves a contradiction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does, certainly, but I think it was by oversight that

in the subsequent letter to the Prime Minister the stating of that point was omitted. The only other point that requires a moment's attention is the statement of Mr. Mercer, Under Secretary of State in the Colonial Office, that the Imperial Government insisted upon, as a condition of their giving assistance to the enterprise, that it should be a 20-knot service. I invite careful consideration to this. I think, it is desirable that those papers should be printed, though late, in order that the Government may give this very important question the careful consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. FOSTER. My impression was very strongly that there was no doubt whatever about the Imperial Government having undertaken, through Mr. Chamberlain, to contribute to the fast line service under certain conditions. I had not the papers themselves, but I have here a digest of the papers in the press. From the "Gazette" account it appears:

Included in the papers is a despatch from Mr. Chamberlain, dated November 21, 1895, on the subject of the Atlantic and Pacific services. He intimated that the fast Atlantic service, even if realized, did not present any advantages over the Suez route for mails between Australia and England. The main advantage of this part of the scheme would rest between Canada and Australia, to which he did not think the Imperial government should directly contribute. With reference to the Atlantic line, as it appears that the Canadian Government could not secure an improved service without assistance, Her Majesty's government were prepared to contribute to that, provided that arrangements could also be made for the acceleration of the land journey to and from Vancouver.

That carries out the impression I had formed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I wish to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). I think that hon. gentleman has been unfair to my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell). If there is a man in Parliament or in the province of Quebe who has at heart the interests of the port of Quebec, it is my hon. friend from Quebec West. Commercially speaking, financially speaking, politically speaking, he has more interest in it than the hon. gentleman from Three Rivers, for the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) does not represent Quebec now, while my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Dobell) has been elected as the representative of one of the most important divisions of the city. If there is a man who understands the commercial interests of Quebec that man is my hon. friend from Quebec West.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Quebec does not seem to think so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) should not forget that for eight years he was a member of a Government which, year after year, made promises which have not been fulfilled. We have heard a great deal of this 20-knot line, and what did Quebec get? Did we get anything? Nothing materialized except words, and out of these words my hon. friend has got his own rewards, I am sorry, on his account, to say. He has filled the city of Quebec with his words, but Quebec, seeing that he did not fulfil one of his promises, has bidden him good-bye. Now, there is one thing I wish to say distinctly—this Government is not bound to pay the political debts of my hon. friend. I happen to know something of the negotiations which took place in Montreal previous to the last election. I happen to know that certain Orders in Council were passed, and I know the object of them. From the negotiations that took place with regard to the fast line, the hon. gentlemen opposite may have derived some little political advantage during the last campaign. If any political debt was incurred, it is not for us to pay it. This Government, I am sure, has at heart quite as much as hon. gentlemen opposite, the interests of the country in reference to this fast line question. We are working at it; we are studying the question carefully; and I say, as I have said before, we have no intention of being drawn into a trap in dealing with it. We will not go faster than is necessary, but we will go as fast as is necessary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Seventeen knots.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And what more have we had in Quebec? What have these promises and speeches given us better than seventeen knots? The late Premier came to Quebec and made magnificent speeches, as my hon. friend from Three Rivers has made, both inside and outside of this House. But nothing ever came of them. I make this prophecy—that we will not be long in power before Canada and Quebec, to which my hon. friend attaches so much importance is in possession of a well established fast line of steamers. We will not make useless speeches. This is a business Government, and it will show itself not so much in speeches as in action.

WAYS AND MEANS—SUPPLY BILL.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved:

That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897, the sum of $14,631,467.18 be

granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 39) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1897, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, and reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved that when the House adjourns this day, it stands adjourned till Monday next at 11 o'clock a.m.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 5th October, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER communicated to the House the following letter which he had received :—

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, 5th October, 1896.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Monday the 5th instant, at 3 o'clock, for the purpose of proroguing Parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN SINCLAIR,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE FINES.

Mr. OLIVER asked :

What amount of money was collected by fines from members of the North-west Mounted Police Force during the year ending June 30th, 1896 ? How was this money distributed ?—giving details.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The amount of fines was $1,646.35 ; the distribution was as follows :—

$100 to each of the eight Divisions into which the Force is divided, for recreation and amusement	$ 800 00
For newspapers	409 00
Balance, for illustrated papers and magazines for the recreation rooms	437 35
	$1,646 35

THE COLLECTOR OF INLAND REVENUE, BRANTFORD.

Mr. BAIN asked :

Has any request from J. Spence, Collector of Inland Revenue, Brantford, to be superannuated, been received at the department ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir H. Joly de Lotbinière). There is nothing on record within the department in the way of a request by Mr. Spence to be superannuated further than a copy of a submission to His Excellency in Council, made by the then acting Controller, which document in recommending such superannuation incidentally states that the course proposed is in accordance with Mr. Spence's request.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask, did the hon. Controller say that that was signed by me ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes ; so the answer reads.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to say that I did not propose any superannuations that were not asked for.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I merely gave the answer as it was prepared by the officers of the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I made the statement in order to set myself right.

THE BINDER TWINE CONTRACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called. I desire to draw the attention of the House to a necessary correction, one of a number that have been found necessary in consequence of the unfortunate statement by one of the members of this House purporting to come from the Department of Justice. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) read a list of pretended debtors in connection with the sales of binder twine. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) felt called upon to explain that the name of his firm was improperly included, as they had paid the amount. One other member has made a correction in regard to a private party doing business

with the Government. It now becomes my duty to make a similar statement with regard to Messrs. James & Reid, of Perth, Ont., who appear in the list as indebted to the Government to the amount of $201.70. These gentlemen have their name improperly included in that list, as they have paid the amount. In proof of that I have sent to me the cheque marked paid for the amount of $201.70.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Dated when ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Dated 23rd March last. The Solicitor General has already expressed regret that this sheet should have been submitted to the House ; and on a subsequent occasion when similar information was asked, I understand, he has wisely adopted the plan I adopted of not bringing down a statement of the accounts running with the department unless under pressure from the House ; because, as the House will easily understand, even if certain items appear there as debts due, it does not necessarily follow that the parties are in any difficulties or that there is any irregularity ; as firms such as that of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), of the very highest credit in the credit of the country, are often for a while on the books of people with whom they are doing business—it is a mere matter of the course of trade. But if their names are included in the list of names of debts due, it creates a wrong impression.

The PRIME MINISTER. To whom was the payment made ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To the warden of the Kingston Penitentiary A letter to me states that this amount was paid by draft in March last, payable to the order of the warden of Kingston Penitentiary.

The PRIME MINISTER. Somebody is at fault then.

MR. GEORGE R. SMITH, OF DUNNVILLE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to mention that I was unable to find in the record of the proceedings, the answer which the Premier said he had given with regard to Mr. George R. Smith, as to whom an Order in Council was passed before the late Government went out of office.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I gave the answer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I could not find it. Would the hon. Minister kindly tell me what the answer was ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The question related, I think, to Mr. C. R. Smith ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No ; I thought the hon. Minister was making a mistake. Mr. C. R. Smith belongs to Hamilton, but the Order in Council I speak of referred to Mr. George R. Smith, of Dunnville. Would the hon. Minister look the matter up, and let me know privately concerning the case ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It seems I made a mistake as between the two Smiths.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And I dropped the question of which I had given notice, because the hon. Minister said he had answered it. Will the hon. gentleman kindly drop me a note with regard to the matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

SUPPLY—ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE AND PORTLAND.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved third reading of Bill (No. 39) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1897, and other purposes relating to the public service.

Mr. FOSTER. I have one or two matters that were left over from the committee without being discussed. For convenience sake, we passed the items and got them into the Supply Bill, but with the understanding that they were to be discussed as in committee this morning. The first is with reference to the present mail service between Canada and Great Britain. Although we have seen certain statements in the newspapers as to the policy of the present Government for this and succeeding years, we have had no definite statement made in the House, and I would like to ask the leader of the Government, or whatever member of the Cabinet is responsible, if he would kindly state what the policy of the Government is with reference to that, as far as the present mail service is concerned, as going from Portland in the state of Maine, or from St. John or Halifax.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That relates to the Allan contract ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Reference has been made in the course of the discussion to the Order in Council passed by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, with regard to the abolition of the subsidy to steamers making their terminus at a foreign port, which was understood to be at Portland ; and the impression has been conveyed in some quarters that it was the intention of my hon. friends opposite to have brought that contract to a summary close. We find, however, that while there was an Order in Council apparently contemplating such a policy, it contained in it the words, "subject to existing contracts." Now, while in a

technical sense there was, perhaps, no existing contract, inasmuch as the Allan contract had expired some years before, that contract had been, by mutual agreement, extended and continued from year to year in a less formal way. It was the opinion of the present Government that in view of the many years during which that contract, possibly in that informal way, had continued, and in view of the very long time during which the Allan Company had been performing that service, it was not a reasonable proposal that it should be summarily disposed of in the way in which it had been said was the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to do—whether they actually did intend to terminate the contract in that way, may be open to debate. However, it seemed to us only reasonable, after the many years during which that service had been performed by the Allan Company, that if they were no longer to have the contract, they should have at all events one season's notice. Therefore, instead of undertaking to terminate that contract at present, we have caused the Allan Company to understand that the service will be continued for the coming year; and then the Government will be at liberty to terminate, and will probably, I suppose, terminate that contract. For the present, therefore, we think it fair that the contract of the Allan Company for the conveyance of mails, with the knowledge that their vessels go to Portland,—though of course that is not a matter with which we are directly connected, because it is a mail contract and not a freight subsidy—but with the knowledge that they make their terminus at Portland, we think it only fair and reasonable that they should have notice before that contract is summarily terminated. Therefore the contract continues for the present season, and will continue to the end of the season of navigation in 1897.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has notice been given?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that we have actually notified them, but the Allans have been made aware of the fact, and, I presume, notice will be given in a more formal shape.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any Order in Council been passed to that effect?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think any Order in Council has actually passed, but it is an understanding which will have to be confirmed by Order in Council.

Mr. ELLIS. Have you the date of the Order in Council to which you refer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 21st February is the date of the Order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has the papers, but he is not in his seat. It was during the early spring, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement which has been made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, renders it necessary that I should make, both in the interest of the late Government and in the interest, I think, of the people of St. John and the maritime provinces, and for that matter, of the whole of Canada, a very short, and I hope, very comprehensive, statement as to the facts of the case, and the policy of the late Government; and in doing so I shall take up some of the points of fact which have been stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I do not wish to make this long, and I do not wish to make it contentious. In the first place, I may state that for the last ten years there has been a gradually growing sentiment in this country that the time was approaching, or had, in all those years approached, in the opinion of many, when the money of Canada should not be given for a service which proceeded from a United States port, that is from any foreign port on this side, and merely calling at a Canadian port, going and coming, to take the mails and what freight what might happen to be collected there. Year by year that feeling continued to grow stronger, and the feeling of the country was represented in Parliament, until I think, in the year 1889, when we were discussing the fast Atlantic service which was proposed, it was stated by myself, in bringing down a Bill, or in debate upon the Bill, that it was the intention of the Government to adopt as their line of policy the entire cessation of subsidies granted in that way, and that in the contract which it was supposed was then about to be made, and for which authority was taken from Parliament, there should be a proviso that the vessels of the fast line should make a Canadian port their ultimate terminus on this side, that is, they should not go to a United States port, or to any other port on this continent other than a Canadian port. As is well known, the provisional contract which was made in the matter of the fast line with the Andersons, fell through; and the Government thereafter, as is also well known, attempted, by calls for tenders and by pushing this programme, which had been laid out and to which the adhesion of the House had been given—the Government endeavoured to bring about the ultimate accomplishment of the fast line, always, as was stated over and over, with the view that that fast line should be one which should run entirely from Canadian ports. Well, matters went on until sometime later, when the contract with the Allans at last entirely terminated, but was taken up again in the yearly way of which my hon. friend has spoken. I do not need to go into the history of that, I think it is well known. However, last year, the House knows, a proposition was made by an old and reliable steamship company to undertake a winter

service from the port of St. John direct to Liverpool, with an idea firmly held by them that it could be made successful, and that they could demonstrate, if a small subsidy were given to them, the fact that Canadian ports were sufficient to do, and economically could do, the winter freight business for Canada, and for whatever freight might offer, even from the United States. The proposition of the Beaver Line was taken up by the Government, and a contract was made for an experimental winter service, for which a subsidy of $25,000 was given. Without going into the history of that largely, suffice it to say that on all sides it is thoroughly admitted that the experiment was an unqualified success, that in the matter of speed, in the matter of quick transit to the ports of Toronto, Montreal and the distributing interior ports, and in the matter of cargo carried, the Beaver Line of steamers, and the attendant steamers which were attracted to the port of St. John in the line of traffic which had been developed—that these were the peers of the Allan Line trading with Portland, and calling at Halifax, in all these respects. In fact, as was stated in the House last year, and shown from the records, freights were delivered more quickly to Montreal and Toronto through the maritime province ports than they were when taken to Portland by the Allan Line in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway. In that debate, the matter of the making of a maritime province port, the final port of call for the future in both freight and mails, was discussed, and discussed upon the memorial from the Board of Trade, I think, of the maritime provinces, which prayed for that; and in response to it, the Government, after having considered it, passed an Order in Council, and it is as well that that Order in Council should be placed upon the records:

On a report dated 29th January, 1896, from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, stating that he has had under consideration a memorial from the Board of Trade of the Maritime Provinces composed of the several boards of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, to His Excellency the Governor General, calling attention to the fact that for some years past after the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence through Canadian freight, carried on steamers subsidized by the Canadian Government, after mails have been landed at a through port, has been landed and shipped at a foreign port to the detriment of the Maritime Provinces and asking that this matter be taken into serious consideration, and that in future subsidies be granted to steamers sailing between port or ports in the United Kingdom and port or ports in Canada only.

The Minister submits that he is of opinion that the view taken by the Board of Trade is the correct one, and that the time has arrived when there are sufficient freights to and from Canadian ports to fully warrant the Government to withhold subsidies to vessels sailing from or landing at any foreign port on this continent, and that it would be for the interests of Canada were subsidized steamers required to sail to and from Canadian ports direct, not to affect existing contracts.

The Minister recommends that a copy of this Minute, if approved, be communicated in the usual manner to the Secretary of the Board of Trade in the Maritime Provinces.

The Committee submit the above for Your Excellency's approval.

This was passed on the 21st of February, 1896. In the debate that took place upon the Beaver Line subsidy, the then member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) went into the question quite elaborately, and spread upon the "Hansard" the history of the negotiations and the actual results of the shipments that had been made up to that time. But what I want to impress more clearly upon the House is, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives), speaking at that time, emphasized the policy and the action of the then Government. He said:

In answer to a petition from the Maritime Board of Trade of the Maritime Provinces, the Government have just laid down as its policy, that after the termination of existing contracts, no subsidy will be given to any line of steamers that touches at any other than a Canadian port on this side of the ocean. That is the settled policy of the Government, and we trust that that declared policy, coupled with the proof of what has been done by the city of St. John, will lead to, practically, a very large increase of business from Canadian ports during the winter season.

Thus, then, we have the history complete as to the policy of the Government, and the Order in Council which I have just read, simply made—as an Order in Council should and as is perfectly just—it simply made an exception of any existing contracts. So much with reference to that.

Now, we will come to the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who said, in the first place, that there really was no contract, but that there had been an understood arrangement by which the contract which had been made in 1891 was continued from year to year. The real facts of the case are these: The last contract that was made with the Allan Line was made on the 14th December, 1891, and was to expire on the 24th December, 1892, and one of the clauses of the contract provided that.—

At that date the contract shall absolutely cease and determine.

Therefore, the last contract made with the Allans absolutely ceased and determined under the terms of that contract on the 24th day of December, 1892—that is, at the close of the navigation season. Now, as to there being any contract after that; the fact is, that this contract remained, and was by Order in Council—which is an official and an efficient authorization—extended from year to year. On the 12th September, 1892, it was renewed for one year. On the 17th of May, 1893, it was renewed for one year from the 24th December, 1893. On the 12th June, 1894, it was renewed to the close

of navigation on the St. Lawrence in 1895; and on the 7th of September, 1895, it was renewed for one year from the close of navigation in 1895, or until the 25th November, 1896. On the 25th November, 1896, the last contract by Order in Council extended, absolutely closes and determines. That is within a month or so of the present date. There is no clause in the contract of 1891 which makes it necessary for the Government to give notice. In fact, the contract was so drawn up that there is a particular clause to preclude the company from asking for notice, because the contract of 1891 very emphatically and distinctly says:

> The contract shall then (that is, on the 24th December, 1892) absolutely cease and determine.

And, it is only kept in force by these successive Orders in Council. Now, Sir, when the Order in Council of the 21st of February of last year, renewing and extending this contract to the close of navigation for the present season—that is until the 25th November, 1896—when that Order in Council of the 21st of February was passed, that became then the existing contract, and that was the existing contract with which the Government, by its Orders in Council, declared it did not intend to interfere. The interference would cease entirely with the ending of the contract, and the contract would end unless renewed again on the 25th November, 1896. It was the expressed policy of the late Government as declared by its Order in Council, and as declared afterwards in the House by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that they would not renew any of these existing contracts which gave the money of Canada for a subsidy to steamers sailing from a United States port and merely calling at one of our own ports. So much with reference to that. It is as clear as it can be. I take issue with the statement of facts made by the Finance Minister: that their difficulty was when they came into power in finding an existing contract which had not been cancelled, and which, as they say now, must go on until the last of the season of navigation, in 1897. I want to call the attention of the Government to the disparity in authorities which exists. I have here an authorized interview, given by the Minister of Railways and Canals to the correspondent of the St John "Telegraph," in which he states the facts, as these:

> The Allans were then performing a service the terms of which have been continued from year to year and which the previous government had not terminated when they resigned. The current year for which the service is being rendered not being terminated by any action of the last Administration, must continue until the end of the year, which will be to the 30th June next. It must be clear to any thoughtful person, who considers for a moment, that June next will be the earliest date at which existing arrangements could be terminated. By that time, he said, the Ministry will have had ample opportunity to mature its policy respecting the so-called fast line service, and necessarily forming part of that policy will be the question of subsidies for freight lines from the maritime ports.

That interview, given by the Minister of Railways and Canals, sets out with the statement that there is an existing contract which does not expire, and ought not to be terminated until notice has been given by the Government, but that would expire on the 30th June. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) now has taken heart of hope, and makes the term for which it ought to extend, six months longer, that is, until the end of navigation for that year. But neither of these statements is correct in fact. The contract expires on the 25th November, 1896. Let us come now to the point of notice. The statement has been made that no notice was given, but, beyond that, the statement is true that no notice was required, that the contract of 1891 and the Order in Council afterwards made it imperative on the face of them that there was to be no notice given, and that there was, therefore, to be no claim on the part of the company that the contract was not to be terminated unless notice were given. But I want to go a little further than that. I want to say that the Government are estopped from using that argument on the line of necessity, even though there statements were true, that notice was required by the decision of their own Minister of Justice, in the case of the clothing contracts, that no contract is valid and binding on the Government unless there is an appropriation to bind the contract. When these gentlemen came into power in July, 1896, there was no appropriation; there was, therefore, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, nothing binding. So much with reference to these facts. I thought it was right that they should be put upon the records of the House, and should be given the utmost publicity. The policy of the late Government was clear and explicit. With reference to notice, it was more clear and explicit than appears upon the records. Suppose notice had been necessary. I say that sufficient notice was given—first, in the publication of an Order in Council, which was published in the newspaper press, and went everywhere; and secondly, by a statement after that Order in Council, made by the Minister of Commerce in the House, which was published in the press, and went everywhere—and that was early in the month of March. But there is additional evidence. When have applications been made by the Allan Company in these preceding years when their contract had to be renewed by Order in Council? They have always been made early in the preceding year—on the 12th September, 1892, on the 17th May, 1893, on the 12th June, 1894, and on the 7th September, 1895, for the succeeding year. Why was not application made by the company in the last year, if there was no opposition to their carrying on the contract? Because

they knew, from the Minister of Trade and Commerce personally, because they knew from his statement in the House, because they knew from the Order in Council, that the policy had been changed; and I am in a position to state that the steamship companies in the city of Montreal, through their principal men, had talked the whole matter over with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that steamships belonging to their different lines were to go to St. John and Halifax during the coming winter and participate in the trips or mileage proportion of the $126,000 subsidy, which was to be distributed in the way that the Minister of Trade and Commerce explained. Then, the policy of the Government is straight enough. There was no contract requiring notice. The contract expires absolutely on the 25th November; there was nothing that called for notice. Anyway, if there had been repeated, notice was given; and these very steamship companies, through their representatives, had talked the whole matter over with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and knew the policy that was going to be pursued. Now, with reference to the policy of the Government during the present session. They have evidently, through some means or other, determined to go against the well-understood policy of Parliament and of the late Government, and they will continue for one whole year longer the subsidy to the Allan Line. But neither the Minister of Finance in his statement to-day, nor the Minister of Railways and Canals in his public interview, nor any member of the Government, so far as I have seen or heard, has stated that at the end of 1897 these contracts and subsidies will absolutely expire, and not be again renewed, and that the policy of paying no subsidy to vessels going from American ports will be carried out. They may make that statement; but I call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that up to the present time not one of them has made it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. member permit me to ask him a question? Did the hon. gentleman hear, or, if he did not hear, did he see the answer given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the questions which were put with regard to the termination of that contract?

Mr. FOSTER. I was in the House when the answers were read, and, so far as my recollection of them goes, the answer in this case was that the Government thought the subsidy ought to be continued during the next season; but I recollect no statement to the effect that the policy of the Government was that no other subsidies of that kind would be given. Now, the position taken by the present Government has caused a great deal of disappointment in many ways—locally, in the city of St. John; to a wider locality in the maritime provinces; and to a wider constituency still, which has followed with interest, and I believe with the strongest appreciation, the gradual approach of the Government of the country to the time when its fully-declared policy would be not to give money longer for vessels taking freight and mails from an American port. All this disappointment has been caused by the action of the Government. The Government may have had a reason for it. The only reason the Government has given was that there was an existing contract which must be carried out. I have analysed that, and I leave it with the House and the country to say which of the two positions is the correct position. But in order, if possible, to allay the dissatisfaction which exists with the negative which they have given to the policy of the late Government, certainly a national policy, they have undertaken to give some additional subsidies, as they appear in the Estimates; but, when analysed, it will be found that the subsidies are really not additional subsidies. The policy of the Government was shortly and explicitly stated by myself in the city of St. John during the last election, and by a telegram or letter, I forget which, from Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Government, endorsing my statement of the policy, as one which not only received the approval of himself at that time, but which had been duly considered in Council, and had been adopted as the definite policy of the Government. The statement made was this:

> The proposed new freight service from St. John to English ports direct is to be an adequate service in every particular, to be weekly in winter and monthly or fortnightly in summer as the requirements of the service demand. The term for which tenders will be called for is the usual one of five years, and the line is to succeed the temporary service to be provided for the season of 1896-97.

I may say that this policy was very keenly and closely discussed in the New Brunswick elections, and especially in the St. John elections, and it will not be out of place for me to read a part of the electoral address signed by my hon. friends, the two members of the city of St. John, as published to their electors:—

> The Liberal party will deal generously and faithfully with the matters which affect particularly the interests of St. John. As a national party it recognizes the importance of developing trade and of building up seaports within our own country capable of doing the winter as well as the summer business of Canada. Too long has this been neglected by the present Administration, which is only just beginning to realize the mistake of fostering trade by large subsidies given to steamers running in winter to ports on this side of the Atlantic not in Canadian territory. Sympathizing with the ambitions and aspirations of the people of this city, we pledge ourselves to stand up for fair-play and equal justice to St. John, and in this we are confident that we shall have the full

support and the steady assistance of the Liberal party.

The advantages of St. John west as the receiving and forwarding point for ocean freight, so effectively shown in the past winter, proves that it is clearly to the advantage of the country to extend and increase that business in the most practical way. The subsidies heretofore paid for a steamship service to ports outside of Canada should now be available for ports in this country, and with a Government disposed to treat St. John fairly there is no doubt at all that this business can be greatly developed, extended and increased here.

That shows that, so far as the declarations made before the constituencies went, the two parties, through their candidates, were in favour of the very same line of policy and the same principle of action. But the Government of the past had gone so far as to determine its policy, to announce it, and to take the necessary steps for carrying its policy into effect. The present Government has gone back upon that, certainly to the extent of one year's extension of subsidy, and so far as any promise is concerned that I remember up to the present time. The answer given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to which my attention was called by the Minister of Railways, is this, and that is the only answer given in the House. To the first question, asking the date of the contract, he gave the date. To the second question, he replied that there was no clause in the contract requiring the Government to give notice to the company of the expiry of the same. To the third question, he replied that the renewals had since been made by Order in Council. To the fourth question :

For what period were the renewals made by the Orders in Council ?

He replied :

17th May, 1893, authorizing renewal for one year from the 24th December, 1893 ; 12th June, 1894, authorizing a further extension until the close of navigation on the St. Lawrence in 1895—7th September, 1895.

Then, to the fifth question :

For what period was the renewal made by the last Order in Council ?

He replied :

For one year from the close of navigation in 1895, or say, until the 25th day of November, 1896.

So that my statement and the statement of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in answer to my questions, are exactly similar.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There was another statement made at another time. I am looking for it, but cannot lay my hands on it just now. It was from the Minister, apart from the categorical answer to the question. My hon. friend put a question across the floor, and thereupon the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a remark which is referred to by the Minister of Railways. I am looking for it now, but cannot find it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have a very distinct recollection of the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It was to the effect that it was the intention of the Government to continue the existing contract until the end of navigation, for next year, but no longer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What date was that reply made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot state the date.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was it previous to or after this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not at all sure. Therefore, I said that that was embodied in the answer he gave to the question of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). The words "and no longer" were clearly stated, and there are many reasons why my hon. friend and myself know that that was said.

Mr. FOSTER. That, I am afraid, cannot be found in the "Hansard." My recollection does not carry beyond the question which I put to the Minister. Whenever this item came up, it was shoved off, from time to time, for future discussion, and this is the first time we have attempted to discuss it. What I have said is this, that this dissatisfaction was caused, and in order to allay that, a show has been made of giving some additional subsidies to the trade from the city of St. John ; but it will be found without going into details, that this will happen. It will be found that the additional subsidies given of $7,500 to Dublin, and $7,500 to Glasgow, besides being very small, at the rate of $2,500 per trip, would simply represent three trips each, and taking into account the fact that last year the steamers of the Donaldson Line made three or five trips of their own accord, and without subsidy, we are gaining nothing more in that respect. When I questioned the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to whether there had been any agreement made concerning the Glasgow and Dublin service, he said there had not been, but he hoped to be able to get these vessels to enter into the arrangement. Suppose he did, then a sum would be expended, in new service, over and above what was expended last year, but it would not give more than one or two trips in excess of those given last year by occasional steamers without subsidy. Now, as to the $15,000 extra to the Furness Line. That gives a direct service from St. John in the winter months, and also a direct service from Halifax, cutting them up into two direct services in the winter time and a common service in the summer time. The advantage will be gained by each of these cities, that they will not be called upon to

take account of freight offered by each other, or make calls on one city or the other. So far as that advantage is given, it is a matter that can fairly be considered. But I call attention to this, that the policy of the late Government was to stop the payment of subsidies from Portland and to take that $126,000 and divide it among the steamships leaving Canadian ports, so that five-twelfths would go to the maritime winter ports.

Mr. ELLIS. You speak of taking $125,000 and dividing it up, but a large portion of that naturally goes to Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that I would give it all to the maritime ports. What I said was that the winter service was about five-twelfths of the whole service, and that five-twelfths would go to the winter service from the maritime ports, which would be a little over $50,000, so that there would have been, under the late Government's policy, $50,000 available for the winter ports of St. John and Halifax. Taking into account what was given to the Furness and the Beaver lines, you would have a far larger amount of money encouraging the trade from those ports than is found in the Estimates of this Government. But, under the present Government's policy, you pull back with one hand what you advance with the other, and you would not have been doing this under the policy of the late Government. What was the Beaver Line subsidy given for? It was given to experiment as to whether winter freight could be attracted to the port of St. John for shipment to Liverpool, and it was given to overcome the disadvantage in land mileage from which St. John suffers as compared with Portland; so that if we had taken away the Portland subsidy and given it to St. John and Halifax, there would have been that much additional encouragement to those two ports. But the policy of the present Government amounts to this, that while they give a smaller amount for the encouragement of trade direct from St. John, with the other hand they are giving more to the trade from Portland, which is the competitor of St. John. Consequently, the subsidy to St. John is almost practically being wasted. What encouragement you give with the one hand to St. John by a subsidy, you take away with the other hand by the subsidy to Portland, because you thereby make it impossible for the subsidy to St. John or Halifax to overcome the advantage which the Portland route possesses, inasmuch as that route is still subsidized. That, then, is the statement of the case. I am sorry that the Government have not adhered to the policy of the late Government. I think that the sentiment of this country is that if we give the money of the people to develop trade or carry mails, we should give it to steamers which go from our own ports and come back to our own ports. As to the reason given by the present Government that there was an existing contract, that I have analysed, and I think I have shown the fallacy of that reasoning.

Now, Sir, this is a plain and, I think, a fair statement that I have made. I wished to make a fair and plain statement in deference to the sentiment of the country and for the sake of justice and truth; and I did want to place the position of the Government with reference to there being anything binding in the contract to make them carry it out for another whole season, as opposed to the view of the late Government and which we on this side at present hold. The only case in which we discussed the question at all, ontside of my query to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was on the 17th September, and certainly at the time of that discussion, there had been no answer indicating an intention to ultimately do away with subsidies to United States ports. But the Government in a moment can solve that part of the question. They cannot alter the fact that they have ignored the late Government's policy and have agreed to give this amount of money for another whole year, that is, they have extended the contract for a year. But they can make it plain by a simple statement from the leader of the Government whether they propose after the fall of 1897 to give a subsidy to vessels going from a United States port to Europe and calling at our ports. That will be good as far as it goes; but it will not overtake the error of this year. In connection with that I wish to bring another very important fact to the attention of the Government. This year Portland is putting forth an extraordinary effort to settle the channels of trade in her favour. She is building immense facilities, interesting the railway corporations of the country to a very large extent, and is doing everything that a lavish expenditure of money can do to draw trade in her direction and to make the channels of trade tend to the port of Portland. The subsidy that the Canadian Government is giving to that line from Portland this year helps Portland in that respect; and the retardation of the results that we thought we were finally gaining by the experiment of last year is made certain by the fact that that subsidy is still continued to Portland and that our own maritime province ports do not have the full advantage that they ought to have in this crucial year when Portland is doing so much to secure the trade not only now but for the future, for her own port.

Mr. ELLIS. It is, perhaps, too late to take up a great deal of time upon this question, but there are one or two observations I would like to make, as this matter affects the city of St. John which I represent and the part of the country in which I live. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is quite right in what he says with regard to the public sentiment which exists in all parts of the maritime provinces upon this question. There is a very strong feeling,

which has found expression at meetings of the boards of trade and at all gatherings of a political kind and which, no doubt, had much effect in the last election, that the time has come when these subsidies to a line of vessels having a terminus at a foreign port should cease. Both political parties, I think, were agreed upon that. It is just possible that in the last election the people of the city of St. John had more confidence that the party represented by the hon. the Premier would carry out its promises in that direction than the Government of which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was so prominent a figure. For, while the hon. gentleman has expatiated at considerable length to-day upon the importance and necessity and value to the country of a policy which would cut off foreign ports from any direct interest in the public moneys of Canada, yet it must be remembered that his party was a long time in power and no step was taken by them in this direction, notwithstanding the influence that was brought to bear upon them; and that it was only on the eve of a general election that this Order in Council was issued and that the hon. gentleman came to St. John and used—with considerable vigour and strength, I admit—the position that the Government had taken. There is no doubt, also, that there may be some little feeling of regret in the maritime provinces that the Government did not carry this idea into effect for the present year. But, on the other hand, one can readily understand the difficulties which may arise in putting an end to a plan which had been carried on so long. While the hon. gentleman himself states that certain things had been done, the Order in Council had been published, that negotiations, and so on, had been carried on, he did not state—I followed him closely—that any official notice had been given by the Government to the Allan people, or the Dominion people, that this subsidy would be discontinued for the future. The whole question was discussed in the Maritime Board of Trade which held its meeting at St. John the other day, and that board passed a resolution expressing itself fully with regard to the actions of the Government and regretting that the service had not been terminated this year, but expressing a confident belief that they will terminate it a year hence. So, looking at the fact that even with the opportunities the hon. gentleman had, holding so influential a position as that of Finance Minister, he did not adopt this policy, it is a satisfaction now to believe that the men who are in power in Canada to-day will carry out that policy immediately. So far as the subsidies to St. John are concerned, I think that on the whole, they will be very beneficial. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has minimized their value, but it does not follow that because a line of steamers came to St. John last year and made three trips carrying freights without subsidy, they will only come three times this year when the service is getting a subsidy; and it is unnecessary for the Government to make arrangements with a line of steamers that will not do more than this. On the whole, the people of the maritime provinces, I think, are perfectly satisfied with the arrangements which had been made, and they fully believe that the declared policy of the Government will be carried into effect. I am fully satisfied that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made a statement to the House, which, however, does not appear upon the record, but I understood him to make a statement to the House in which he declared that for the present, and no longer than the present year, Portland subsidy would be continued. That being the declared policy of the Government, I think it makes comparatively little difference as between one year and another, provided it is eventually carried out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to add anything to the very clear and emphatic statement made by the hon. ex-Finance Minister upon this important question. But I wish for a moment to draw attention to the fact that before confederation, one of the great wants that old Canada experienced was that of access to the ocean during the winter season, from one of our own ports. That, my hon. friend, the First Minister will find, was a matter that had great influence in the old province of Canada in determining the very general consensus of opinion in favour of confederation; it was one of the matters to which great importance was then attached. We thought in the past that by the creation of the Intercolonial Railway we would not only furnish a local port all the year round to every portion of Canada, but that we would be able to compete, from the greater proximity of Halifax to the mother country, with the means of communication on which old Canada was forced to depend before confederation. But it was found that the distance was too great, it was found that the advantage which Portland had in point of distance over St. John and Halifax—or rather from Halifax, because St. John was not intersected by the Intercolonial Railway in the first instance—and the greater distance involved was one with which practically we could not compete. In consequence, the Government of the day determined, when that fact was made apparent to them——. What is that my hon. friend says?

The PRIME MINISTER. We were discussing between ourselves the new point of eastern geography, that St. John was not tapped by the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By a direct line. St. John had communication, not by a direct line, but from Moncton, from which point the original line from St. John and Shediac brought you in connection with St. John, but by a circuitous route. At all events, the fact remains, that the distance either to St. John or to Halifax, by the Intercolonial Railway, was too great to en-

able it to compete with Portland. In consequence of that, the Government determined upon the very serious matter of asking this Parliament for a large subsidy for the purpose of obtaining a more rapid and direct communication than any that existed, by the construction of what is called the Short Line from Montreal through the state of Maine down to the port of St. John. Now, I draw attention to that, because, under the circumstances, nothing would have justified, in my judgment, so great an expenditure of money except the determination to secure, if possible, a winter port within the Dominion of Canada, and one that would compete with any port in the United States of America. Under these circumstances, efforts were constantly being made, from the time that object was undertaken, for the purpose of endeavouring to bring it to a successful conclusion; and it was only a little more than a year ago that the Government were able to obtain a proposal from the Beaver Line to establish a freight line from the city of St. John during the winter season. I was delighted on my return to Canada to find from communication with Sir William Van Horne, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that by the combination effected between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Beaver Line, the question had been at last satisfactorily solved; and it was found that under the circumstances as they existed, it was perfectly practicable to compete with the city of Portland as a winter port for Canada. I regarded this matter as of the greatest possible moment, not merely to the city of St. John and the maritime provinces, but to the whole of Canada, as it was accomplishing what was considered a matter of prime importance from the inception of confederation, and which we had been steadily endeavouring to work up to. Now, I regret that the policy of the late Government, as was clearly pointed out by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Foster) has been departed from, because not only a year has been lost, and unnecessarily lost, but the great efforts made by the city of Portland to maintain its position in antagonism with a winter freight port in Canada, render the matter more difficult for us than before; and I am quite certain, in fact I think I may say that I know, that had the Government maintained the policy of the late Government, the Allan Company would have been quite prepared to adopt the city of St. John as a winter freight port, and would have been quite ready to transfer their valuable line of steam communication to that port from Portland. I do not intend, at this stage of the session, to prolong this debate further than to express my great regret that what we have aimed at so long, the policy of securing a winter port within the Dominion that could compete with any port on this continent, has not been followed up as earnestly and as vigorously as I think it ought to have been by the present Administration, and brought into immediate operation, not only to the advantage of the city of St. John and the maritime provinces, but to every portion of Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know what degree of interest may attach in the city of St. John to the observations made to-day by the hon. gentleman opposite, but as respects the city of Halifax, which I know pretty well, I will venture to say that any professions from hon. gentlemen on that side of a deep and abiding interest in what is called the winter port question, will be received with the broadest smiles. It is an old question with us down in the maritime provinces. Much has been said, from year to year, about the winter port, and the great things that were to be done for our maritime province cities in that respect; but there is one fact clearly known to the people of Halifax, and that is that the only winter port business they ever received, they received under the Mackenzie Government, and as a result of arrangements made by that Government. It was the Mackenzie Government which made arrangements whereby the mail service to Portland ceased, and Halifax was made the port of call for taking mails to Europe. And so, summarizing the question, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the only winter port business which ever came to the port of Halifax came under the Mackenzie Government, who made very small professions in the matter, while out of all the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite, who talked of the question year after year, and held it before the people of Halifax as a great bait, substantially nothing came. I remember that in the election campaign of 1878 my hon. friend who now leads the Opposition, went to Halifax, and was very earnest and very eloquent, as he can always be, in his advocacy of the interests of that port. I well remember a notable letter which he wrote to a merchant in that city on the question. The Mackenzie Government, as I say, had made Halifax the winter port so far as the mail service was concerned, but the hon. gentleman opposite thought that that was not enough, and our Halifax people naturally desired more. My hon. friend, in his anxiety to make favour with the people of Halifax, did not hesitate to say that it was the duty of the Government to do more, much more; they should not be content, he said, with merely taking the mails from Halifax, but Halifax should be made the great winter port of Canada for freights as well as for mails. I remember, we had some rather historical words which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) used.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will do me the credit to say that I stated that it was after having exhausted every effort in that direc-

tion, that we were forced to fall back upon the short line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the time to which I refer there was no short line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Precisely, but, as I say, every effort to accomplish what we had then believed would be accomplished by the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, not having been successful, then the Government followed it up by the adoption of the short line, which shortened the distance materially.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall have a word or two to say on the short line later. At that time it was not a question of doubt. It was a question of the assurance of the people of Halifax that if they would put the Conservative Government in power, if they would support this great national policy, which we heard so much about at that time, then Halifax would become, without any question at all, the winter port of Canada. There was no question of short line, there was no question of short or long distance. I remember well that in the letter to which I refer, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) described in eloquent terms, as he well can, the greatness of the Dominion, and the vast volume of traffic which was to come from the Pacific. He said:

> In dealing with a great question of that kind as to the port of shipment, why chaffer about a few pence?

For eighteen long years these hon. gentlemen were in power, and at the end of eighteen years we find them chaffering about a few pence, just as they had done at the beginning of their term. Yet they ask the maritime province people, and the people of Halifax, to believe that they had a deep and abiding interest in that winter port question, and that the present Government had departed from their policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there were to be a departure from their policy, I venture to say that the people of the maritime provinces would welcome that change, because their policy was eighteen long years of promises and nothing substantially done in the matter of a winter port. And, suppose that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) is correct: suppose we accept now as a statement of fact, that at the last moment of their existence, his Government were adopting a new policy; it is but a death-bed repentance, and repentances of that character are proverbially received with a great deal of suspicion. I, therefore, say that hon. gentlemen opposite are not in a position to boast that they have taken up this great national question of a winter port and that we on this side have changed that policy of theirs. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) said that after exhausting every effort they came to a conclusion for the short line. Ah, there is an interesting story in the city of Halifax about the short line. The hon. gentleman went to Halifax and he stated that a contract had been signed with the Canadian Pacific Railway to build that short line, which would make its terminus at the city of Halifax. He stated that it was the intention of the Government to continue the short line, not merely down to St. John, but to build that section of the line which extended from Harvey to Salisbury or Moncton, and thus make a genuine short line to Halifax. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) made that statement before a large audience in the city of Halifax. He said that, before he left London, the last thing he had done was to sign the bonds which guaranteed to the people of Halifax the construction and the completion of that short line railway. Sir, since that time not a shovel of earth has ever been raised on what I might call the Halifax section of the short line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I am unable to speak again in this debate, I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) to allow me to interrupt him to say that there was a distinct understanding with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when provision was made by Parliament for the short line it was covered by that understanding. If I am not mistaken, a measure providing for that extension was rejected by the Senate afterwards.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Considering, Sir, the vast preponderance of the friends of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) in the Senate, the rejection of any measure proposed by his Government to carry out a promise of that nature might well be looked upon with the gravest possible suspicion. The fact remained, Sir, that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) went down to the maritime provinces, and with that readiness of promise which is so characteristic of him, he told the people that all doubts and difficulties had passed away, that we were to have the short line, and that we were to have pouring into Halifax this vast stream of traffic which was to come across the continent. Well, we have not it to-day, and it seems, if we are to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, we are less likely to have it now than ever; for his statements to-day lead altogether in the direction of the traffic going to the city of St. John. I have nothing but the kindliest feeling towards our friends in St. John, and if we in Halifax cannot receive that traffic, I want it to go to St. John or at all events to some port in Canada. I say that the maritime provinces have had much to complain of in the past in this respect, and that above all the port of Halifax, for which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) professes so much zeal and interest to-day, has had good reason to complain of the manner in which promises have been made

to that port, promises which have never materialized.

Now, as to the main question on which this debate arose, namely the Allan contract. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) says that in the contract of 1891 there were words inserted declaring that that contract should absolutely cease and determine in 1892. Well, Sir, these words cannot have meant a great deal, because four years afterwards, we find that that contract had not absolutely ceased and determined, but had been renewed and continued from year to year. The insertion of these words "absolutely cease and determine" would probably be found in most contracts that are made. But, we know that whatever the late Government put in the contract, their intention evidently was that it should not cease and determine, and so they have renewed it from year to year. I say, Sir, that though there is no binding obligation on the Government in a technical sense to continue that contract beyond the close of navigation of the present year, yet I say there is a moral obligation which the Government are bound to acknowledge, and which we do unhesitatingly acknowledge. Was it reasonable that a great steamship line which had been doing the service of the country for forty years or more, which had continuously been aided by the Government of Canada, was it fair and reasonable that they should be summarily turned out of that business without a moment's warning? I claim that they had no warning. I claim that these words "absolutely cease and determine" in the contract were of no value, because time had shown to that company that the Government did not mean these words when they put them in; but that they continued their contract from year to year. I claim that these hon. gentlemen opposite are debarred from asserting that these words had any weight, when they themselves never enforced them. Now, as to the particular date when we can terminate that contract. Whether that date be the 1st of July next year, or at the end of navigation, perhaps is a fair matter of debate. Inasmuch as the subsidies voted by Parliament are from the 1st of July to the 30th of June, it would seem at first blush that the termination of the contract should be at the same date as the termination of the appropriation. But, on the other hand, we find that these contracts have always been made for the season of navigation. They have always terminated in the month of November or December, and inasmuch as that was the case in the past, and as we did not feel that we were at liberty to determine the contract in the month of November, now close upon us, we felt it was only fair and reasonable that we should recognize that contract as one which might properly extend until the close of navigation of the next season. One point more, Sir, and I am done. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was anxious to make it appear that the Government had not declared any policy for the future in regard to that contract. We were under the impression on this side of the House that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in answer to a question put to him at an earlier stage of the session, had declared, that for reasons substantially the same as those which I have now given, the Government were disposed to recognize the moral contract with the Allans extending into the next year, and that they would be notified that at the end of that time that contract should cease. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said there was no evidence of that, and he read from "Hansard" what seemed to be a justification of his views. I knew there was something wrong in the matter. I knew the Minister of Trade and Commerce had made a further statement. I find that the "Revised Hansard" is not available, but I have here an authority which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ought to be willing to accept. I have here the Montreal "Gazette" of September 29th, 1896, containing a report of the proceedings in Parliament, and I shall read from the "Gazette's" report what I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will receive as disposing of that point:

> Replying to a question from Mr. Foster, Sir Richard Cartwright said that the last contract with the Allan Steamship Company for carrying mails between Canada and Great Britain was given on December 16th, 1891. It extended until December 21th, 1892, with a proviso that the Government should have the right to continue the operation of the contract for a further period not exceeding one year. There was no clause in the contract requiring the Government to give notice to the company of the expiry of the service. But in view of the fact that the contract had been continued from year to year for many years, the Government were of the opinion that notice to terminate the arrangement should have been given, and that under all the circumstances the company was entitled to the contract for carrying the mails to the close of the season of 1897 and no longer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is only one observation I desire to make, and that is called out by the indignation displayed by the Minister of Finance that friendship should be professed for Halifax, and then abandoned or reduced in the slightest degree. On behalf of Halifax, as I do not see either of the representatives of that city present, I want to remind the hon. gentleman of a declaration of love on his part towards the city of Halifax made not long ago, so that when dealing with these important subjects he may bear it in mind. He is reported in the Halifax "Chronicle" of November 30, 1895, to have said:

> Halifax should look with pleasure on the accomplishment of the fast Atlantic service. Both passenger and mail service by water and land Canada wants the fastest, and that is through the port of Halifax. We cannot make a success of it by sending it up the St. Lawrence. It is clear that for a summer and winter service some point of the maritime provinces must be selected.

If Halifax has the advantages which we think she has, then Halifax should be selected.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My interest in the city of Halifax will not be found lacking, but the hon. gentleman will fail to find any promise made by me on behalf of the Government. When I promise a thing as a Minister, it will be because I feel that I am in a position to carry it out, or else I shall not make the promise.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hope the promises made by the hon. gentleman are just as sacred when he is out of the Cabinet as when he is in it. I refer to his promise as a man, not as a Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope I shall not be less mindful of my promises as a man than of promises as a Minister, and I am not quite sure that I shall regard the hon. gentleman as the best judge whether those promises have been carried out or not. Whenever I promise anything in any capacity, I shall hope to use my best efforts to carry out the promise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is very difficult for me, I confess, to take a serious view of the debate which the hon. gentleman has opened, because I can hardly think that he can feel the deep and profound interest he has evinced here to-day in the subject of the winter port of Canada, and yet not to have endeavoured, when he had the power, to give effect to some fraction at least of that interest. I would think there is, perhaps, just the slightest, but at least some ground for suspicion that the hon. member's present zeal is the outcome rather of a political sentiment than a very deep interest in the welfare of St. John. I think the hon. member must have in his mind the possibility of a contested election occurring in that constituency, and perhaps in one or two others in New Brunswick before very long, which has fed the hon. gentleman's zeal in regard to this question. Now, there is no doubt that the feeling in the city of St. John, and in the whole province, with respect to this question is very deep and strong. There has, no doubt, been for many years a feeling that the Government of Canada has not evinced the interest in the national welfare of the country which it had professed, otherwise it would not have permitted this state of things to continue. But while that feeling does exist, I think there is at the present moment an equally strong feeling throughout that province, and nowhere greater than in the city of St. John, that the interests of the province and the interests of that port are safer in the hands of the present party and the present Administration than they were in the hands of their predecessors. I cannot imagine for one moment that the hon. gentleman, having such power as he had in the last Cabinet, could have cared one straw whether the whole winter trade of Canada was taken through a Canadian port or through Canadian ports, or whether it was shared with a port of a foreign country; otherwise he would have been enabled to accomplish something, which he certainly did not do. The hon. leader of the Opposition has told us how deeply his party have been concerned in this question from the early days of confederation, and how anxiously they were seeking for some opportunity in which to secure the winter trade for a Canadian port, and he has told us that notwithstanding the careful search and the anxious inquiry which they directed to the subject, that desideratum was never attained until last winter, when they were able to prevail on the Beaver Line Steamship Company to take up the business at St. John. Now, I think I am correct in saying, that the late Government were not by any means intrumental in inducing the Beaver Line Company to seek a port at St. John in the first instance. I am well informed, I think, when I say that a good deal of pressure and influence had to be brought to bear on the Government before they consented to give the subsidy which they believed was necessary to induce the Beaver Line Company to make St. John their port of shipment last year. Instead of the Government looking round for a steamship company that would take up that service, the steamship company had to come looking for them. I think that the initiative had to be taken in the city of St. John, that the corporation of St. John was the first to move in the matter, that they had to send a delegation to Ottawa to urge the matter upon the Government, and that it was only after considerable urging that the Government consented to give this subsidy; and I think it will be a surprise to many friends of the late Government to learn from the hon. leader of the Opposition that they found this Beaver Line as a result of a very careful study and of very anxious inquiry on their part, as to how this winter port service could be established. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has endeavoured to minimize the value of what this Government has done in the direction of further aiding the winter service at the ports of St. John and Halifax. He has told us what it was the late Government had determined upon—how much more liberal they proposed to be in their future grants to establish these lines. What is it the hon. gentleman says? He says they proposed to withdraw in the first place the $126,000 from the Allan Line, or prevent them going to Portland. I do not so understand. I cannot think the hon. gentlemen intended to make any very radical change in the existing system until their fast line service, which they had in contemplation, should get into full and complete operation. But if they did have it in view to make that change, I do not see that they had it in mind at all to give any more liberal grant than the present Government have

given in aid of this service. How does the hon. gentleman figure it out? He says the grant to the Allan Line was $126,000; that five-twelfths of that grant, which I suppose was on the basis of five months out of twelve during which the winter service would continue, would amount to $50,000; and that this $50,000 would be divided between the two maritime province ports, Halifax and St. John. How much better would that be than what is now proposed? We have given a subsidy for the whole, distributed over these different vessels, of precisely the same sum of $50,000 to St. John alone. We give $20,000 for the Beaver Line, $15,000 for the direct Furness Line, and $15,000 divided between the other two companies, making $50,000 in all. I do not know by what process of calculation the hon. gentleman reaches the conclusion that $50,000 given by us would not be equal in amount to $50,000 if given by them, and there is this further important difference that the hon. gentleman's statement rested altogether upon promises of what they were going to do, but which they did not happen to accomplish, whereas, we have carried the arrangement out which we proposed, and have actually procured authority for this amount of subsidy. One other observation the hon. gentleman made which I do not think I should let go without reply. He said that the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not say that the steamers would accept the small subsidies he offered. This sum of $50,000, in aggregate, the hon. gentleman now considers very small. It would have been a very large amount if the late Government had been giving it, but it becomes a very trifling sum when the present Government gives it. But the hon. gentleman said that we had no assurance that these several lines, which are embraced in these subsidies, will accept the same, and will perform the service. Well, I happened to be present when the Minister of Trade and Commerce answered the question which the hon. gentleman put him, and I did not gather that he left the slightest doubt in any one's mind as to the acceptance of the several subsidies by these lines. The hon. member asked whether or not the Minister of Trade and Commerce would say whether he intended to impose any conditions and whether the conditions had been agreed upon or would be satisfactory to the steamship lines——

Mr. FOSTER. The only lines with reference to which I asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether he had any knowledge that they would accept the subsidies, were the Donaldson and Head lines. With reference to the others, I did not raise a question, but simply asked with regard to those two, and he said he was not certain, but proposed to try and get them to accept and give as good a service as possible.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My recollection does not quite agree with the hon. gentleman's, but I am not at all certain that I am right. I do know, however, that the agents of both the Head Line and the Donaldson Line say they will agree, or are willing to accept, the subsidies and comply with the conditions, so that the hon. member need have no anxiety on that score.

I think I may say to my hon. friend that so far as he hopes to realize political advantage from the raising of this question and the throwing of doubts upon the liberal purposes of this Government towards the maritime provinces, or its desire to secure for Canadian ports, as far as possible, the winter trade of Canada, he will find, before many months go by, that his expectations will not be realized. He will find that it will be a very difficult matter to make capital for himself or party out of the present action of the Government in giving a subsidy, or their inaction in not having terminated the existing arrangement with the Allan Line any earlier than they proposed to do it. As much as I desire—and I do desire as much as the hon. gentleman does—to see the trade of Canada done from our own ports in winter as well as in summer, I fully sympathize with the feeling that we would not be justified in terminating the existing arrangement without giving the parties concerned all reasonable notice.

But, beyond that, there is another consideration. Coming into power, as this Government did, right on the eve of a session of Parliament, with its time fully engrossed in the preparations for and in carrying on the business of the session, it would be quite impossible for us to make any arrangements to secure a new line or to enter upon a new contract for the coming winter before the fall so as to justify our termination of the existing contract. Those things cannot be done properly unless done in good season. If done hurriedly, they are likely to be done very inefficiently, and therefore if there was no reason for waiting, if there was no claim which the Allan Company could fairly make to a reasonable notice of the termination of the present contract, the interest of the service itself would demand at our hands that we should take time before terminating the present contract and making a new arrangement for the carriage of mails across the water. Therefore, from every point of view, it seems to me that a person disposed to be reasonable at all, will think the Government are acting wisely by taking the course they have taken. We have now supplied, by the assurance which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given this session, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman, the most conclusive evidence that it is the determination of the Government to terminate the arrangement which now exists with the Allans at the end of the coming year.

Mr. FOSTER. To show that I was right with reference to the conversation with the

Minister of Trade and Commerce, I find, on reference to pages 2557 and 2558, that when I asked the hon. Minister what line would receive the $7,500 subsidy for the service with Dublin and Belfast, he replied that it was the Head Line, and it went on to say :

However, these are tentative propositions, and it remains to be seen whether the lines will acquiesce in them.

I desire to bring another and not less important matter, which I shall deal with as shortly as possible. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance and the Government generally to the financial situation, as shown in the Estimates brought down, and to the probable amount of revenue for the past year and the year now current. In the first place, I wish to give a very brief comparison of Estimates as brought down by the late Government and the present Government. For 1895-96, on consolidated revenue, the Estimates amounted to $37,832,353. For the present year, 1896-97, the Estimates, as declared upon the paper, amounted to $39,763,259. When you add to them, for the purpose of comparison, what was included in 1895-96, and what must be absolutely spent in 1896-97 for the parliamentary session, namely, the $400,000 which is the least sum that will do it, it makes their additional estimate——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How do you make that amount ?

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the explanation of that the other day—the total includes indemnities, mileage, "Hansard," extra expenses for clerks, sergeant-at-arms' expenses, and so on. Adding that sum, which is quite fair for the purposes of comparison, it makes the whole estimate for 1896-97 thus far brought down, on consolidated fund account, $40,163,259, as against $37,832,353, for last year, or an excess in the Estimates already brought down for the current year over the total Estimates brought down for the past year, of $2,330,906 on consolidated revenue alone. When we come to capital account, we find that, inclusive of redemption of debt—which we will leave out for purposes of fair comparison, inasmuch as the redemption of debt simply means that we are borrowing on one hand to redeem on the other, so that the operation does not affect actual debt—the Estimates brought down on capital account for 1895-96 amounted to $3,936,220. The amount so far brought down for 1896-97 on capital account is $4,498,091, an excess of $561,871. Thus we find that the total estimated expenditure of last year, exclusive of redemption of debt, was $41,768,573. This year, it amounts to $44,661,350, an excess of $2,892,777. The consolidated revenue fund Estimates as brought down this year are made up of the following :—The main Estimates, brought down on the 27th August, amounting to $38,225,787 ; the first Supplementary Estimates, brought down September 26th, amounting to $1,215,841 ; the second Supplementary Estimates, brought down 1st October, amounting to $351,631, less $30,000 since dropped or reduced when we were going over the Estimates ; and $400,000 for parliamentary sessional expenses omitted, but absolutely and admittedly necessary. These make up the total estimate I have given on consolidated fund. Now, it is to be borne in mind that while the total estimated expenditure both on consolidated revenue and capital funds for 1895-96 was $41,768,573, and the total for the current year is $44,661,350, the latter is not the total estimated expenditure for the current year. There is still the larger part of this year to run, and there is another session to come in the course of the year, and Supplementary Estimates are certain to be brought down during that session. Already, we have several items referred to, inside and outside of this House which have been absolutely promised, making it necessary that further Supplementary Estimates should be brought down. The above figures may be summarized as follows :—

ESTIMATES.

	1895-6.	1896-7.	Excess over 1895-6.
On Consolidated Fund Account	$37,832,353	$40,163,259	$2,330,906
On Capital Account, exclusive of redemption of debt...	3,936,220	4,498,091	561,871
Total. ...	$41,768,573	$44,661,350	$2,892,777

Going from that let me take up the individual heads of expenditure. I find that the decreases are very few and far between, while the increases are very many and not far between. The following will show the increases and decreases :—

Increases and Decreases in Estimates, 1896-97, as compared with those of 1895-96.

INCREASES.

Item.	Amount of Increase.
Net Public Debt, &c.....	$264,527
Charges of Management.....	1,250
Administration of Justice, &c.....	8,223
Penitentiaries	14,539
Quarantine	11,471
Immigration	500
Pensions	4,733
Superannuation	42,000
Militia (income).....	504,641
Railways and Canals (income).....	126,678
Public Works	518,241
Mail and steamship subsidies.....	91,334
Lighthouse and Coast	44,759
Marine Hospitals	1,143
Steamboat Inspection	1,300
Fisheries	44,133
Insurance	300
Geological Survey	17,927
Miscellaneous	52,078
Arts and Agriculture	45,070

Item.	Amount of Increase.
Legislation	$290,614
Ocean and River	39,678
Customs	48,201
Post Office	122,720
Dominion Lands (income)	1,200
Subsidies to Provinces	3,500
Indians	110,309

DECREASES.

Item.	Amount of Decrease.
Civil Government	$ 3,069
N. W. Police	5,613
Inland Revenue	1,622
Minor Revenues	900
Public Works (Collection of Revenue)	2,963
Government of North-west	28,650
Railways and Canals (Coll. Rev.)	9,306

This shows that in all the principal controllable items, although I have read two or three that are uncontrollable, like the interest on the public debt, there is either a very large increase, or, in the few cases in which there is a decrease, that decrease is infinitesimal. Now, Sir, if we come to the actual expenditure on consolidated fund, as shown by the Public Accounts, what do we find? Commencing at 1877-78, the actual expenditure for the several years was as follows:—

Total Expenditure on Consolidated Fund Account.

1887-88	$36,718,494
1888-89	36,917,834
1889-90	35,994,031
1890-91	36,343,567
1891-92	36,765,894
1892-93	36,814,052
1893-94	37,585,025
1894-95	38,132,005
1895-96	37,500,000
Average 1887-1896	36,985,644

The total for 1895-96 is made up from the returns latest brought down, with what may be estimated as still to be expended. The average expenditure under the late Government for these ten years was $36,985,644. The estimated expenditure, as in the Estimates already brought down, not taking into account further supplementaries, is $40,163,259, or a little more than three millions over the actual expenditure of last year. Now, it is fair to say that if all the Estimates for the current year 1896-97 were down, we could calculate on $1,000,000 or more to be left unexpended. But the Government has nothing of that kind to look forward to. It must bring down further Supplementary Estimates which will increase the total of these Estimates, and consequently we can take little off this amount for probable lapsed balances. The probability is, then, that the first year of the Reform Government, starting, as it does, with an Estimate of $2,892,777 greater than the preceding year, and as against an average expenditure of the late Government from 1887-88 to last year, of $36,985,644, will show an expenditure of $40,000,000. Now, Sir, with reference to the deficiency. I find that the income for the past year will be very close up $36,700,000. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) can rely upon a larger income to any considerable amount for the current year. Suppose that the income is $36,700,000, and taking his estimate as being $44,661,350 on consolidated fund and capital account, as it is at the present time, there is a possible deficit as between his probable income and his total estimated expenditure of $8,000,000 in round numbers.

Now, Sir, the figures that I read as the yearly expenditure, did not take into account the capital expendture, although the summation that I have given, does. The capital expenditure from 1890-91 upwards, has run from one to three million dollars; and I cannot tell from the returns brought down, what it will be for 1895-96; but as against an average of about three millions, we may say, during the past five years, the estimate at present for capital expenditure is $4,498,000.91. Now, what I want to call my hon. friend's attention to is this: He has come before this Parliament and the country with Estimates of $44,661,350, and he cannot lay his finger upon a revenue which will exceed $36,700,000 or $37,000,000. He has the financial affairs of this country, by his over-estimates, in this position, that with a purse which will not provide him with more than $37,000,000 at the outside, he proposes to expend on current and capital account, $44,600,000. I do not think in the annals of parliamentary government, a Finance Minister, in normal times, has ever faced Parliament and the country with a proposition of that kind. The hon. gentleman has not condescended to give this House or the country one single iota of information as to how he expects to raise that money, he has not asked the House to go into consideration of ways and means. The very first axiom of steady finance is that the expenditure shall be kept within income on consolidated revenue account and for current purposes. There may be occasions which will cause a Finance Minister to take a different view of the situation. Provided he is cutting down taxation, and provided that some depression in business gives him, in his forward look, the impression that for a year or so the revenue will be small; it may become a matter for him to decide whether, in these depressing times, he will put on the extra taxation, if he cannot cut down expense, or whether he will provide it out of capital. Such a time occurred two years ago, when the depression commenced, and when a very large amount of tax revenue had been left off on the article of sugar in this country, and for the succeeding year, a large deficit was faced, but a deficit not greater than the capital expenditure, to any considerable amount, which was a better alternative than, in that time of depression, putting on again the taxation which had been taken off the year or two before. But there is no such condition now. Things are fairly normal. The Finance Min-

ister looks out upon a future in as normal a condition as it well can be, and he deliberately asks this House, with a revenue of less than $37,000,000, to sanction an expenditure of $44,600,000, with Supplementary Estimates yet to come down. That is not the whole of the expenditure; my hon. friend knows that there are sums not in his Estimates that have to be met. For the current year he will have to pay the bounty on pig-iron, he will have to make his refunds, he will have to pay the bounty on beet-root sugar, he will have to overtake the bounty on the silver and lead production in the mines of British Columbia, and certain other expenses, all of which will add to the actual expenditure. I think it would have been far better that the hon. gentleman should have commenced the first year of his administration by keeping his Estimated expenditure, and his estimated, nay his almost certain, income of what he will be able to get in the shape of revenue, somewhere near on a par. He has not done it. What happens? That my hon. friend before this year is out, must borrow at least $10,000,000 on the market in order to make things square, for he has already a current loan of $2,000,000, and if his Estimates propose to be anything like honest Estimates, which we know they are, as to what he will expend the money that he has to borrow will in the main go, not for capital expenditure, but actually to meet daily needs, the hand to mouth existence, and the expenses of the country from the beginning to the end of the year. This is a grave matter. When the hon. gentleman goes to the money market, he will go not under the best conditions. No man wishes to make a loan upon the London market with a showing upon his books which indicates a certain and large deficit for the year in which he is making a loan. My hon. friend would have been better advised if he had restrained the demands that were made upon him, and particularly his estimates on consolidated revenue fund, and brought it down to the amount of possible revenue. Now, Sir, what answer may my hon. friend make? The answer which he has indicated two or three times during this session, and that other hon. gentlemen have indicated, is that the Estimates that were brought down last year do not at all show the Estimates we were proposing to bring down; that is, that they hold in their hands, they say, papers proving that we proposed to bring down four millions and odd more. Now, I have emphasized my contradiction to that statement as strongly as it can be emphasized, but I propose to do it again. The papers that hon. gentlemen have shown and quoted from, are not Estimates that it was proposed to put before this House as Supplementary Estimates; they were the aggregate demands that were made by the different departments, printed by the Queen's Printer for distribution and discussion in Council. The greater mass of them were never even discussed in Council; and it is not fair, it is not honest dealing to say that the demands that are made upon the Government are just exactly the measure of the Estimates that they bring down. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows that he has not this year brought down as Estimates submitted to this Parliament, all that was asked for from him by the different sections of the country for public works. Always that is the case in every department, and until you can form an idea of the Government expenditure in the actual estimate that it brings to Parliament, you cannot draw any conclusion from the demands that are made upon the Government as to what will be the amount it brings down. Now, I wish to end this exposition of the matter by calling the attention of this House, small as it is, and of the country, which is just as large as ever, to three quotations. One is a plank in the Liberal platform, which was adopted in 1893, which sums up seventeen years of earnest preaching and earnest canvass by the Liberal party, and which was the large card relied upon in their canvass in the elections which took place in June last. It was with reference to public debt and expenditure:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people, under the Governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand strict economy in the administration of the government of the country.

This was moved by Mr. George C. Gibbons, Q.C., of London, and the paper remarks:

> He made an excellent speech for the convention with his witty references.

Then, Sir, I find that the leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier), when in Brantford, on the 20th August, 1894, after this was brought down, after this had been made a plank of the party platform, declared:

> Do you imagine there is any justification for this increase in expenditure? The Conservatives tell us that there is a justification. The population has increased, they say. Oh, yes; it has increased 9 per cent; but the expenditure has increased 100 per cent. There can be no justification for such an expenditure (the increased debt) when, as has been stated, the great bulk is a corrupt expenditure. Moreover, they tell us that if we were in power we could not retrench and economize. But I do not believe that it will be a very difficult task. (Hear, hear.) It would not be a very difficult task to retrench to the extent of one, two, three, and Mr. Mills told his constituents a few days ago that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the reason they left Mr. Mills out.

Mr. FOSTER. In Toronto, in 1894, the same gentleman, the present leader of the Government was speaking, and he says:

> Has the expenditure gone down? No, it has gone up. It went up two, three, five, ten mil-

lions and more, until it is now $38,000,000. And the Conservatives do not shrink from it, but swallow it all. If we come into power, we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that although we may not be able to bring the expenditures back to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three, million dollars a year. (Applause.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who said that?

Mr. FOSTER. The present leader of the Government in his speech on the 23rd of August, 1894, said that. These statements of economy, these expressions of decreased expenditure, these professions for the relief of the taxpayers were prime articles of faith of the Liberal party in their canvass for the last eighteen years. The Liberals came into power. Their leader's word is that they can reduce the expenditure $3,000,000, but the facts are that their leader now sitting in the House as Prime Minister, sanctions estimated expenditures which are over $3,000,000 greater than—I was going to say the estimated expenditure for 1895-96, but I will put it still more strongly—the estimated expenditure is over four millions of dollars greater than the actual expenditure of 1895-96. The actual expenditure for 1895-96 was, in round figures, $37,500,000 on consolidated fund account, and the proposal of the present Government is to expend $40,163,259 —the difference being $2,500,000 odd greater on consolidated fund account. The proposal on capital account is to expend about $1,500,000 more than was actually expended in 1894-95; the figures for 1895-96 not yet being brought down. Add the two together, and the total expenditure on consolidated fund account and on capital account which it is proposed to make, viz., $44,600,000 will be nearly $8,000,000 more than the total revenue that can be expected during the present fiscal year. Thus, Mr. Speaker, do the professions and the practices of the Liberal party not agree.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has some good purpose in deferring until the last hours, nay until the last moments, almost of the session, this somewhat involved statistical argument, which, I regret to say, I have not been able to follow as closely as I should like to follow anything coming from the hon. gentleman in relation to the finances of the country, because, as ex-Finance Minister, we are bound to believe that anything he may say on that subject is entitled to consideration. In view of the most extraordinary speech that he has just made, we shall not be able to devote to his addresses on that subject as much respect as we ought to devote to anything coming from such a source. It is rather an extraordinary thing for the hon. gentleman, especially at this stage of the session, to present the marvellous statement which he has given to the House to-day. Perhaps, Sir, it is because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has the high honour of having within three successive years rolled up deficits to the amount of $6,000,000, or very near it, that he thinks he ought to commence to prophesy what the deficit of his successor may be. I do not think the country is going to be very much alarmed by comparisons between estimates. It may be necessary to compare estimates from time to time, but the practical, commonsense people of this country are much more concerned in comparing actual expenditures than they are in comparing estimates. They know well that the estimates which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has presented in the past have not always conveyed a clear indication of the actual expenditures of the country. Certainly, if we take the Estimates presented by him for the current fiscal year, we are forced to conclude that they were not intended to show the real necessities of the country. I believe the people will compare the expenditures of the two years. I believe the people will be content to wait until the end of this current fiscal year before they will be disposed to make comparisons between the present Government and the extravagant Government of the past. When a discussion similar to this was up at an earlier stage of the session, I had to say that I thought we ought to make our comparisons at the end of the year and not at the beginning, and even then we might justly claim that to a very considerable extent the expenditures of the present year will be chargeable upon hon. gentlemen opposite, because those expenditures will be influenced in a large degree by their own policy, and because in a certain degree these Estimates are necessary to carry out engagements entered into by them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) swells the Estimates to a degree that might be alarming to people who do not understand the question. He swells them to. I do not know how many millions. He asks the people of Canada to believe that there must necessarily be an enormous deficit. He says we only have a revenue of thirty-six and a half millions. As he himself placed on the Table of the House at the close of the last session Estimates for $38,300,000 chargeable to consolidated fund account, he certainly started out with the resolve of having a heavy deficit. Assumin his calculation to be correct, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself started out with the resolve that we should have a deficit representing the difference between that amount and $38,308,514, the total of his main Estimates. But do these main Estimates of the hon. gentleman represent correctly the public expenditures that he anticipated? It is true that the hon. gentleman, at an early stage of the session, rather conveyed the impression—I will not say that he stated—that he did not intend to have any Supplementary Estimates. He said that if I followed his good example, I

would have no Supplementary Estimates at all. Well, Sir, we know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did intend to have Supplementary Estimates, and we know that these Supplementary Estimates amounted to an enormous sum. I will accept the statement that in some respects these Supplementary Estimates had not passed Council, but I am compelled to say that estimates for large public works either passed Council, or were made by the Ministers and the representatives of the Conservative party throughout the Dominion, to do work in the election, and these hon. gentlemen said they were led to expect that they would have them. Throughout the length and breadth of Canada we had Conservative candidates declaring again and again with respect to any public work in which the people were interested, that they had provided for these works, and that the Government would provide the money for them in the Supplementary Estimates. Then they had this form of argument: That they would have got the money were it not for the obstruction pursued by the Liberal party in the House last session. And so, when hon. gentlemen opposite convey the impression that they had never passed in Council or elsewhere in any authoritative way, the Estimates for the public works and the railways of the country, we are compelled to look upon that as a statement which does not represent the whole facts. If we are to accept that statement as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, then it is a statement which reflects most seriously on the Conservative candidates throughout the Dominion of Canada, because they made statements which must have been untrue and unfounded. Now, I am forced to ask the question, to whom shall we look for the truth of the matter? Is it the late Minister of Finance, who seeks to convey the impression that there have never been such Estimates, or the two hundred and odd Conservatives throughout the Dominion of Canada who told the people everywhere that grants for these particular public works were included in those Estimates, and that they would have been brought down to Parliament but for the obstruction which they said took place? I am told that in some cases the printed sheets of the Estimates were exhibited. My hon. friend may laugh, but it is a fact which they cannot get over, that all over the country these promises were made. They did not say: We expect to get these grants, we are going to ask for so much money, and we hope to get it. They said: This thing has been provided for in the Estimates. Therefore, I am bound to assume that those Estimates, which the hon. gentleman is so anxious to get rid of to-day, were Estimates which he had intended to use. What do we find? We find that the hon. gentleman had Estimates chargeable to consolidated revenue, amounting to $38,308,548, and also large Supplementary Estimates for the various departments, chargeable both to revenue and to capital account. Taking the Estimates which we found in the various departments—not requests, but actual Estimates, approved by the Ministers of the Crown—the hon. gentlemen, in order to carry out their engagements, would have been bound to bring down to this House, Estimates, capital and revenue united, amounting to over $47,500,000. And when these hon. gentlemen tell us that they never intended to bring down those Estimates, they can only make that statement by discrediting their own friends throughout the length and breadth of the country—and I am told Ministers, too. Now, the Estimates brought down to Parliament this session are of three classes. First, there is this blue-book, containing the main Estimates. These are substantially the Estimates of hon. gentlemen opposite. Where they differ at all, they differ in the interest of economy, because the gross amount is sensibly less than the amount to which the late Finance Minister committed himself. Clearly, then, in a comparison between parties, he is as much responsible for these Estimates as we are. Then, we have the first Supplementary Estimates. What are they? They amount to a considerable sum, and the final Estimates were small; but if you examine them, you will find that there is hardly a dollar in them that is not put there to carry out the engagements of hon. gentlemen opposite. These Estimates, with scarcely an exception, are to pay the debts of hon. gentlemen opposite, or to cover public works to which they had committed themselves, according to the records to be found in the departments. Why, Sir, look at one item in these very Supplementary Esimates. What can be said of the hon. gentleman attempting to hold us responsible for Estimates which he implies are not necessary, when there is one sum of $1,165,000 for militia alone, to pay the debts of hon. gentlemen opposite—to pay the bills for goods which they ordered. And yet we find the hon. gentleman to-day trying to convey the impression to the public that these Estimates are brought down by us for some sinister purpose, and not for the end of good government. I venture to say that in all history of criticism in this Parliament, it will not be possible to find such an exhibition—the hon. gentleman called it an exposition, which I think may be translated exhibition—as that afforded by the hon. gentleman when he complains of these large obligations that we are going to assume, when he knows that the greater part of these appropriations are simply to carry out his own undertakings. We had to say in the beginning that we accepted the Estimates of hon. gentlemen opposite, with a full and clear understanding that we had not an opportunity of inquiring elaborately

into the details of the organization of public affairs; but that our hope and expectation was that we would be able to make some reductions in the expenditure. I have a strong hope that before the end of the fiscal year we may be able to effect some changes in fulfilment of our promises in that direction to show the public that we are able to effect economies which have been spoken of by hon. gentlemen opposite. But it will not be till this first year is completed, and until we have paid the debts of hon. gentlemen opposite and entered upon a new year, for which we shall prepare the Estimates ourselves, and have full and complete control of them, that we shall be in a position to make comparisons. I have not the slightest doubt that when that time comes, a comparison of the records of the Liberal party and the Conservative party will show that the Liberal party is one of economy, understanding by economy not parsimony or niggardliness, but a policy which will enable us to spend money on the useful public works of the country—a policy on which we can safely challenge the criticism of Parliament and the verdict of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my regret that the Minister of Finance had not placed in his hands some more formal notice in regard to this interesting statement by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), because we would then have been favoured, no doubt, with the best answer that was available at the hands of the Minister of Finance in regard to a matter of considerable importance, outside altogether of the interests of the two political parties in this country. I rise now only to make this observation in regard to the excuse which the Minister of Finance puts forward, and behind which he endeavours to shelter the Government, in connection with the claim of irresponsibility as regards the Estimates which have been laid before the House, and the Supply Bill, which now stands for its third reading. I could understand and sympathize with that excuse and with the argument of the Minister of Finance, if the Government had been consistent—if they had come to this House and said: Here are the Estimates of our predecessors; we have not had the time to look into these questions and to assume responsibility where we think the responsibility ought to be assumed, and to discard from the Estimates items for which we are not prepared to take the responsibility, and we ask for the indulgence of the House and the country. That would have been a consistent and intelligible position. But the hon. gentleman cannot deny that we have evidence that they are very much alive to these Estimates and have attempted to discriminate in regard to them; and for that discrimination and on every other ground they are as fully and completely responsible for these Estimates as if they had proposed them. They have dropped out Estimates here and there that were in those tentative Estimates prepared under the late Government, which they found in the different departments. They are aware of that; and they have exercised, with regard to many items, such as those for harbours and rivers, perhaps a wise political and party discretion, but purely a party discretion; and gentlemen supporting them over whose heads petitions are hanging, having the pleasure in finding in these Estimates their counties provided for, while others against whom there are no petitions and gentlemen on this side of the House are not so fortunate. When hon. gentlemen exercise a discrimination of that kind, and make a selection from Estimates prepared by their predecessors in office, it is a very lame excuse which the hon. Minister of Finance has put forward to-day for such an extraordinary estimate at such a time as this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is unnecessary that I should intervene at all, at this stage of the debate, after the very slight notice which the hon. Minister of Finance has given to the very able and distinct statement made with reference to the financial position of this country. The hon. gentleman failed altogether to meet the case put by my hon. friend, that the professions of economy to which hon. gentlemen opposite were pledged, and by no person more emphatically than by the First Minister, have been utterly ignored by their conduct since they have been in office. It is not for the purpose of touching that part of the discussion at all that I rise, but to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Finance has failed to meet the gravamen of the charge made by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster). My hon. friend's charge was that in no place where parliamentary government was carried on, has any Finance Minister ever brought down to Parliament an appropriation for the expenditure of a large sum of money, over and above any means with which he has to meet it, without providing the necessary means.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did the hon. gentleman hear the Finance Minister read a statement of proposed revenue which the ex-Finance Minister hoped to get, and the estimates he had already brought down, the latter exceeding the former by nearly $2,000,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman must not forget that the late Government were not in a position to go into the question of ways and means. He knows that was not the fault of the late Government, but that he himself and the gentlemen around him are responsible for the late Government not having been in a position to submit their estimates to Parliament in a constitutional manner, and to

ask Parliament to provide the ways and means necessary to meet that expenditure. I am not now dealing with the question of promises of economy, met by a proposal to swell the expenses of the country to a point that it has never reached in its pervious history; I am not simply calling the attention of the House to the position hon. gentlemen opposite occupy, in having obtained the support of the people, upon declarations of economy to which they have given the most emphatic contradiction by bringing down estimates greater than they ever were before, but I am pointing to the further fact that the Minister of Finance took his seat, after having attempted in vain to draw aside attention from the grave position of the financial affairs of the country, without attempting to explain where this money which he proposes to expend was to be obtained. We have, for the first time in our history, a Finance Minister putting before Parliament a statement involving the expenditure of millions of money more than he can show any expectation of obtaining. A more striking exhibition of impotency on the part of a Finance Minister has never been witnessed on the floor of any Parliament in the world. If the hon. gentleman desired to utterly discredit himself, if he desired to show his utter inability to deal with the financial affairs of the country, he could not have done so more completely than he has by taking his seat without making the faintest attempt to meet the statement of my hon. friend from York, or offer to the House the slightest apology for the course he has taken. The country will therefore understand what the promises and the pledges and the declarations of hon. gentlemen opposite mean. The people will understand with what contempt these hon. gentlemen, when in office, are prepared to treat the pledges they made when out of office. They will know more, they will know that the hon. Minister of Finance, when challenged by my hon. friend with the statement that he was about to spend something like $10,000,000 more than he has any reason to expect to receive, he did not attempt, for a moment, to question the soundness of the position taken by my hon. friend or make the slightest attempt at reply. When my hon. friend said that no more fatal act could be done by a Finance Minister, no act more calculated to destroy the credit of this country, than to provide for an expenditure exceeding by $10,000,000 the revenue anticipated, the hon. gentleman had nothing to say. He has no resource but to borrow the money, and he must know that there is no means by which he can place Canada in a more unfortunate position than to go to the money market of the world in order to borrow money to meet the ordinary expenditure of the public service. He knows that a Finance Minister could commit no more injurious act to the interest of the country than to go to the market of the world and borrow money, not for the purpose of carrying on capital expenditure or great public undertakings, but for the purpose of meeting the ordinary expenses that are chargeable to consolidated revenue. If the hon. gentleman wishes to discredit himself and make it impossible to obtain a loan upon fair and beneficial terms, he could not have taken any means more calculated to bring about such a disaster. This is a serious matter, aside altogether from party questions. It touches the public credit of the country. The First Minister smiles, but I ask him who would have thought, when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce went, year after year, to put our securities on the market at a ruinous discount, that a Liberal-Conservative Government would be able to raise the credit of this country to such a pitch that our 3 per cent would touch a premium of 6 per cent above par. Why, such a statement would have been received with perfect derision by hon. gentlemen opposite. But that high position for the credit of Canada would not have been attained—that of placing the credit of Canada next to that of the mother country, higher, I think, I am safe in saying, than that of any other country in the world, except the United Kingdom—had the Finance Minister of the late Government dealt with the matters in their charge in the way the present Minister of Finance does. For the hon. gentleman sits down as he has done to-day under this declaration, virtually admitting that he is going to borrow millions in the money market of the world to pay the ordinary expenditure chargeable to consolidated revenue which he has asked this House to vote. He has not offered the slightest explanation as to how he hopes, under these circumstances, to get upon fair and advantageous terms to Canada the means to provide for the expenditure. Any tyro in finance can see the consequences of the hon. gentleman rushing madly into the most extravagant expenditure to which this country has ever been committed, not only without any means provided but with the fact patent that there are no means except to borrow money for the purpose. I hold that the hon. gentleman was not only wanting in self-respect but he was wanting in respect to this House and to the country when he allowed a statement of that kind, made upon so high authority as that of the ex-Minister of Finance of this country to go without a single word of remark or explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, for one to maintain either his temper or his equanimity in the face of such an exhibition as we have had. The wild, reckless and reprehensible statements the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has made are not calculated to enhance his reputation in this country. We have before us facts which both the hon. gentleman and his colleague (Mr. Foster) should regard with

shame, facts for which they are more directly responsible than any other two men in this country. But not only do they not admit their responsibility, but they seek to throw that responsibility upon their opponents. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) talks about the "most extravagant expenditure to which this country has ever been committed" in the face of the fact that he has not and dare not contradict the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that, with the exception of three or four hundred thousand dollars, every single dollar of this reckless and extravagant expenditure was either absolutely incurred by him and is to-day a debt we have to provide for, or represents expenditure which he pledged the country to make. How dare the hon. gentleman talk to this House and the country about extravagant expenditure when he and his colleague alongside of him either actually placed these debts upon the country or left obligations which we, their successors are bound to discharge. The hon. gentleman is playing to-day the role which he successfully played in 1873. In 1873 when the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were on the eve of an election they came down and pledged this country to the expenditure of many millions of money, expenditure for which he had no provision whatever to meet. He knew that there must of necessity be an enormous deficit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me—the year closed with a surplus.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman cannot understand what I am referring to. I am referring to the budget speech brought down by Sir Leonard Tilley just before the election of 1873, when he pledged the country to many millions of expenditure beyond what the revenue could meet. And the hon. gentleman knew that; and he played the same trick this time, for he not only pledged this country to the expenditure of many millions, beyond what the budget of his Finance Minister could meet, but he went beyond that and burdened the country with reckless promises made by himself, some by telegrams and letters signed by himself, for which he made no provision. He talks about the necessity, the dire, the terrible necessity of our being pledged to go into the money markets of the world to borrow ten millions. Let me ask, Sir, what possible responsibility rests upon my hon. friend the Finance Minister for that? Did we incur the debts or liabilities which compel us to borrow this $10,000,000? Why, the hon. gentleman knows—the thing will not bear argument for a second—that he and his party and Government incurred all these liabilities. And if we are obliged, as they say we will be, to go into the money market for these funds, upon their shoulders lies not merely a portion but the entire responsibility. And yet the hon. gentleman rises in this House and talks as if we were in some sense or way responsible for this terrible state of public affairs. Then he makes another point—that we did not go into Committee of Ways and Means and provide for that contemplated deficit. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) came down with a budget speech last year showing an estimated revenue of about thirty-six and a half millions.

Mr. FOSTER. Thirty-seven millions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It did not reach thirty-seven millions. He said that he hoped there would be some better times, and a portion of his estimate of revenue was based upon that. At the same time the hon. gentleman brought down an estimated expenditure of very nearly two millions more than that. And he knew he was incurring an obligation of one million dollars for the purchase of arms in England, making an estimated deficit of nearly three millions altogether; and he did not pretend to make the slightest provision for a dollar of it. Did the hon. gentleman, in his budget speech, propose to lay additional taxes upon the country to raise that three millions of dollars? No, Sir. Will he dare to rise now and say that he intended to levy three millions of extra taxation in order to meet that deficit? He will not. He had incurred a deficit of nearly six millions in the previous three years besides this three millions of an estimated deficit. And yet he rises now and prates about the incompetence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). That the facts are serious, disgraceful, I acknowledge; but every atom of responsibility is chargeable upon the hon. gentlemen for the reckless manner in which they managed the finances. They scattered their promises broadcast with the idea of buying the representation of the people from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island. In addition to the million of dollars of obligation for arms of which I have spoken, there were obligations of nearly a million more which the hon. gentleman had either actually incurred, for which the debts were actually existing, or to which he had pledged the honour of the country. And, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has shown in the Supplementary Estimates of about two millions of dollars, there is hardly a dollar for which these hon. gentlemen had not actually incurred the obligation or had not pledged the faith of the country. What did we do? We brought down a paltry three or four hundred thousand dollars of Estimates for public wharfs and public works which they allowed to go into disrepair, and which would have been carried out to sea if we had not done something to repair them. We are spending a few hundred thousand dollars to save the expenditure of millions next year, and these hon. gentlemen, having let the public works of the country, unprovided for, having squandered its resources, and pledged its credit,

condemn us because we have the business-like capacity to meet this state of things in which they have involved the country. Why, Sir, we told the country beforehand, my hon. friend repeated it time and again, that it was not the intention of this Government to alter the tariff at the present session. Every one knew that: and I say it was a wise and statesman-like policy. I say more than that, that the facts which exist to-day in Canada, the contentment and the satisfaction which prevail in every commercial centre in Canada, with the conduct of the Government, are the best testimony in the world to the fact that the policy we propose to pursue is a statesman-like one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What about the last election in Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman talks about a three-cornered fight which took place in Prince Edward Island between a Patron, a Liberal and a Conservative, in which the Conservative came out some twenty-nine votes ahead. Why, Sir, if the Patron, who polled some 129 votes, had not been induced to run, as other gentlemen were induced to run in that county the last time my hon. friend attempted to steal the seat from the Liberals—if that had not been done, the Liberal candidate would have been returned by his old-time majority.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say the Government are where they are in consequence of exactly the same course pursued all over this country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are where we are because of the well-grounded and deep-seated dissatisfaction with the extravagant Government of the hon. gentleman, and because the people had lost confidence in his promises; because from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island there was not a single class of the people but were delighted beyond measure when they found that the Conservative party had passed out of power, and a new regime had taken its place. I repeat what I said before, that for the existing expenditure, every dollar of it, the hon. gentlemen are responsible. They are trying to play the same trick to-day they played in 1873. But they will find that the people have learned a lesson, and understand them now, and that all this fine talk and extravagant predictions which the hon. gentleman indulges in, will not have the weight of a feather upon the public mind. The people are willing to wait for the development of my hon. friend's policy, which will take place next session, and they will judge the Minister of Finance by the policy which he then propounds, and its results, and not by the explanation of his policy by his predecessors in office.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the motion is adopted, I wish to make a statement with reference to what has fallen from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have always noticed that when the hon. gentleman gets a little extravagant in his language, his case is generally a weak one. In this case I do not think that the Government, even on the assumption made by the Minister of Finance, will be able to hide behind the acts of the late Government. The Government of to-day came into power within a week or ten days of the beginning of the fiscal year, and there were no Estimates made for this fiscal year, there were no expenditures allowed to be undertaken, excepting during those eight or ten days that the normal expenses of the Government were going on, such as the payment of the Government officials; but there were no expenditures being made for public works: and I think the people of this country will very properly hold the Government to account for the expenditures of the present fiscal year. There may be some works in progress on which a great loss would have been incurred if they were not continued; but these items, I think, when examined, will be found to be very few. But the general principle still remains, that the present Government must be held responsible for the expenditures they are proposing during the present fiscal year. Now, when the Minister of Finance makes a statement that there was hardly a dollar but that was put there to carry out the engagements of the late Government——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Which they had agreed to.

Mr. WALLACE. The present Government may agree to it, or may not agree to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the hon. gentleman must understand me. If we come into power, and find that the ex-Premier, for instance, had written letters pledging himself to a certain expenditure, and on which letters expenditure had been incurred by those people, assuming that the hon. gentleman was honest and intended to carry it out—as I have no doubt he was—would not there be, in some sense, a moral obligation, if not a legal one, binding us to implement that promise?

Mr. WALLACE. No; that is not the way that our public works are done. The public works are let by public contract. Now, if a contract were let, then I would say that the present Government would have to carry out the obligations of the former one. But I cannot imagine a single dollar's worth of expenditure that would come under the description given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, excepting in one case, and that, I think, was in the town of Collingwood, or in some place where an expenditure was to be made by the Dominion Government, and another expenditure by the town council; it was to be a joint expenditure, and the

town council expended their money, and a little more, perhaps. But as a general principle, there are no expenditures made except in a regular and legally formal way. For all those expenditures where a contract had been entered into, the former Government must accept full responsibility —I will say that; but for all those others, I say the present Government should accept full responsibility. Well, we are met face to face with the fact that the estimated revenue during the present fiscal year is, in all, $37,000,000, and we are told that the late Government had brought in an estimate of two million dollars, or more, exceeding that. But it does not exceed it by two millions or more, it is not a million and a half more, it is about a million and three hundred thousand dollars greater than the estimated revenue.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What did you put the estimated revenue at?

Mr. FOSTER. When I made my Budget speech I estimated the revenue at thirty-seven million, and I brought down $38,200,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but my recollection of it was that it was $36,500,000, with a vague hope that it would reach $37,000,000.

Mr. WALLACE. The estimated expenditure was $38,700,000, or a little over a million and a quarter dollars more than revenue. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says there was another million more than that for military equipment. If I remember rightly, military equipments were to be paid out of capital account.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, only some; not these.

Mr. FOSTER. All the cost of equipment was on capital account.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But this million was not on capital account.

Mr. WALLACE. This million was capital account expenditure, and I think very properly, too. The Government undertook this extraordinary expenditure in one year, and they undertook it very properly, and it has met with the approval of both sides of the House. I think, under the circumstances, it is a fair charge to be made to capital account. But without taking capital account into consideration at all, there is a difference between the $37,500,000 of revenue, and the $40,500,000 on expenditure which the Minister of Finance now proposes, and which will be further increased by Supplementary Estimates. But I call the attention of the House to another very important element in this discussion. We have been told for many years that the tariff is too high, that the burden of taxation on the people is too heavy, and that the general expectation is that when this Government meets Parliament at the next session, they will propose a large reduction in the tariff, and, consequently, a corresponding reduction in the revenue. Therefore, the $37,000,000 that was estimated by the late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) our present Finance Minister may find it necessary to reduce very considerably because if he carries out promises of himself and his friends, his revenue may be millions of dollars less than the $37,000,000, and consequently the deficit may be correspondingly greater. These are serious matters that the present Government has to face. It will create a feeling, if not of alarm, of very great dissatisfaction, because the expenditures of the last Government were felt to be perhaps too liberal in view of the stringency throughout the country, and the necessity for retrenchment everywhere. If the present Government is going to carry out its pledges to reduce the expenditure by three or four millions of dollars, they have a very serious financial question before them. It will be a great disappointment to the people of this country, regardless of politics, who are looking forward to decreased expenditures, when they find that the Estimates placed before the House are increased to a large extent, rather than decreased.

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

PROROGATION.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. SPEAKER:

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

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

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to revive and amend the Acts respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to confirm an agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.

An Act for the relief of Albert Nordheimer.

An Act amalgamating the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the

Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company under the name of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Company.

An Act to incorporate the Mather Bridge and Power Company.

An Act respecting the South Shore Railway Company.

An Act to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act by dispensing with the preparation of new voters' lists in certain cases.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows :—

May it please Your Excellency :

The Commons of Canada have voted certain Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words :—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the First Session of the Eighth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I am glad to be able to relieve you from further attendance in Parliament.

I am happy to repeat the assurance already given, that I have every expectation that an amicable settlement of the Manitoba School question will shortly be arrived at.

In conformity with the statement made to you at the commencement of the session it was not considered advisable to submit any important measures of legislation for your consideration.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I have to thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the service of the current year.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said :—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Saturday, the seventh day of November next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the seventh day of November next.

OTTAWA : Printed by S. E. Dawson, Printer to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, 1896.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1896.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parenthesis are those of the mover.

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., conc. (M.) 2258.

Hamilton Powder Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 784.

Inland Revenue Collector, Brantford, Superannuation (Ques.) 2596.

Railway Act Amt. (B. 34) 1°*, 1876.

Beattie, Mr. T., *London.*

Cameron, Maj. Gen., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2390.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies (remarks) 1036.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1037.

Port Stanley Harbour, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 886.

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*

Address, on The, 302.

Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2363.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2006.

St. Lawrence River Floods (M. for Ret.) 601.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1215.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1265.

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa City.*

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2005, 2085.

Mackenzie, Hon. Alex., O. C.'s passed after Resignation, 1878 (M. for Ret.*) 1341.

Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 784.

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 484.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 774.

SUPPLY:

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1511.

Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1844.

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 946.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 394.

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income: Trent (Fishway at Lindsay) 2288, 2289.

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2430.

Public Works—Capital: Ont. (Collingwood Harbour) 2297. *Income:* Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1300; (Goderich Breakwater) 2341.

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Appropriation for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2466.

Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1461.

Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 1922.

French Canadian Emigration to Brazil (remarks) 957, 1133.

Hayes, Convict, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 402.

O'Hara, Mr., late Acting Coll. Customs, Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 2519.

Shortis, Valentine, Commutation of Sentence (Ques.) 407.

——— French Translation of Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2278.

Soulanges Canal, Estimated Cost (Ques.) 1586.

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Lachine (St. Louis *vs.* Crown) 2256; Sault Ste. Marie (Construction, &c.) 2251. *Income:* Beauharnois (Improvements) 2282.

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 1033; Customs, 860; Public Works, 964.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2519.

Indians (Ont. and Que.) 2026.

Legislation: House of Commons (Stationery, &c.) 2448.

Militia (Arms, Ammunition, &c.) 2243.

Penitentiaries: Kingston, 1461; St. Vincent de Paul, 1471.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1269; (Ottawa) 2308.

Bethune, Mr. J. L., *Victoria, N.S.*

Harbours and Breakwaters, N.S., Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 573.

SUPPLY:

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2039; (N.S.) 2026.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2321.

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3° of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2605, 2619.

Balsam and Cameron Lakes, Improvement of Channel (Ans.) 2104.

Bedford Township, Addington, Rebuilding Bridges (Ans.) 1138.

British Pacific Railway Co., Money Subsidy (Ans.) 1588.

Chambly Canal Lock-keeper Appnmt. (Ans.) 2109.

Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2364.

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*

Dismissal of I.C.R. Employees (Ans.) 2057, 2108.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1497, 1529, 1570.

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1595.

——— P.E.I. Ry. Employees (Ans.) 2105.

——— Translators, on 4th Rep. Debates Com., 2364.

Empire, Tug, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 1139.

Galops Canal Enlargement, Contracts (Ans.) 886.

Hannan, John, Dismissal from Lachine Canal (Ans.) 577.

"Hard-Pan" Claims, Cape Breton Ry. (Ans.) 1137.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2069.

Hurvey Line Ry., Govt. Subsidy (Ans.) 2105.

I.C.R., Cor. *re* Dismissals (Ans.) 2057.

——— Free Carriage of Wood for Employees (Ans.) 2111.

——— Tenders and Contract for Sale of Papers, &c. (Ans.) 1135.

——— Time Table (remarks) 1133.

Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1862.

Jobin, Achille, Dismissal (Ans.) 2102.

Lachine Canal, Lock No. 2, Construction (Ans.) 1136; Lock No. 1 (Ans.) 1306.

——— St. Louis *vs.* Queen, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2281.

Lakefield Dam, Transfer to Govt. (Ans.) 1139.

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2345.

O'Neil, John, Collector of Canal Tolls, Montreal (Ans.) 2108.

Pembroke Southern Ry., Cor. *re* Bonus (Ans.) 1144.

Ry. Rates Commission, Publication of Evidence (Ans.) 874, 877.

Ry. Subsidies (Ans.) 574.

Restigouche and Victoria Ry., Revote of Subsidies (Ans.) 1591.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Superintendent's Vacation (Ans.) 883.

Soulanges Canal, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 1587.

——— Tenders, &c., for Bridges (Ans.) 880.

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Cornwall (Enlargement) 2249; Galops, 2249; Lachine, 2255; (St. Louis *vs.* Crown) 2256; North Channel, 2248; Welland, 2278. *Income:* Beauharnois (Improvements) 2282; Farran's Point, 2293; Iroquois, 2294; Lachine (Electric Light Station) 2282; Trent (Fishway at Lindsay) 2287; Welland, 2295.

Civil Government: Railways and Canals, 967.

Public Works—Income (N.S.) 2479.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R., 1494; (Dalhousie Wharf) 2244; (Dismissals) 1497, 1529, 1570; (Halifax Cotton Branch) 2246; (Halifax, increased accommodation) 2241; (Levis, increased accommodation) 2247; (Riviere du Loup Station) 2248; (St. François Station) 2478.

Tay Canal, Land Damages, Claims (Ans.) 1312, 1314.

Trent Valley Canal, Valuation of Lands (Ans.) 1140.

Boisvert, Mr. F., *Nicolet.*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2334.

Borden, Hon. F. W. (Minister of Militia) *King's, N.S.*
Augustus, Capt., Dismissal (remarks) 1477.
Brantford Drill Hall, Granolithic Sidewalk (Ans.) 879.
Cameron, Maj. Genl., Resignation (Ans.) 317.
——— Gen. Gascoigne's Letter (M.) 1475.
——— Gen. Cameron's Letter to Min. (presented) 1684.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2376.
——— Gratuity, in Com. of Sup., 2477.
Fages, Capt. ("B" Battery) Quebec Centre Voters' List (Ans.) 875.
——— Capt. Alf., Leave of Absence (Ans.) 1134, 1580.
Fort Anne, Annapolis County, Repairs (Ans.) 1581.
Fortification at Kingston, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1581.
Gananoque Drill Shed Site (Ans.) 1136.
Militia Camps (Ans.) 403.
——— Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1046, 1059.
Militia Camp, London, Brigade Staff (Ans.) 1141.
Militia Clothing, Telegram from Senator Sanford (read) 2368.
Military College, Gen. Cameron's Letter to Min. (presented) 1684.
——— Administrative Changes, &c. (Ans.) 159.
———Rep. of Commandant (M. for copy) 869.
Port Hawkesbury, &c., Mail Service, on inquiry for Ret., 1209.
Rebellion in N. W. T., Monument to Volunteers, Toronto, Govt. Aid (Ans.) 883.
SUPPLY :
Civil Government : Militia and Defence, 859 ; Civil Employees) 1478.
Militia (Annual Drill) 556 ; conc., 620 ; (Annual Drill) 2243 ; (Cameron, Gen., gratuity) 2477 ; (Clothing, &c.) 1989, 2021, 2228 ; (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2239 ; (Deputy Asst. Gen.) 2228 ; (Dom. Rifle Ass.) 2243 : (Esquimalt Defences) 1494 ; (Miscellaneous) 1494 ; (Monuments) 2242 ; (Oliver Equipment) 1483 ; (Rifle Associations) 1493 ; (Staff) 1478 ; (Warlike Stores) 1479.
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1286.
Wood Mountain (N.W.T.) Scouts, Services during Rebellion (Ans.) 1590.

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 387.
Eastern Trust Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 22) 1**, 869.
Gov. Gen's Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 649.
Inland Revenue Inspector, Halifax, Appnmt. (Ques.) 2112.

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Civil Government : High Commissioner (contingencies) 1018.
Collection of Revenues : Excise, 2043.

Bostock, Mr. H., *Yale and Cariboo.*
Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 21) 1**, 869.
Kootenay Smelting, &c., Co.'s Land Grant at Revelstoke (M. for Cor.*) 1207.
Land Grants in Ry. Belt, B.C. (M. for Cor.*) 1207.
Mara, J. A., ex-M.P., Land Grants at Revelstoke (M. for Cor.*) 1207.
Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re* (prop. Res.) 1323.
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues : Post Office (Mail Service) 2161.
Indians (B.C.) 2039.

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*
Fishing Licenses on Lake Winnipeg (Ques.) 1317.
Hudson Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 24) 1**, 951.
Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio (Ques.) 155.
SUPPLY :
Public Works — Income : Buildings (Portage Laprairie P. O.) 1286.

Britton, Mr. B. M., *Kingston.*
Cameron, Maj. Gen., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2384.
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1919.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 373, 501.
——— I.C.R. Employees, in Com. of Sup., 1556.
Fortifications at Kingston, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1581.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 745.
I. C. R., Locomotive Boilers, Contracts (Ques.) 406.
Select Standing Coms., Rep. of Sel. Com. (Ques.) 310.
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1251.
Civil Government : Customs, 861.
Immigration (Expenses) 1952.
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 1452.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 2229 ; (Cameron, Gen., gratuity) 2477 ; (Miscellaneous) 1494.
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Halifax Drill Shed) 1263 ; Dredging, 428.
Railways—Capital : I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1556.

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Volunteers (1837-38) Services (prop. Res.) 1337.
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1244.
Canals—Income : Iroquois, 2294.

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.* [*See* SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy.]
O'Neil, John, Collector of Canal Tolls, Montreal (Ques.) 2108.

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Campbell, Angus P., P. O. Dept., Absence (Ques.) 1307.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1046.

Wardsville Postmaster, Appnmt. and Salary (Ques.) 874.

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*

Austin, John, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence (M. for Cor.) 1317.

Connolly, Messrs., Claim against Govt. (M. for copies) 1169.

Dalton, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence (M. for Cor.) 1322.

Dunn, Capt., Complaints against *re* Elections, &c. (Ques.) 16.

Franchise Act, Legislation *re* Repeal (Ques.) 16.

Goderich Harbour Improvements, Expend., &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 2114.

Govt. (late) alleged mal-Administration, Commission, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1311.

Import Duties on Malt Liquors, &c. (Ques.) 1580.

Langevin Block, Ottawa, Contracts for Construction, &c. (M. for copies) 427.

Point Clark Light-keeper, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 160.

——— on M. for Ret., 604.

Port Albert Harbour, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for Ret.) 887.

McGregor, Capt., Complaints against *re* Elections (Ques.) 15.

SUPPLY:

Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 2030.

Mounted Police, 2040.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 1264. Harbours and Rivers (Goderich Breakwater) 2239.

Tay Canal, Land Damages, Claims (Ques.) 1312, 1314.

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ontario.*

Linley, Harry, Fishery Overseer, Kent Co. (Ques.) 2113.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Three Rivers Ex.) 2224.

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2160; Weights and Measures, 2050.

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*

Address, on The, 179.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Article in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 1683.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2115.

Dismissal of I.C.R. Employees (Ques.) 2108.

——— Public Officials since July, 1896, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 601.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1096, 1130, 1430.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 820.

Great Britain and Can. SS. Service (Ques.) 575.

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—*Continued.*

House of Commons, Messengers in 1878, &c. (Ques.) 2108.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Derlin*) in Com., 2008, 2077.

Lépine, A. P., Date of Dismissal (Ques.) 1582, 2106.

Man. Schools, Press Rep. *re* Mr. Greenway (Ques.) 1134.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1042.

Military College, Rep. of Commandant, on M. for copy, 871.

Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 1043.

Proulx, l'Abbé, Par. in *La Presse re* Telegram (remarks) 1371.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Three Rivers Ex.) 2225.

Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 980.

Legislation: House of Commons (Serjeant-at-Arms) 1130; (Sessional Clerks) 1096.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Great Britain and Can.) conc., 2589.

Militia (Annual Drill) 558; (Clothing) 1671, 1993, 2231; (Oliver Equipment) 1481.

Miscellaneous (Quebec Landslide) 2496.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2485. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1430.

Wakeham, Commander, Removal (Ques.) 1590.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *South Oxford.*

Address, on The, 117.

Allan SS. Co.'s Mail Contract (Ans.) 2109.

Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2457.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Tenders (Ans.) 17, 575.

——— O. C.'s, &c., on M. for copies, 582.

Chamberlain, Hon. J. A., Interview with (Ans.) 2122.

Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2362.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (M) 307.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 514.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1543.

——— Translators, on 4th Rep. Debates Com., 2362.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 639.

Great Britain and Can. SS. Service (Ans.) 17, 575.

Hay Exports and Govt. Aid (Ans.) 1136.

Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 880.

Man. Schools, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2391.

Manufacturers and the Tariff, Circular Letter (Ans.) 884.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1047.

Personal Explanation (Mr. Dobell) *re* Change of Politics (remarks) 309.

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1249.
Civil Government: Customs, 861; Post Office, 868: Privy Council, 566; Trade and Commerce, 969.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John, Dublin, &c.) 2494, 2495; (Great Britain and Can.) conc., 2584; (Liverpool and St. John) conc., 2558.
Militia (Annual Drill) 559.
Ocean and River Service (Winter Mail Service) 1673.
Pensions (Mrs. Colebroke) 1262.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1284. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 2553.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1543.
Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1728.

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*
Binder Twine, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1578.
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1906.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 337.
Govt. Business and Order Paper (remarks) 1370.
Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1332.
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 28) 1**, 1580.
Order (Ques. of) Tay Canal Land Damages, 1313.
Port Stanley Harbour, Public Expend. and Transfer (M. for Stmnt.*) 2114.
——— Ret. *re* (Ques.) 1371.
Serjeant-at-Arms, Complaint against (remarks) 1315.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1217; (Year-Book) 1212; (Wheat Stations) 1237.
Militia (Oliver Equipment) 1483; (Warlike Stores) 1479.
Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay Expedition) 2500.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2490.

Casgrain, Mr. T. C., *Montmorency.*
Aberdeen, Cruiser, Mr. F. G. Marchand's Trip to Magdalen Islands (Ques.) 406.
Address, on The, 202.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Minister's statement at Quebec (remarks) 1342.
Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1462.
Dismissal of I.C.R. Employees (Ques.) 2108.
Lepine, A. P., Date of Dismissal (Ques.) 1582, 2106.
Man. Schools, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2390.
SUPPLY:
Militia (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2238; (Clothing, &c.) 2230.
Miscellaneous (Boundary, U.S. and Can.) 2405.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1462.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1274; (Quebec Post Office) 1265, 2301. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 1300, 2334. Miscellaneous (Engineers' Salaries) 2318.

Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Lévis, increased accommodation) 2247; (Riviere du Loup Station) 2248.

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1404.
Boston P.O., Change of Name (M. for Cor.*) 482.
Chinese Immigration, on M. for Ret., 1350.
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 9) 1**, 617.
Excise Duties on Malt Liquors, &c., Amount (Ques.) 1134.
French Can. Emigration to Brazil (remarks) 958.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 812.
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays &c. (remarks) 315.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2060.
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Lount*) in Com., 1802.
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1*, 1768.
Sunday Labour on Canals (remarks) 1210.
Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1782, 1803.
Waterford Postmaster, Resignation, Appnmt., &c. (M. for Cor.*) 482.

Chauvin, Mr. L. A., *Terrebonne.*
Address, on The, 216.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 724.

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Agriculture and Colonization 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 2269.
Bridge at Quebec, Construction, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 883.
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 84.
——— 2nd Rep., Dismissal of Translators (presented) 1367.
——— conc. (M.) 1680, 1766, 1876.
——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 1970.
——— 4th Rep., Appnmt. of Translators (presented) 2165; conc. (M.) 2346.
Divisions, Members not Voting (remarks) 853.
Fages, Capt. Alf., Leave of Absence (Ques.) 1134, 1580.
Floddy, Informer, Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 2111.
Govt. (late) Reps. and O.C.'s presented to His Ex. (M. for copies) 1322.
I.C.R. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 582.
——— Tenders and Contracts for Sale of Papers &c. (Ques.) 160, 1134, 1135.
——— Time Table (remarks) 1133.
Postmasters and late Elections (remarks) 1321.

Choquette, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Interior, 1873.
Public Works—Income: Telegraph Lines, 1429.

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2ª, 945.
Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1467.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 332.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1099, 1126.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 737.
Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1871.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1255; (Crop Reports) 1235; (Experimental Farms) 1230.
Civil Government: Interior, 1871.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1618. Weights and Measures, 2050.
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1676.
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2038.
Justice, Administration of (Penitentiaries Commission) 2427.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1099, 1126
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1467.
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia) 1262.
Ocean and River Service (Obstructions in Rivers) 1672.

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*
Advertisements *re* Private Legislation (Ques.) 886.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 376.
Rebellion in N.W.T., Monument to Volunteers at Toronto, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 883.

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*
Australia, Imports and Exports, Value (Ques.) 1144.
Imports and Exports, Australian Colonies, Percentages and Values (Ques.) 1585.

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1104.

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Address, on The, 253.
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1900.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 665.
House of Commons Bar, Abolition (prop. Res.) 1202.
Prohibition, Plebiscite of Dom. (Ques.) 406.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1233.

Craig, Mr. T. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Goderich Breakwater) 2342.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1557.
Tariff Legislation on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2276.

Davies, Hon. L. H. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Aberdeen, Cruiser, Mr. F. G. Marchand's Trip to Magadalen Islands (Ans.) 406.
Anticosti Island, Fishing within Three-mile Limit (Ans.) 1137.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3ª of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2636.
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Purchase (Ans.) 236.
Bear River Bridge, Removal of Obstructions (Ans.) 1310.
Behring Sea Seizures, Date of Commission, &c. (Ans.) 951.
——— Seizure of Schooners (remarks) 1476, 1589; (Ans.) 2107.
Bounty to Fishermen, Increased Grant (Ans.) 17.
Chicago Drainage Canal and Can. Interests (Ans.) 402.
Chignecto Ship Ry., Speech at Amherst (Ans.) 1308.
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1928.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 323.
——— P.E.I. Ry. Employees (Ans.) 160.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1090.
Dunn, Capt., Complaints against *re* Elections, &c. (Ans.) 16.
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry., Lands in Ry. Belt (Ans.) 1587.
Fishery Commission, Joint, on M. for Ret., 1155.
Fishery Overseer, P.E.I., Appnmt. (Ans.) 876.
Fish Hatcheries on Fraser and Skeena Rivers (Ans.) 404.
Fishing Bounty, Deep-Sea Weir Fishing (Ans.) 1589.
Fishing in Lower Rideau Lakes (Ans.) 1141.
Fishing Licenses on Lake Winnipeg (Ans.) 1317.
Fishways in North River, Argenteuil Co. (Ans.) 1137.
Gaspé Coast Road, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 882.
Green, T. D., Emplymt. by Indian Dept. (Ans.) 1586.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2078.
I.C.R., Locomotive Boilers, Contracts (Ans.) 407.
——— Sale of Newspapers, &c., Contract (Ans.) 160.
La Canadienne, Cruiser, Dr. Ennis's Trip to Magdalen Islands (Ans.) 572, 874.
——— Gaspé Elections (Ans.) 1585.
Langevin Block, Contract for Construction, &c., on M. for copies, 461.

Davies, Hon. L. H.—*Continued.*

Lemieux, Jos., Fishery Inspector, Complaints against (Ans.) 237.

Lighthouse at Oka, Construction (Ans.) 1306.

Linley, Harry, Fishery Overseer, Kent Co., Ont. (Ans.) 2113.

Lobster Fishery and Fishery Protection (Ans.) 1582.

——— Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 2168.

McBride, Fishery Overseer, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 159.

McGirr, Wm., Rep. *re* St. Peter's Indians (Ans.) 1589.

McGregor, Complaints against *re* Elections (Ans.) 15.

Magdalen Islands Lighthouse, Improvement of Service (Ans.) 882.

——— Lobster Hatchery (Ans.) 882.

Maple Lake (N.W.T.) Distribution of Fish Fry (Ans.) 1590.

Marine and Fisheries Officers, Appnmts., &c. (Ans.) 158.

Military College, Kingston, Rep. of Commandant, on M. for copy, 872.

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1°, 312.

Oyster Fishery, P.E.I., Dredging (Ans.) 573.

Oyster Fishing Privileges in P.E.I. (Ans.) 1586.

——— Removal of Restrictions (Ans.) 1310.

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, on M. for Cor., 480.

——— Employees, Dismissals and Appnmts. (Ans.) 160.

Personal Explanation (Mr. *Dobell*) *re* Change of Politics (remarks) 308.

Point Claire Lighthouse, Rebuilding (Ans.) 1581.

Point Clark Light-keeper, Complaints, &c. (Ans.) 160.

Port Hawkesbury, &c., Morrison Contract (Ans.) 1596.

Public Works in B. C., Erection (Ans.) 404.

Rys. in P.E.I., Legislation respecting (Ans.) 155.

Ry. Subsidies in B. C. (Ans.) 404.

St. Johns (P.Q.) Port Physician (Ans.) 239.

Seizure of Sealing Schooners by Russians (remarks) 1476, 1589.

Smith, George R., Appnmt. as Preventive Officer (Ans.) 1589.

Smuggling between U.S. and B.C., Prevention (Ans.) 405.

Supplies for Repairs of Vessels, on M. for Cor., 411.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Statistical Year-Book) 2213.

Civil Government: Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 1025; High Commissioner (contingencies) 1010; Interior, 1862; Marine and Fisheries, 961.

Fisheries (Behring Sea Commission, Expenses) 2392; (Fish-breeding) 1677; (Nfld., Refund of License Fees) 2394; (Protection Service) 1678, 2394; (Salaries) 1674; Seal Fisheries) 2394.

Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2179, conc., 2575; (Penitentiaries) 2420.

Davies, Hon. L. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1090; (Stationery) 2451. Library (Messengers) 2467. Senate (Leather Trunks) 2207; (Stationery, &c.) 2446.

Militia (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2237.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Belle Isle Fog Alarm) 2391. (Gas Buoys, Lake Erie) 2391; (Salaries) 1673.

Miscellaneous: (Boundary, U. S. and Can.) 2402; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 2498; (Mounted Police and Half-breeds) 2497; (Quebec Landslide) 2497.

Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland) 2491; (Tidal Service, &c.) 1672; (Winter Mail Service) 1673.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1283. Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 2329, 2481.

Scientific Institutions (Hydrographic Surveys) 1674.

Tariff Reform, Speech at Middleton, 1893 (Ans.) 156.

——— Speech at Sussex, N.B. (Ans.) 157.

Trent Canal, Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake Section, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 19.

Wakeham, Commander, Removal (Ans.) 1590.

Willie McGowan and *Ariel*, Seizures, Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 2107.

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia, N.W.T.*

Address, on The, 145.

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 2264.

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty (Ques.) 573.

Alien Labour, Prohbition, B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 937.

Anderson, Wm., Claims for Damages by Indians (M. for Ret.*) 2114.

Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2465.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1410.

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Interview with Hon. J. A. Chamberlain (remarks) 2122.

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid (prop. Res.) 583.

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 918.

Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1880.

——— 4th Rep. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2346.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 391.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1083, 1106.

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 23) 1°, 873.

Exhibition in N.W.T., Outstanding Indebtedness (Ques.) 17.

Forget, A. E., Indian Commissioner at Regina (Ques.) 1683.

Freight Rates in N.W., Mr. Laurier's Speech (1894) at Moose Jaw (Ques.) 407.

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

Govt. Business, Precedence, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1369.

Govt. of N.W.T., wthdrl. of B. (remarks) 2166.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 755.

Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 1188, 1200; (remarks) 1929.

Hayes, Convict, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 402.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2015.

Indian Reserve, North Ont., Par. in Orillia *Packet*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2171.

Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1864.

Lambert, J. K., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 959.

——— (Ques.) 2057, 2168.

Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 36) 1°*, 1929.

Maple Lake, Distribution of Fish Fry (Ques.) 1590.

Moose Jaw Town Site, Com. from Municipality (Ques.) 1143.

Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. (B. 16) 1°, 784.

N.W.T., Govt., Increased Subsidy (Res. wthdn.) 601.

North-west Territories Act Amt. (B. 7) 1°, 312.

Parliament, Newspaper criticisms *re* Dignity: on M. for Com. of Sup., 1597.

Penhallwick, Messrs., Claims for Damages by Indians (M. for Ret.*) 2114.

Prohibition and Lib. Convention at Ottawa (Ques.) 1317.

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 920.

Subsidies to N.W.T., Increased, on M. for Ret., 418.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Creameries, N.W.T.) 2468; (Three Rivers Ex.) 2209.

Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 982; Interior, 1864; Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2201; Trade and Commerce, 974.

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 2047.

Indians (Elkhorn Industrial School) 2399; (Man. and N.W.T.) 2037.

Immigration (Expenses) 1940.

Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2177; (Penitentiaries Commission) 2414.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1083, 1106.

Mounted Police, 2041.

Public Works, Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 2308.

Quarantine (Cattle) 2215, 2468.

Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1739.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (prop. Res.) 2274; neg. (Y. 26, N. 128) 2276.

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

Veterinary Surgeons in N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1068.

Wood Mountain Scouts, Services during Rebellion (Ques.) 1590.

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Wright.*

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 364.

Fages, Capt. Alf., Leave of Absence (Ques.) 1580.

Hull Electric Co.'s Change of Name (B. 20) 1°*, 869; in Com., 2006, 2058, 2070.

Import Duties on Malt Liquors, &c. (Ques.) 1580.

Personal Explanation, on the Address, 244.

Dimock, Mr. W. D., *Colchester.*

Pointe Claire Lighthouse, Rebuilding (Ques.) 1581.

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Protection Service) 1679.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1572.

Dobell, Hon. R. R. (Minister without Portfolio) *West Quebec.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1387, 2118.

——— Statement at Quebec (remarks) 1342.

Campbell, J. J., and North Ontario By-Election (Ans.) 885.

C.P.R. Land Grants by Crown (Ans.) 1142.

——— Exemption from Taxation, &c., 881.

Forget, A. E., Indian Commissioner at Regina (Ans.) 1683.

Industrial Indian Schools, Man. and N.W.T., Number, &c. (Ans.) 876.

Personal Explanation *re* Change of Politics, 307.

——— Telegram published in *L'Electeur*, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1970.

Ry. Lands in N.W.T., Selection, &c., by Companies (Ans.) 881.

Stoney and Clear Lakes, Islands (Ans.) 1138.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Indian Affairs, 1933; Geological Survey, 969.

Dominion Lands—Capital, 2407.

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1934.

Indians (B.C.) 2039; (Man. and N.W.T.) 2056, 2397; (Elkhorn Industrial School) 2398; (Removal Expenses) 2400; (Tannery Instructor, Blackfeet Reserve) 2402; (N.S.) 2024; (Ont. and Que.) 2028.

Militia (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2238.

Miscellaneous (Boundary. U.S. and Can.) 2403; (Surveys, Stickine and Yukon) 2406.

Thousand Islands, wthdrl. from Sale (Ans.) 1138.

Domville, Mr. J., *King's, N.B.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1400.

Cameron, Maj. Gen., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2382.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 400, 542.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1098, 1549.

Domville, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., Employees at late Elections (M. for Ret.) 577.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1048.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1213.
Civil Government: Privy Council, 566.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1098. Senate (Leather Trunks) 2208.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1998, 2019; (Oliver Equipment) 1479, 1480.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Halifax Drill Shed) 1263, 1264.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1549.

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia, N.W.T.*
Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 600.
Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T., Revision (Ques.) 878.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2075.
McGirr, Wm. (Indian Dept.) and late Election in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1142.
——— Rep. *re* St. Peter's Indians (Ques.) 1589.

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*
House of Commons, Messengers in 1878, &c. (Ques.) 2108.
Man. Schools Question, Press Rep. *re* Mr. Greenway (Ques.) 1134.
Tobacco Duty on Foreign Leaf (Ques.) 1310.

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Address, on The, 225, 240.
Agriculture and Colonization, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 2270.
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1909.
——— 4th Rep. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2349.
St. Johns (P.Q.) Port Physician (Ques.) 238.

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 941.
Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1332.
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Superintendent's Vacation (Ques.) 883.
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1534.

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2364.

Edgar, Hon. J. D., *West Ontario.* [*See* SPEAKER, Mr.]

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John City, N.B.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1417.
——— and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3° of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2610.

Ellis, Mr. J. V.—*Continued.*
Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1464.
Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2356.
House of Commons Bar, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Craig*) 1206.
I. C. R. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 581.
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies, &c.) 2022.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1464.
Public Works—Income: Telegraphs (Margaree and Cheticamp) 2345.
Quarantine (Cattle) 1261.

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Fishways in North River (Ques.) 1137.
Lighthouse at Oka, Construction (Ques.) 1305.

Fauvel, Mr. W. LeB., *Bonaventure.*
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (M. for Cor.) 891.
Bonaventure River Money Order Office (Ques.) 406.

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Port Credit Harbour, Transfer to Govt. (Ques.) 885.

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Appropriation for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2455.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3° of Sup. (B. 39) 2598, 2614, 2629.
Chignecto Ship Ry. Co.'s Lapsed Subsidies (Ans.) 1143.
Consolidated Fund, 1896, Receipts and Payments (Ans.) 881.
Corn and Cornmeal, Free Entry (Ans.) 18.
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1681.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 353.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1087, 1436.
Estimates, The, 1896-97 (presented) 307.
——— Suppl. (presented) 2056.
——— Further Suppl. (presented) 2345.
——— (remarks) 714, 1208.
Exhibition in N.W.T., Outstanding Indebtedness (Ans.) 17.
Financial Statement (remarks) 316.
Fredericton Bridge Co., Overdue Interest (Ans.) 1141.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (remarks) 20, 161, 240, 317.
——— Printing (M.) 483.
——— July and August, 1896, Amounts Paid under (Ans.) 575.
Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1851.
Loans, Temporary Current (Ans.) 575.
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 307, 2056, 2345.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Continued.*

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Unparliamentary Language, 1044.

Printing Bureau, Payment of Employees (remarks) 1373, 1596.

Provincial Subsidies, Letter (1892) to Halifax *Chronicle* (Ans.) 157.

Public Service and Estimates (remarks) 1372.

——— Financial Provisions (remarks) 1209.

Senate and House of Commons, Members' Indemnity (B. 40) prop. Res. and 1° of B., 2537.

Superannuation of Civil Servants, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 886.

SUPPLY (Res. for Com.) 306.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 1211; (General Statistics) 2211; (Three Rivers Ex.) 2210.

Charges of Management (Asst. Rec. Gen.'s Offices) 563; (Printing Notes) 565.

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 1034; Auditor General, 859, (contingencies) 1027; Customs, 860; Finance and Treasury Board (contingencies) 1028; Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 1024; Indian Affairs, 1034; Interior, 1851; Post Office, 863, (contingencies) 1031; Privy Council, 565, (contingencies) 1026; Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2204; Railways and Canals, 968; Sec. of State, 859, (contingencies) 1027; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 1024.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1620, 2428.

Dominion Lands—Income (Commissioner's Salary) 2165.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1087; (Stationery) 2447. Library (Messengers) 2467. Senate (Leather Trunks) 2206; (Sessional Salaries) 2445.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Liverpool and St. John) conc., 2557; (Port Mulgrave) 2022, 2494; (St. John and W. Indies) 2021, 2022.

Militia (Annual Drill) 563.

Miscellaneous (British Medical Association) 2501; (Li Hung Chang) 2501.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1276. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2480; (Ont.) 2490, (conc.) 2552; (Que.) 2486. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1436.

Quarantine (Cattle) 2222.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1510.

Supply (B. 18) 1°*, 786.

——— (B. 30) 1°, 1765.

——— (B. 39) Res., 1°*, 2°*, 2594.

Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 307; in Com., 713.

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., *Rimouski.*

Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2348.

Little Metis Harbour of Refuge, &c. (Ques.) 885.

Rimouski Post Office, Contractor's Failure (Ques.) 884.

——— (M. for Cor.*) 2114.

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*

Agriculture and Colonization, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 2272.

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Continued.*

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duty (Ans.) 573.

Bureau of Mining Information, Establishment (Ans.) 572.

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 587.

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. (remarks) 1768.

——— (B. 37) 1°, 1971.

Experimental Farm, Appnmt. of Agriculturist (Ans.) 1581.

——— Ottawa, Cost of Buildings (Ans.) 1582, 1591.

"Horn-fly" Eradication of Scourge (Ans.) 2107.

Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1334.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agricultural Societies) 1256; (Archives) 1211; (Butter Shipments) 1240; (Cold Storage) 2469; (Creameries, N. W. T.) 2467; (Crop Reports) 1235; (Dairy Service) 1237; (Experimental Farms) 1214; (Fruit Stations) 1234; (General Statistics) 2211; (Man. Census) 2212; (*Patent Record*) 1211; (Statistical Year-Book) 1212, 2212; (Wheat Stations) 1236.

Immigration (Women's Protective Society) 2228.

Civil Government: Agriculture, 2440.

Quarantine (Cattle) 1257, 2214, 2468; (Man. Hospital) 1257; (Organized Districts) 1256; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2223.

Three Rivers Ex., Experimental Farm Stock (Ans.) 1583.

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C. (Solicitor General) *Quebec County.*

Address, on The, 169.

Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1459.

——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 1576.

——— Sales and Overdue Accounts (Ans.) 1584.

——— Manufactured in Kingston Penitentiary, Year 1896 (Ans.) 1306, 1317.

Copyright, Conclusion of Negotiations (Ans.) 1307.

Hays, Convict, Release from Penitentiary (Ans.) 402.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2017, 2058.

Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1330.

N. W. T. Representation Act (Voters' Lists) Amt. (B. 38) 1°*, 2057.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Justice, 571, 2173,

Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2173, conc., 2538; (Exchequer Court) 1450; (Penitentiaries Commission) 2198, 2408.

Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1459; B. C., 1473. Dorchester, 1472. Man., 1474. St. Vincent de Paul, 1472.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1274.

Supreme Court, Additional Judge, prop. Res. wthdn., 2367.

——— Temporary Judge, Appnmt. (B. 33) 1°*, 1875.

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*

Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1468.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 679.

I. C. R., Free Carriage of Wood for Employees (Ques.) 2111.

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1115.

Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1468.

Fortin, Mr. T., *Laval.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1301.

Foster, Hon. G. E., *York, N. B.*

Address, on The, 86.

Allan SS. Co.'s Mail Contract (Ques.) 2109.

Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup, 2451.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Minister's Stmnt. at Quebec (remarks) 1344.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1389, 2118.

——— and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3° of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2598, 2600, 2621.

Cape Breton Mail Service, Papers (Ques.) 1320.

Coin and Bullion, Imports and Exports (Ques.) 576.

Consolid. Fund (1896) Receipts and Payments (Ques.) 881.

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1680, 1766, 1927.

——— 4th Rep. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2354.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 400, 494.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1070, 1112, 1128, 1431, 1498, 1535.

Estimates, The (remarks), 307.

——— Suppl. (Ques.) 715, 1208.

Estimates of late Govt. and present, in Com. of Sup., 545.

Experimental Farm, Cost of Buildings (Ques.) 1582.

Financial Statement (remarks) 316.

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c. (remarks) 314.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (remarks) 19, 161, 240.

——— July and Aug., 1896, Amounts Paid under (Ques.) 575.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 620; (Amt.) 637; neg. (Y. 69, N. 102) 851.

Govt. (late) alleged mal-Administration and Appnmt. of Commission: Ques. objected to, 1311.

——— Resignation, on presentation of Cor. (remarks) 311.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2009, 2061, 2075.

Indian Reserve, North Ont., Par. in Orillia *Packet*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2172.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1851, 1857.

Imports, &c., Home Consumption (Ques.) 575.

Loans, Temporary Current (Ques.) 575.

Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmastership, Appnmt. (Ques.) 576.

Militia Camps (Ques.) 402.

——— Contract for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1053.

Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 1044.

Personal Explanation (Mr. *Dobell*) *re* Change of Politics (objection) 308.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 1211; (Butter Shipments) 1241; (Cold Storage) 2474; (Experimental Farms) 1213; (General Statistics) 2212; (McNaughton, Mrs., gratuity) 2468; (*Patent Record*) 1211; (Three Rivers Ex.) 2209, 2223; (Year-Book) 1213.

Charges of Management (Asst. Rec. Gen.'s Office) 563; (Printing Notes) 565.

Civil Government: Agriculture, 868, (contingencies) 1034; Auditor General, 859; Customs, 861; (contingencies) 2444; Geological Survey, 968; Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 1024, 1025; High Commissioner (contingencies) 978; Indian Affairs, 1933; Interior, 1851; Marine and Fisheries, 962; Militia and Defence, 858; Post Office, 863, (contingencies) 1028; Privy Council, 857, (contingencies) 1025; Public Works, 964, (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2199; Railways and Canals, 967; Sec. of State, 859; Trade and Commerce, 969, (contingencies) 1034.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1609, 2436. Excise, 2044. Electric Light, 2405. Post Office (Mail Service) 2136, conc., 2546. Public Works, 1449.

Dominion Lands—Capital, 2407.

Fisheries (Behring Sea Commission, Expenses, &c.) 2393.

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1934; (Expenses) 1935.

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2034, 2396; (Removal Expenses) 2400; (Tannery Instructor, Blackfeet Reserve) 2402.

Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2177, conc., 2581; (Penitentiaries Commission) 2413, 2418.

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 1068; (Serjeant-at-Arms) 1128; (Sessional Clerks) 1070, 1112; (Stationery, &c.) 2447. Senate (Leather Trunks) 2206; (Sessional Salaries) 2445; (Speaker's Secretary) 2445.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John, &c.) 2021; (St. John and W. Indies, &c.) 2022, 2494; (St. John and Liverpool) conc., 2557; (Great Britain and Can.) conc., 2593.

Militia (Annual Drill) 556, 619; (Civil Employees) 1478; conc., 2545.

Miscellaneous (Arbitration, Ont. and Que.) 2043; (Boundary, Can. and U.S.) 2404; (British Medical Association) 2501.

Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland 2491.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage Laprairie, P.O.) 1290; (Dom. Reformatory) 1280; (Ottawa) 2304. Dredging, 1301. Harbours and Rivers, conc., 2548; (Que.) 2483. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1431; (Ottawa) 2479. Roads and Bridges, 1429.

Quarantine (Cattle) 2216.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1498, 1535; (Halifax Cotton Branch) 2246; (Halifax, increased accommodation) 2245.

Tariff Legislation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1684; (Amt.) 1727; neg. (Y. 76, N. 113) 1847.

Tay Canal, Land Damages (remarks) 1312.

Trade Relations with U.S., Speeches of Ministers (Ques.) 1304.

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough, N.S.*

Chinese Immigration, Memorials to Govt., on M. for copies, 904.

Dismissals, in Com. of Sup., 1079.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2015, 2063.

I. C. R. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 579.

Louisburg sub-Collector of Customs (Ques.) 408.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1051.

Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1333.

Private Bills, Standing at next Session of Parlt. (prop. Res.) 2443.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 979; Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2203.

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2147.

Immigration (Expenses) 1944.

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2036.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1079.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage Laprairie P. O.) 1289. Dredging, 1301.

Frost, Mr. F. T., *Leeds and Grenville.*

Address, on The, 200.

Fishing in Lower Rideau Lakes (Ques.) 1141.

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 942.

Fishing Bounty, Deep-Sea Weir Fishing (Ques.) 1589.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1247.

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*

Tobacco Regulations *re* Manufacture (Ques.) 2107.

Weights and Measures, Legislation *re* Repeal (Ques.) 2107.

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Civil Service, Appnmts., Promotions, &c., O.Co.'s (M. for copies) 604.

Fishing Licenses, Lincoln and Niagara, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 609.

Grand Trunk Ry. and C.P.R. Confirmation of Agreement (B. 10) 1°*, 713.

I.C.R. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 580.

Lundy's Lane, &c., Historical Monuments. Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2114.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1038.

Printing of Parliament., 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1368; conc. (M.) 2257.

——— 3rd Rep., conc. (M.) 2544.

Queenston Postmaster, Name and Date of Appnmt. (Ques.) 406.

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°, 313.

Smith, Chas. R., Appnmt. by late Govt. (Ques.) 2103.

Smith, George R., Appnmt. as Preventive Officer (Ques.) 1589.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Customs, 862.

Canals—Capital: Sault Ste. Marie (Construction) 2252.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1610.

Fisheries (Protection Service) 1679.

Militia (Annual Drill) 562.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage Laprairie, P.O.) 1292. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1439.

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*

Chapel Cove Breakwater, Construction (Ques.) 885.

Fishery Commission, Joint (M. for Ret.) 1144, 1168.

Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 880.

L'Ardoise Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1581.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1048.

Petit de Grat, Construction of Harbour (Ques.) 1591.

Port Hawkesbury, &c., Mail Contract, Papers, *re* (Ques.) 1209, 1373.

——— Morrison Contract (Ques.) 1596.

Port Richmond Breakwater, Construction (Ques.) 1587.

Privilege (Ques. of) Par. in Halifax *Chronicle* (remarks) 2545.

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2122.

Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 1677.

Indians (B.C.) 2039; (N.S.) 2023.

Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 1450.

Legislation: Library (Messengers) 2467.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 2022.

Penitentiaries: Dorchester, 1472.

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1301, 1302. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2323.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 2245.

Guay, Mr. P. M, *Lévis.*
Bourassa, P. E., Irregularities (Ques.) 1307.

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*
Binder Twine, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1578.
SUPPLY:
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 2029.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Goderich Harbour) 2342.

Hackett, Mr. E., *West Prince, P.E.I.*
Address, on The, 219.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 381.
——— P.E.I. Ry. Employees (Ques.) 159, 2106.
McBride, Patrick, Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ques.) 159; (M. for Ret.) 467.
Oyster Fishery (P.E.I.) Dredging (Ques.) 573, 1586.
Oysters, Standard Barrel Measure (Ques.) 573.
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, on M. for Cor., 482.
——— Dismissal of Trackmen (M. for Cor.*) 483.
——— Employees, Dismissals and Appnmts. (Ques.) 159, 2106.
Public Works in P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 607.
——— Repairs and Improvements (Ques.) 238.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 2296.
Militia (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2236.
Ocean and River Service (Winter Mail Service) 1673.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 2315. Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1300, 2325, 2484.
Tignish Village, Govt. Aid to Sufferers by Fire (remarks) 617, 2056.

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Chicago *Record's* Interview with Mr. Laurier *re* Relations Can. and U. S. (remarks) 12.
Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1973.
Dismissals, &c., Public Officials, since July, 1896 (M. for Ret.) 601.
Govt. (late) Reps. and O. C.'s presented to His Ex. (Ques.) 1322.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 786.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2085.
I. C. R. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 581.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 2295.
Civil Government: Auditor General, 860; Post Office, 863; Railways and Canals, 967.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John, &c.) 2495.

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2299. *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 2303. Harbours and Rivers, conc., 2553. Miscellaneous (Engineers' Salaries) 2318.

Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton, N.B.*
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: I.C.R., 1573.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 948.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 805.
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gas Buoys, Lake Erie) 2392.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Burlington Channel) 2339; (Goderich Breakwater) 2343.
Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1837.

Henry, Mr. R., *South Brant.*
Brantford Drill Hall, Granolithic Sidewalk (Ques.) 879.
——— Govt. Buildings, Improvements (Ques.) 879.
——— Postal Service, Free Delivery (Ques.) 879.
Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1827.

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 950.
Barron, J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1307.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Sault Ste. Marie (Construction) 2255. *Income:* Trent (Fishway at Lindsay) 2285.
Civil Government: Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 1035.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 2285; (Dom. Rifle Ass.) 2243.
Trent Canal, Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake Section, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 19.

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 379.
Franchise Act, Legislation *re* Repeal (Ques.) 19.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1041.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office, 864.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1106.
Militia (Annual Drill) 561.

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Address, on The, 137.

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G. (Controller of Inland Revenue) *Portneuf.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1399.

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—*Continued.*

Bourassa, P. E., Irregularities (Ans.) 1307.
Chinese Immigration, on M. for Ret., 1344.
Culling Timber, Cullers' Fees, &c., on M. for Ret., 411.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 346.
Excise Duties on Malt Liquors, Amount (Ans.) 1134.
Floddy, Informer, Inland Revenue Dept. (Ans.) 2112.
Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 9, 878.
——— on M. for Ret., 1195.
Inland Revenue Collector, Brantford, Superannuation (Ans.) 2596.
——— Inspector, Halifax, Appnmt. (Ans.) 2112.
Li Hung Chang in Can. (remarks) 907, 1344, 2502.
Louisburg sub-Collector of Customs (Ans.) 408.
Oysters, Standard Barrel Measure (Ans.) 573.
Personal Explanation, Inland Revenue Deptl. Staff, 2167.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1218.
Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 862.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2432. Electric Light, 2406. Excise, 2043. Weights and Measures, 2047.
Miscellaneous (Foster, J. J., Refund) 2495; (Li Hung Chang, Expenses) 2502; (Mounted Police and Half-breeds) 2497.

Tobacco, Duty on Foreign Leaf (Ans.) 1310.
——— Regulations *re* Manufacture (Ans.) 2107.
Weights and Measures, Legislation *re* Repeal (Ans.) 2108.
——— Metric System (Ans.) 9.

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg, N.S.*

Anticosti Island, Fishing in Three-mile Limit (Ques.) 1137.
Bounty to Fishermen, Increased Grant (Ques.) 17.
Corn and Cornmeal, Free Entry (Ques.) 18.
Fishery Commission, Joint, on M. for Ret., 1151.
Hurvey Line Ry., Govt. Subsidy (Ques.) 2105.

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Fish-breeding) 1678; (Salaries, &c.) 1676.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Great Britain and Can.) conc., 2586.
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1300.

Kendry, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*

Floods in South Monagan, Peterborough (M. for. Ret.*) 2114.

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income: Trent (Fishway at Lindsay) 2286.

Klock, Mr. J. B., *Nipissing.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2319.

Kloepfer, Mr. C., *South Wellington.*

Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1823.

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*

Binder Twine, Sales and Overdue Accounts (Ques.) 1584.
Connolly, Messrs., Claim against Govt., on M. for copies, 1180.
Fortifications at Kingston, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1581.
Govt. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 578.
North Ontario Election, Article in Toronto *World* (Ques.) 574.
Queenston Postmaster, Name and Date of Appmnt. (Ques.) 406.

Lang, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*

Customs Defalcations at Peterborough (Ques.) 1140.
Empire, Tug, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 1139.
Lakefield Dam, Transfer to Govt. (Ques.) 1139.
Stoney and Clear Lakes, Islands (Ques.) 1138.
Trent Valley Canal, Valuation of Lands (Ques.) 1140.

Langelier, Mr. F., *Centre Quebec.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1419.
——— O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies) 582.
——— Tenders (Ques.) 17.
Bridge at Quebec, prop. Building (Ques.) 17.
——— connecting I.C.R. with C.P.R. (M. for Ret.*) 609.
Fages, Capt. ("B" Battery) Quebec Centre Voters' List (Ques.) 875.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2078.
Le Courier du Canada, Free Transmission through Mails (Ques.) 879.
St. John's (Quebec) Suburban P.O. (Ques.) 878.
Soulanges Canal, Tenders, &c., for Bridges (Ques.) 880.

SUPPLY:

Militia (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2239; (Clothing, &c.) 2231.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*

SUPPLY:

Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2193.

Laurier, Hon. W. (President of the Council and Premier) *East Quebec.*

Address, on The, 70.
Adjnmt., Pub. Dismissals (remarks) 401.
Advertisements *re* Private Legislation (Ans.) 886.
Alien Labour B., on Adjnmt. (remarks) 610.
——— Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 932, 949.
Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2458.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1384.
——— Contract (Ans.) 2105.
Barron, J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1308.

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*

Battleford Industrial School, Close Confinement of Boy, on M. for Cor., 1223.
Bridge at Quebec, prop. Building (Ans.) 17.
——— Construction, Govt. Aid (Ans.) 863.
Cameron, Maj. Gen., Letter *re* Resignation (Ans.) 1037, 1131.
Cape Croker Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) 2274.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A., Press Criticisms, on M. to adjn., 956.
Chicago *Record's* Interview *re* Relations between Can. and U.S. (remarks) 14.
Chief Justice of B.C. and Recent Elections (Ans.) 407.
Civil Servants in B.C., Salaries (Ans.) 1310.
Clarke, Mr. E. F., deceased (remarks) 84.
Coal Interests (N.S.) and Liberal Platform (Ans.) 156.
Controllers of Customs and Inland Rev., Standing in Cabinet (Ans.) 18, 161.
Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 7.
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (Dismissal of Translators) on conc., 1767, 1924.
——— 4th Rep. (Appnmt. of Translators) on conc., 2359.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 504.
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 401.
——— since 1st July, 1896, on M. for Ret., 601.
Fishery Commission, Joint, on M. for Ret., 1163.
Franchise Act, Legislation *re* Repeal (Ans.) 16, 19.
Freight Rates in N.W.T., Speech (1894) at Moose Jaw (Ans.) 408.
French Can. Emigration to Brazil (remarks) 958, 1133.
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 313.
——— Precedence (M.) 1369, 2544.
Govt. (late) Resignation, Cor. with His Ex. (remarks) 10, 20, 617, 1037, 1131, 1207.
——— (presented) 311, 952.
——— precedents (remarks) 609.
——— Reps. and O. C.'s presented to His Ex., on M. for copies, 1322.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1660.
Govt. Rys., I.C.R. Branch Lines, on M. for Ret., 425.
Her Majesty's Reign (remarks) 1976.
House of Commons Bar, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Craig*) 1205.
——— Messengers in 1878, &c. (Ans.) 2108.
Hudson Bay, Practicability of Navigation (Ans.) 1316.
Indian Reserve, North Ont., Par. in Orillia *Packet*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2170.
Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio (remarks) 155, 952, 1209.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1852, 1868.

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 15.
Labour Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 712.
Land Transfers Earned by Ry. Co.'s, &c., in N.W.T. (Ans.) 408, 410.
Library of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 1132.
Macpherson, Hon. Sir David, deceased (remarks) 84.
Man. Schools, on Adjnmt., 7, 8.
——— Press Reps. *re* Mr. Greenway (Ans.) 1134, 1766.
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 15, 85, 1036.
Military College, Kingston, Commandant's Rep., on M. for copy, 870.
——— Letter of Resignation, 1131.
Mining Engineers' Visit to Can. (Ans.) 2103.
Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1326.
Moose Jaw Town Site, Com. from Municipality (Ans.) 1143.
Mounted Police Fines, Disposition (Ans.) 2596.
North Ont. Election, Article in Toronto *World* (Ans.) 574.
Notices of Motion, postponement (M.) 14.
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1**, 5.
Order (Ques. of) Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 2117.
Paris Universal Exhibition and Can. Representation (Ans.) 236.
Payne, Mr. J. L., Papers *re* (presented) 1303.
Postmasters and late Elections (Ans.) 1321.
Printing Committee, Joint (M.) 616.
——— 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 2258.
Private Bills, Standing at next Session of Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2444.
Prohibition and Lib. Convention at Ottawa (Ans.) 1317.
——— Plebiscite of Dom. (Ans.) 406.
Prorogation (Ans.) 2057.
Proulx, l'Abbe, Reported Official Mission (remarks) 1371.
Public Officials, Dismissals, &c., since July, 1896, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 601.
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 920.
St. Lawrence River Floods, on M. for Ret., 603.
Saskatchewan Electoral District, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 161, 239.
Seizure of Sealing Schooners by Russians (remarks) 1476.
Select Standing Coms. (M.) 7.
——— (Lists presented) 611.
——— Substitution of Name (M.) 782.
Shortis, Valentine, Commutation of Sentence (Ans.) 407.
Smith, Charles R., Appnmt. by late Govt. (Ans.) 2103.
Smith, George R., Dunnville (remarks) 2597.
Songhees Indian Reserve, Proceedings of Commission (Ans.) 403.

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Speaker, The, nomination (M.) 2.
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 6.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Agriculture, 868; Interior, 1852, 1868; Post Office, 865, 961: Privy Council, 853; Trade and Commerce, 976.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2043. Excise, 1619.
Immigration (Expenses) 1935.
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2034; (Ont. and Que.) 2027.
Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2185: (Penitentiaries Commission) conc., 2556.
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 1069. Senate (Speaker's Secretary) 2445.
Miscellaneous (Quebec Landslide) 2496.
Mounted Police, 2040.
Supreme Court (B.C.) Appnmt. of Judge, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1932.
Tariff Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2274.
Tariff Speech (1895) at Montreal (Ans.) 19, 159.
Tignish (P.E.I.) Govt. Aid to Sufferers by Fire (remarks) 618, 2058.
Trade Relations with U. S., Speech at Dalhousie, N.B. (Ans.) 2103.
——— Chicago *Record's* Interview (remarks) 14.
——— Speeches of Ministers (Ans.) 1305.

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
General Election (Eighth) Printing, &c., of Rets. (M. for copy*) 2115.

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 31.
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 236.
Gaspé Coast Road, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 882.
Le Canadienne, Cruiser, Dr. Ennis's Trip to Magdalen Islands (Ques.) 572, 874, 1585.
Lemieux, Jos., Fishery Inspector, Complaints against (Ques.) 237.
Magdalen Islands Lobster Hatchery (Ques.) 882.
——— Lighthouses, Improvement of Service (Ques.) 882.
Paris Universal Exhibition and Can. Representation (Ques.) 236.
Public Works in Gaspé, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 875.

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Austin, John, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence, on M. for Cor., 1319.
Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1463.
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 1578.
Connolly, Messrs, Claim against Govt., on M. for copies, 1183.
Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 592.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 328.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1505.

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 659.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2007.
I.C.R., Locomotive Boilers, Contracts (Ques.) 406.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1055.
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 924.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 985, 1002; Privy Council, 567.
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 1451.
Penitentiaries: Kingston, 1463.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1505.

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland, N.S.*
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1563.

Lount, Mr. W., *Centre Toronto.*
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 669.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2072.
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 14) 1°*, 784; in Com., 1802.
Nordheimer Relief (B. 35) 1°*, 1875.
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 1768.

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Annandale Wharf, Repairs (Ques.) 238.
Campbell Cove Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 237.
Customs Service, King's Co. (Ques.) 877.
Dismissal of I.C.R. Employees, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1066.
Lobster Fishery Protection, Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 2168.
Newport Wharf Extension (Ques.) 238.
St. Peter's Bay Lighthouse, Rebuilding (Ques.) 238.
Sailor's Hope Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 2106.
Stephen's Pier at Montague, Repairs (Ques.) 238.
SUPPLY:
Militia (Annual Drill) conc., 619.
Ocean and River Service (P. E. I. and Mainland) 2492.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom.) 1264; Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 2327, 2483.

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1425.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2065.
Mail Service, between C.P.R. and Gorrie and Fordwich P.O., Contract (Ques.) 405.

Macdonald, Hon. H. J., *Winnipeg.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 940.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 524.

Macdonald, Hon. H. J.—*Continued.*
Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1855.
St. Andrew's Rapids, Construction of Lock (Ques.) 877.
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Asst. Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 564.
Civil Government: Interior, 1855.
Immigration (Expenses) 1960.
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 2038.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage la Prairie P.O.) 1298.

Macdonell, Mr. J. A., *Selkirk.*
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 535.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage la Prairie P.O.) 1297.

Mackie, Mr. T., *North Renfrew.*
Pembroke Southern Ry., Cor. *re* Bonus (Ques.) 1143.

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1418.
Bureau of Mining Information, Establishment (Ques.) 572.
Chicago Drainage Canal and Can. Interests (Ques.) 402.
Experimental Farm, Appnmt. of Agriculturist (Ques.) 1581.
Georgian Bay Ship Canal and Power Aqueduct Co.'s (B. 19) 1st, 869.
Govt. Business, Precedence, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1370.
Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio, in Com. of Sup., 1861.
Ry. Employees Safety (B. 4) 1st, 155; 2nd m., 918.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Interior, 1861.

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche, N.B.*
Laurier, Hon. Mr., Speech at Dalhousie (N.B.) *re* Trade Relations with U.S. (Ques.) 2103.
Restigouche and Victoria Ry., Revote of Subsidies (Ques.) 1591.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 2324, 2480.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dalhousie Wharf) 2244; (Dismissals) 1569.

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Brandon Electoral District, Resignation of Seat (remarks) 86.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 730.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2069.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Capital (Collingwood Harbour) 2298.

McCleary, Mr. W., *Welland.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2nd, 939.
Connolly, Messrs., Claim against Govt., on M. for copies, 1186.
Manufacturers and the Tariff, Circular Letter (Ques.) 884.
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Lount*) in Com., 1802.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1040.

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton, N.S.*
Chignecto Ship Ry., Hon. Mr. Davies's Speech at Amherst (Ques.) 1308.
Copyright, Conclusion of Negotiations (Ques.) 1307.
Cow Bay Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 576.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 352.
Fishery Commission, Joint, on M. for Ret., 1149.
Gabarus Breakwater or Pier (Ques.) 576.
Inland Revenue Inspector, Halifax, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 2112.
Laurier, Hon. Mr., Speech (1895) *re* Protection (Ques.) 158.
Mining Engineers' Visit to Can. (Ques.) 2103.
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 17) 1st, 785.
Seizure of Sealing Schooners by Russians, on M. for Com. of Sup, 1475.
——— (Ques.) 1589.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agricultural Societies) 1276.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2130, 2143.
Militia (Annual Drill) 561.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2320, 2323.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R., 1494.
Three Rivers Fair, Experimental Farm Stock (Ques.) 1583.
Willie McGowan and *Ariel*, Seizures, Settlement of Claims (Ques.) 2107.

McGillivray, Mr. J. A., *North Ontario.*
Indian Reserve, North Ont., Par. in Orillia *Packet*, 2168.

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2nd, 946.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2518.
Justice, Administration of (Penitentiaries Commission) 2410.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1092.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gas Buoys, Lake Erie) 2391.

McHugh, Mr. G., *South Victoria.*
Balsam and Cameron Lakes, Improvement of Channel (Ques.) 2104.

McHugh, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income: Trent (Fishway at Lindsay) 2286.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1471.

McInerney, Mr. G. V., *Kent, N.B.*
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 676.

McInnis, Mr. W. W. B., *Vancouver, B.C.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 20.
British Pacific Ry. Co.'s Money Subsidy (Ques.) 1588.
Chief Justice of B.C. and Recent Elections (Ques.) 407.
Chinese Immigration, on M. for Ret., 1359.
Civil Servants in B.C., Salaries (Ques.) 1310.
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry., Lands in Ry. Belt (Ques.) 1587.
Nanaimo, Comox, Union, &c., Mail Service (Ques.) 2102.
Ry. Subsidies (Ques.) 574.

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 155; 2° m., 909.
——— B. 37 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1973.
Ry. Return Fare Tickets, Sale (B. 3) 1°*, 155.
Reformatory at Alexandria, Contract, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1584.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1267.

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness, N.S.*
Hard-Pan Claims, Cape Breton Ry. (Ques.) 1137.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Coaticook) 2102. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2479. Telegraphs (Margaree and Cheticamp) 2344.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1521.

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 2261.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1423.
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B 2 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 915.
Port Albert Harbour, Engineers' Reps., on M. for Ret., 890.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1250; (Dairy Service) 1238; (Experimental Farms) 1219.
Quarantine (Cattle) 1260.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1421.
Binder Twine, Sales and Overdue Accounts (Ques.) 1584.
Connolly, Messrs., Claims against Govt., on M. for copies, 1180

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 348.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1078, 1098, 1504.
Estimates of late Govt. and Present, in Com. of Sup., 551.
Fredericton Bridge Co., Overdue Interest (Ques.) 1141.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 799.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2073.
I.C.R Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret., 581.
Indian Reserve, North Ont., Par. in Orillia *Packet*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2171.
Post Office Act, Violation *re* Free Postage (Ques.) 1306.
Scott, Thos., Ret. *re* (Ques.) 1372.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1250; (Experimental Farms) 1217; (Statistical Year-Book) 2212; (Three Rivers Ex.) 2227.
Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 978: Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2200; Trade and Commerce, 972.
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2158.
Dom. Lands—Income (Commissioner's Salary) 2165.
Justice, Administration of (Penitentiaries Commission) 2426.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1078, 1098. Senate (Leather Trunks) 2207; (Stationery, &c.) 2446.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 2229.
Quarantine (Cattle) 2214.
Railways—Capital: I. C. R., 1494; (Dismissals) 1504.

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1404.
Cape Croker Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) 2273.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A., Visit to Can. (Ques.) 957.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 536.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1122, 1554.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 832.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1056.
Port Albert Harbour, Engineers' Reps., on M. for Ret., 889.
Printing Bureau, Payment of Employees (remarks) 1373, 1596.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1246.
Canals—Capital (Galops) 2251.
Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 984, 990, 1006, 1012.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1122.

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1284; (Ottawa) 2315. Dredging, 1300.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1554.

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries, 963.

Marcotte, Mr. F. A., *Champlain.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2333.

Martin, Mr. A., *East Queen's, P. E. I.*

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry., on M. for Cor., 893.

Belle River, &c., Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 237.

Dismissal of P. E. I. Ry. Employees (Ques.) 2105.

Fishery Overseer, P. E. I., Appnmt. (Ques.) 876.

Lobster Fishery and Fishery Protection (Ques.) 1582.

Oyster Fishing, Removal of Restrictions (Ques.) 1310.

P. E. I. Ry., Branch Lines (M. for Cor.) 469.

Public Works in P. E. I. (M. for Ret.) 606.

Rys. in P. E. I., Legislation respecting (Ques.) 155.

Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 2115.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Three Rivers Ex.) 2227.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P. E. I.) 2328, 2481; (Que.) 2489.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1572.

Vernon River, &c., Dredging (Ques.) 237.

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard, B.C.*

Chinese Immigration, Memorials to Govt. (M. for copies) 893.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage la Prairie P. O.) 1294.

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1**, 1303.

Migneault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*

Mondoux, A. A., Indian Agent, Abenakis Village, Complaints (M. for Ret.*) 2115.

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis, N.S.*

Anticosti Island, Fishing in Three-mile Limit (Ques.) 1137.

Bear River Bridge, Removal of Obstructions (Ques.) 1310.

Fort Anne, Annapolis County, Repairs (Ques.) 1581.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 1299.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1527.

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*

Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2348, 2352.

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, on The, 191.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 841.

Jobin, Achille, Dismissal (Ques.) 2102.

Point Claire Lighthouse, Rebuilding (Ques.) 1581.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Statistical Year-Book) 2214.

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2154.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Construction, &c.) 1673.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1267. Miscellaneous, 1446.

Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 2263.

Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2466.

Binder Twine, on M. to adjn. Hse., 1578.

Dismissals Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 346.

Inland Revenue Collector, Brantford, Superannuation (remarks) 2596.

Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio: in Com. of Sup., 1869.

Smith, George R., Dunnville (remarks) 2597.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 1211; (Butter Shipments) 1243; (Crop Reports) 1235; (Dairy Service) 1238; (Experimental Farms) 1214; (Fruit Stations) 1234; (Mrs. McNaughton, gratuity) 2468; (*Patent Record*) 1211; (Wheat Stations) 1236.

Canals—Income (Welland) 2296.

Civil Government: Agriculture, 868, (contingencies) 1032, 2440; Customs, 862, 1611; Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 1024; Interior, 1869; Post Office, 863. (contingencies) 1028; Privy Council, 565, 857, (contingencies) 1026; Public Works, 965; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 1035.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2438, 2514. Electric Light, 2407. Excise, 2046. Post Office (Mail Service) 2161.

Fisheries (Protection Service) 1679.

Indians (Schools, Man. and N.W.T.) 2397; (Removal Expenses) 2499; (N.S.) 2025.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gas Buoys, Lake Erie) 2391.

Militia (Annual Drill) 561.

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Nanaimo Harbour) 2300; (Collingwood Harbour) 2297. *Income:* Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1278; (Ottawa) 2314. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2489; conc., 2551.

Quarantine (Cattle) 1257; (Organized Districts) 1256.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R., 1496.

Veterinary Surgeons, N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1067.

Moore, Mr. A. H., *Stanstead.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1252; (Cold Storage) 2476.

Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1768.

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Chambly Canal Lock-keeper, Appnmt. (Ques.) 2109.

Petit, H. E., and Coal Contracts (Ques.) 2110.

Rosseau, Wilfrid, Appnmt. as Postmaster, St. John's (Ques.) 2109.

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster, B.C.*

Address, on The, 261.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2091.

Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1335.

Mulock, Hon. W. (Postmaster General) *North York.*

Austin, John, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence, on M. for Cor., 1320.

Bonaventure River Money Order Office (Ans.) 405.

Brantford Postal Service, Free Delivery (Ans.) 879.

Campbell, Angus P., P.O. Dept., Absence (Ans.) 1307.

Dalton, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence, on M. for Cor., 1322.

Election Literature, Gratuitous Distribution (Ans.) 572.

Le Courier du Canada, Free Transmission through Mails (Ans.) 879.

Letter Postage, 2-cent Rate (Ans.) 1305.

Mail Contract, Morris (Man.) Cancellation (Ans.) 2112.

Mail Service between C.P.R. and Gorrie and Fordwich, Contract (Ans.) 405.

Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmastership, Appnmt. (Ans.) 576.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1042, 1053.

Nanaimo, Comox, Union, &c., Mail Service (Ans.) 2163.

Port Hawkesbury, &c., Mail Service, Papers *re* (Ans.) 1373.

Post Office Act, Violation *re* Free Postage (Ans.) 1306.

Queenston (Ont.) Postmaster, Name and Date of Appnmt. (Ans.) 406.

Rosseau, Wilfrid, Appnmt. as Postmaster, St. John's (Ans.) 2109.

St. John (Quebec) Suburban Post Office (Ans.) 878.

Sailor's Hope (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 2106.

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 1023; Post Office, 863, 961, (contingencies) 1028.

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2130; conc., 2547.

Tariff Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2275.

Wardsville Postmaster, Appnmt. and Salary (Ans.) 874.

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta, N.W.T.*

Address, on The, 151.

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 2266.

C.P.R. Land Grants by the Crown (Ques.) 1142.

——— Lands in N.W.T., Exemption from Taxation, &c. (Ques.) 881.

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 585.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 540.

Green, T. D., Emplymt. by Indian Dept. (Ques.) 1586.

Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 12) 1*, 784; 2* m., 909.

Indian Industrial Schools, Man. and N.W.T., Number, &c. (Ques.) 876.

Land Transfers Earned by Ry. Co.'s, &c., in N.W.T. (Ques.) 408, 410.

Mounted Police Fines, Disposition (Ques.) 2595.

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2*, 927.

Ry. Lands in N.W.T., Selection, &c., by Companies (Ques.) 881.

Ry. Rates Commission, Publication of Evidence (Ques.) 874, 877.

Subsidies to N.W.T., Increased (M. for Ret.) 412.

SUPPLY :

Immigration (Expenses) 1952.

Indians (Schools, Man. and N.W.T.) 2394; (Elkhorn Industrial School) 2398,

Pensions (Mrs. Colebroke) 1262.

Quarantine (Cattle) 2221.

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2466.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 846.

Paterson, Hon. W. (Controller of Customs) *North Grey.*

Australia, Exports and Imports, Value (Ans.) 1144, 1585.

Coin and Bullion, Imports and Exports (Ans.) 576.

Customs Defalcations at Peterborough (Ans.) 1140.

Customs Service, King's Co., P.E.I. (Ans.) 877.

Exports and Imports, Australian Colonies, Percentages and Values (Ans.) 1144, 1585.

Paterson, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Import Duties on Malt Liquors, &c. (Ans.) 1580.
Imports, &c., Home Consumption (Ans.) 575.
Scott, Thos., Ret. *re* (Ans.) 1372.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2444.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1609, 2503.

Penny, Mr. E. G., *Montreal (St. Lawrence).*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2433.

Pettet, Mr. W. V., *Prince Edward.*
Personal Explanation *re* Vote on Tariff Legislation, 2367.

Pouliot, Mr. C. E., *Temiscouata.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract (Ques.) 2104.
Election Literature, Gratuitous Distribution (Ques.) 572.

Poupore, Mr. W. J., *Pontiac.*
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal (M. for Cor.*) 2115.

Powell, Mr. H. A., *Westmoreland, N.B.*
Cameron, Maj. Gen., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2368.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 2317. Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 2325,
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1508.

Prior, Hon. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 944.
Behring Sea Seizures, Date of Commission, &c. (Ques.) 951.
Chinese Immigration, on M. for Ret., 1354.
Fish Hatcheries on Fraser and Skeena Rivers (Ques.) 404.
Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1329.
Public Works in B.C., Erection (Ques.) 404.
Ry. Subsidies in B.C. (Ques.) 403.
Smuggling between U.S. and B.C., Prevention (Ques.) 405.
Songhees Indian Reserve, Proceedings of Commission (Ques.) 403.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Fruit Stations) 1234.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 2228: (Esquimalt Defences) 1494; (Rifle Associations, &c.) 1493.
Miscellaneous (Boundary, U. S. and Can.) 2403; (Surveys, Stickine and Yukon) 2405.
Quarantine (Organized Districts) 1256; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2222.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 2343.
Supreme Court (B.C.) Additional Judge, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1930.
Victoria and Carmanah Point Telegraph Line (Ques.) 404.

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., *Montreal (St. Anne's).*
Address, on The, 162.
Board of Commissioners (Customs) Appmnt. (M. for Cor.*) 1341.
Culling Timber, Montreal, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 482.
—— Cullers' Fees, &c. (M. for Ret.) 411.
Dismissals, in Com. of Supply, 1435, 1503.
Galops Canal, Obstructions to Navigation (remarks) 1210.
Hannan, John, Dismissal from Lachine Canal (Ques.) 577.
Hay Exports, Govt. Aid, (Ques.) 1136.
Interest Act Amt. (B. 25) 1°*, 1132.
Lachine Canal, Lock No. 2, Construction (Ques.) 1136.
—— Lock No. 1 (Ques.) 1306.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1058.
O'Hara, Mr., late Acting Coll. of Customs, Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 2434, 2524.
Public Service and 8-hour Labour System (M. for Ret.*) 1341.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Galops) 2249; (Lachine) 2255.
Civil Government: Customs, 861.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2434, 2524.
Justice, Administration of (Penitentiaries Commission) 2416.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1280; (Dom. Buildings) 1264. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1435.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1503.

Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Miscellaneous, 1443.

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
Galops Canal Enlargement, Contracts (Ques.) 886.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Galops) 2249; (North Channel) 2248. *Income* (Farran's Point and Galops) 2293; (Iroquois) 2294; (Lachine, Electric Light) 2282.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gas Buoys, Lake Erie) 2392.
Public Works—Capital (Collingwood Harbour) 2298. *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa) 2306; (Que.) 2319. Harbours and Rivers (Goderich Breakwater) 2339.

Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.*
Battleford Industrial School, Close Confinement of Boy (M. for Cor.) 1323.
Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1452.
—— Manufactured at Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 1316.
Campbell, J. J., and North Ont. By-Election (Ques.) 884.
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 1896.

Richardson, Mr. R. L.—*Continued.*
Hudson Bay, Practicability of Navigation (Ques.) 1316.
Letter Postage, 2-cent Rate (Ques.) 1305.
Mail Contract, Morris (Man.) Cancellation (Ques.) 2112.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 2053.
Immigration (Expenses) 1937, 1969.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1452.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage la Prairie P.O.) 1288.
Tariff Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2275.

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
"Horn-fly," Eradication of Scourge (Ques.) 2107.

Robertson, Mr. J. R., *East Toronto.*
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 1911.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 676.
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1525.
Tariff Legislation, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1835.

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Prohibition and Liberal Convention at Ottawa (Ques.) 1317.

Rogers, Mr. D. D., *Frontenac.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1420.
Binder Twine Manufactured at Kingston Penitentiary, 1896 (Ques.) 1306.
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 29) 1st m., 1682.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income: Trent (Fishway at Lindsay) 2291.
Penitentiaries (Commissions of Investigation) 2197.

Russell, Mr. B., *Halifax.*
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 714.
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2195.

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1216; (General Statistics) 2212.
Civil Government: Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2200.
Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1675.
Legislation: Senate (Leather Trunks) 2208.
Quarantine (Cattle) 1259.

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Point Clark Lighthouse-keeper, Complaints against (M. for Ret.) 604.

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Wentworth and Brant.*
Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2361.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 981; Public Works, 966, (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2205.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1094, 1124.
Volunteers' (1837-38) Services, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Broder*) 1340.

Speaker, Mr. (HON. JAMES DAVID EDGAR) *West Ontario.*
Address, The, Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read 1036.
Brandon Electoral District, Resignation of Member (remarks) 86.
Business of the House, Notices on Order Paper (remarks) 9.
Cameron, Maj. Genl., Resignation, Letters *re* (remarks) 1475.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. (remarks) 954.
Dairy Products Act Amt. B. (Ruling) 1768.
Dismissals on I.C.R., incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1592.
Govt. (late) Resignation, and Cor. with His Ex., ref. to Gov. Genl. (remarks) 1636, 1655.
House of Commons Bar, Abolition (remarks) 611, 1208.
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 15.
——— Rep. affecting (remarks) 1368.
Jacques Cartier Election, Judgment (presented) 1303.
Laval Election, Judgment (presented) 1303.
Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 7.
McCarthy, Mr., Resignation of Seat for Brandon, 86.
Members, New (notification) 571.
Members' Remarks checked, 244, 328, 449, 579, 1018, 1309, 1370, 1579, 1683, 2169.
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 15, 85, 307, 1036, 2056, 2345.
Minister reading Documents (remarks) 1177.
Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies (remarks) 1037.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1053.
Notices of Motion (remarks) 410.
Order Paper, change in Form (remarks) 1303.
Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) irrelevancy of remarks, 595.
Order, Ques. of (Ruling) 2117.
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Dobell*) ref. to past deb. not in order, 308.
Postmasters at Elections, irrelevancy of deb. (remarks) 1321.
Private Bills, Standing at next Session of Parliament, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2444.
Procedure, Ques. of (Ruling) 1311.
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec. (read) 2595.
Royal Assent to Bills (notification) 1373.

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Royal Assent, Com. from Dep. Gov., 1766.
Rules of the House, Distribution (remarks) 10.
Saskatchewan Electoral District (remarks) 161, 240.
——— Issue of Warrant for Writ (notification) 311.
Seizure of Sealing Schooners by Russians (remarks) 1476.
Serjeant-at-Arms, Complaint against (remarks) 1313, 1316.
Speaker, Election as (acknowledgment) 4.
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 5
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries) 1069, 1126; (Sergeant-at-Arms) 1127; (Sessional Clerks) 1070; (Stationery, &c.) 2447.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) conc., 2554.
Tay Canal, Land Damages (remarks) 1313.
Unparliamentary Language, 593, 1043, 1415.
Vacancies (notification) 155, 310.

Speaker, Dep. (Mr. L. P. BRODEUR) *Rouville.*
Dismissals, I.C.R. Employees, in Com. of Sup. (Ruling) 1535.
Members, Remarks, checked, 1018, 1579.
Mess. from His Excellency, read, 2345.

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep., on conc., 2260.
Bedford Township, Rebuilding Bridges (Ques.) 1138.
Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1465.
Bureau of Mining Information, Establishment (Ques.) 572.
Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 600.
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 916.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 340.
Gananoque Drill Shed, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 1136.
Govt. Employees and late Elections, on M. for Ret. 578.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 765.
Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T, on M. for Ret., 1197.
Grey, North, Par. in *L'Electeur*, recent Elections (remarks) 1427.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2018, 2063.
Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1328.
——— (Ques.) 572.
Order (Ques. of) Denial of Stmnt., 924.
Printing, Joint Com., 1st. Rep., on conc., 2258.
Ry, Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 922.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Butter Shipments) 1240; (Dairy Service) 1237; (Experimental Farms) 1214; (Wheat Stations) 1236; (Year-Book) 1212.
Canals—Capital (Rideau) 2276.
Civil Government: Auditor Gen. (contingencies) 1027; Finance and Treasury Board (contingencies) 1028; High Commissioner (contingencies) 1015; Interior, 1873; Marine and Fisheries, 961; Post Office, 863, (contingencies) 1031; Public Works, 963, (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2202; Trade and Commerce, 973.
Collection of Revenues: Public Works, 1449. Customs, 2437.
Dominion Lands—Capital, 2407.
Indians: Man. and N.W.T., 2401; Elkhorn Industrial School) 2398; (Tannery Instructor) 2402.
Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2194.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sergeant-at-Arms) 1130. Senate (Leather Trunks) 2206.
Militia (Staff) 1478.
Miscellaneous (Boundary, Can. and U. S.) 2403.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1465.
Public Works—Capital (Collingwood Harbour) 2277. *Income:* Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1270; (Ottawa) 2307; (Ont. and N.W.T.) 2302; (Grosse Isle) 1265. Dredging, 1301. Harbours and Rivers (Goderich Harbour) 2343. Miscellaneous, 1429.
Quarantine (Cattle) 1269, 2215.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R., 1495.
Thousand Islands, wthdrl. from Sale (Ques.) 1137.
Three Rivers Fair, Experimental Farm Stock (Ques.) 1583.

Stenson, Mr. M. T., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Address, on The, 143.
Debates, Official Rep., 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2351.

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Balsam and Cameron Lakes, Improvement of Channel (Ques.) 2104.
Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 335.
Division, Members not Voting (remarks) 853.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2013, 2095.
Smith, Chas. R., Appmnt. by late Govt. (Ques.) 2103.
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Excise, 2047. Weights and Measures, 2048.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1110; (Stationery, &c.) 2453.

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 592.

Tarte, Hon. J. I. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John and Iberville.*
Annandale Wharf (P.E.I.) Repairs (Ans.) 238.
Belle River, &c., Breakwater (P.E.I.) Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 237.

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Continued.*

Brantford Public Buildings, Improvements (Ans.) 879.

Campbell Cove (P.E.I.) Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 237.

Chapel Cove (N.S.) Breakwater, Construction (Ans.) 885.

Connolly, Messrs., Claim against Govt., on M. for copies, 1177.

Cow Bay Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 576.

Dismissal of Public Officials, in Com. of Sup., 1119, 1430, 2308, 2318.

Gabarus Breakwater or Pier (Ans.) 577.

Harbours and Breakwaters in N.S., Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 574.

Lambert, J. K., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 960; (Ans.) 2057.

L'Ardoise Breakwater (C.B.) Repairs (Ans.) 1581.

Lépine, A. P., Date of Dismissal (Ans.) 1582, 2106.

Little Métis Harbour of Refuge, &c. (Ans.) 885.

Newport Wharf (P.E.I.) Extension (Ans.) 238.

Petit de Grat, Harbour Shelter (Ans.) 1591.

Petit, H. E., and Coal Contracts (Ans.) 2110.

Port Albert Harbour, Engineers' Reps., on M. for Ret., 888.

Port Credit Harbour, Transfer to Govt. (Ans.) 885.

Port Richmond (N.S.) Breakwater, Construction (Ans.) 1587.

Port Stanley Harbour, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 886.

Public Works in Gaspé, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 875.

——— P.E.I., Repairs and Improvements (Ans.) 238.

——— on M. for Ret., 607.

Reformatory at Alexandria, Contract, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1584.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1268.

Rimouski Post Office, Contractor's Failure (Ans.) 884.

St. Andrew's Rapids, Construction of Lock (Ans.) 877.

St. Peter's Bay (P.E.I.) Lighthouse Rebuilding (Ans.) 238.

Stephen's Pier at Montague (P.E.I.) Repairs (Ans.) 238.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Three Rivers Ex.) 2210.

Civil Government: Public Works, 964, (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2199.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1119.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Great Britain and Can.) conc., 2593.

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Nanaimo) 2301; Ont. (Collingwood Harbour) 2297; (Kaministiquia) 1262; Que. (St. rence Ship Channel) 1262. *Income:* Buildings, 1264; Man. (Portage la Prairie. P.O.) 1287; N.S. (Halifax Drill Shed) 1263; N.B., 1264; Ont. (Dom. Reformatory) 1268, (Ottawa) 2302; Que., 2319, (Grosse Isle) 1265 (Quebec P.O.) 1265, (St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary) 1265, 2301, (Coaticook, Public buildings) 2302,

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Three Rivers Ex.) 2223. Dredging, 1300. Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 2480; N.S., &c., 1299, 2322, 2480; Ont. (Burlington Channel) 2339, (Goderich Harbour) 2339, 2489, conc., 2549; P.E.I., 2325, 2482; Que., 2333, 2483. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1429; (Engineers' Salaries) 2318; (Ottawa) 2479. Telegraph Lines, 1429. Roads and Bridges, 1429.

Vernon River, &c. (P.E.I.) Dredging (Ans.) 237.

Victoria and Carmanah Point Telegraph Line (Ans.) 404.

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 5) 1st, 155; 2nd m., 929, 951.

——— on Adjnmt. (remarks) 610.

Augustus, Capt., Dismissal (remarks) 1476.

Bedford Township, Addington, Rebuilding Bridges (Ques.) 1138.

Binder Twine, Manufacture and Sale, in Com. of Sup., 1470, 1566, 1575.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of of Sup., 349.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1125, 1566.

Gananoque Drill Shed, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 1136.

Members not Voting (remarks) 852.

North Grey Election (remarks) 128.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairy Service) 1239.

Canals—Capital (Galops) 2249.

Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 988, 1014, 1022; Privy Council, 570; Trade and Commerce, 974.

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) 2159.

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1674.

Justice, Administration of (Penitentiaries Commission) 2428.

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1125; (Stationery) 2447.

Militia (Clothing, &c.) conc., 2545.

Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1470.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Dom. Reformatory) 1265.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1566.

Thousand Islands, wthdrl. from Sale (Ques.) 1137.

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2nd, 937.

Cameron, Maj. Gen., Resignation (Ques.) 317.

Coal Interests and Liberal Platform (Ques.) 156.

Davies, Hon. Mr., Rep. of Speech at Sussex *re* Tariff (Ques.) 156.

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 344.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2006.

Marine and Fishery Officers, Appnmts., &c. (Ques.) 158.

Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Lount*) in Com., 1303.

Tisdale, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1060.

Militia Camp, London, Brigade Staff (Ques.) 1140.

Military College, Kingston, Rep. of Commandant, on M. for copy, 870.

——— Administrative Changes, &c. (Ques.) 159.

Mining Interests of Dom., Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1329.

Oliver's Infantry Equipment. Newspaper criticisms (remarks) 1209.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1479, 1490.

Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1004.

——— Singing, &c., by Members in Com., 1851.

Provincial Subsidies, Mr. Fielding's Letter (1892) in Halifax *Chronicle* (Ques.) 157.

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 921.

St. Clair and Erie Canal Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 11) 1°*, 784.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: High Commissioner (contingencies) 1012.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1612.

Militia (Annual Drill) 557; (Clothing, &c.) 1977; (Oliver Equipment) 1479, 1490.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Goderich Breakwater) 2342.

Tariff Reform, Mr. Davies' Speech (1893) at Middleton (Ques.) 156.

Tolmie, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*

Point Clark Lighthouse, Complaints against Keeper (M. for Ret.) 604.

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart., *Cape Breton.*

Address, on The, 36.

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 933, 950.

Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2463.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) 484.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1374.

——— and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3 of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2612, 2634.

Cameron, Maj. Gen., Resignation, Letter *re* (Ques.) 1037; (remarks) 1475.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A., Press criticism (remarks) 952.

Clarke, Mr. E. F., deceased (remarks) 83.

Coal Interests (N.S.) and Liberal Platform (Ques.) 156.

Connolly, Messrs., Claim against Govt., on M. for copies, 1173.

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Govt. Aid, on prop Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 588.

Debates, Official Rep., on M. for Sel. Com., 7.

——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 1706.

——— (remarks) 1368.

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on conc., 2361.

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—*Continued.*

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 506, 1064.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1073, 1089, 1498, 1544.

——— Translators, Official Rep. of Debates, on 4th Rep. of Com., 2361.

Fishery Commission, Joint, on M. for Ret., 1166.

Govt. (late) Resignation, Cor. with His Ex. (remarks) 6, 10, 20, 609, 617, 1037, 1131, 1207.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1623.

Govt. Business, Precedence, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1369.

Govt. Rys., I.C.R. Branch Lines, on M. for Ret., 425.

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, Printing (remarks) 483.

High Commissioner, Cor. with Govt. (remarks) 1369.

Her Majesty's Reign (remarks) 1976.

House of Commons Bar, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Craig*) 1205.

I.C.R., Dismissal of Employees, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1064.

Interior Dept., Vacant Portfolio (remarks) 785, 1208.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1853, 1867.

Macpherson, Hon. Sir David, deceased (remarks) 83.

Man. Schools, on Adjnmt. (remarks) 8; (Ques.) 1765.

Marine and Fisheries, Dismissal of Employees, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1064.

Militia Camps, Contracts for Supplies, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1047.

Military College, Commandant's Letter of Resignation, 1131.

——— Commandant's Rep., on M. for copy, 869.

Notices of Motion (remarks) 410.

Order (Ques. of) irrelevancy of remarks, 595.

Printing Committee (Joint) Name substituted, 617.

Private Bills, Standing at next Session of Parlt., (remarks) 2444.

Resignations, Govtl., 1873, 1878, 1896; O. Cs. *re* (M. for Ret.*) 482.

Saskatchewan, Electoral District, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 161, 239.

——— Mr. Speaker's Warrant for Writ (M.) 239.

Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3.

Speech from the Throne, on M. for consdn. (remarks) 6.

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 1024; High Commissioner (contingencies) 979, 987, 993; Interior, 1853, 1867; Militia and Defence (contingencies) 1026; Post Office, 866, 966; Privy Council, 567, 853; Sec. of State (contingencies) 1026.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1616.

Fisheries (Protection Service) 1678; (Salaries, &c.) 1674.

Immigration (Expenses) 1938.

Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2182.

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Legislation: House of Commons (Sergeant-at-Arms) 1126; (Sessional Clerks) 1073, 1089.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Great Britain and Can.) conc., 2583.
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1671; (Oliver Equipment) 1487.
Ocean and River Service (Winter Mail Service) 1672.
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2484; (Ont.) conc., 2551.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1498, 1544.

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Aberdeen, Cruiser, Mr. F. G. Marchand's Trip to Magdalen Islands (Ques.) 406.
Address, on The, 264.
Antwerp Exhibition, 1885 (M. for Ret.*) 2115.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3° of B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2618, 2633.
Binder Twine Contract, Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) 2596.
——— Manufacture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1457.
——— on M. to adjn. Hse., 1579.
Chignecto Ship Ry. Co.'s Lapsed Subsidies (Ques.) 1142.
Colonial Securities, Imp. Stamp. Duty (M. for Ret.*) 2114.
Controllers of Inland Rev. and Customs, Status in Cabinet (Ques.) 18, 161.
Copyright Negotiations (Ques.) 1307.
Davies, Hon. Mr., Speech at Amherst, Chignecto Ship Ry. (Ques.) 1308.
——— Rep. of Speech at Sussex, N.B., *re* Tariff (Ques.) 156.
——— Speech at Middleton, 1893 (Ques.) 156.
Death Duties Imposed upon Colonists by England (M. for Ret.*) 2115.
Dismissals, Public Officers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 318, 401, 540.
——— in Com. of Sup., 1070, 1076, 1500.
——— I.C.R. Employees, incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1591, 2057, 2167.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 6) 1°, 311.
——— Fielding, Hon. Mr., Letter in Halifax *Chronicle* (1892) *re* Provincial Subsidies (Ques.) 157.
Fishery Commission, Joint, on M. for Ret., 1157.
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c. (remarks) 315.
Govt. Rys., I.C.R. Branch Lines (M. for Ret.) 423.
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, Printing (M.) 317.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 686.
Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2059.
I.C.R., Bridge-keepers, Dismissals and Appmnts. (M. for Cor.*) 482.
——— Cor. *re* Dismissals (remarks) 2057.
Imperial Stamp Duty on Colonial Securities (M. for Ret.*) 2114.

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*

International Customs Bureau, Brussels (M. for Ret.*) 2115.
——— Ry. Co., St. Petersburg (M. for Ret.*) 2114.
——— London, 1895 (M. for Ret.*) 2115.
Langevin Block, Contracts for Construction, &c., on M. for copies, 444, 448.
Laurier, Hon. Mr., Speech (1895) *re* Tariff (Ques.) 18.
——— Coal interests (N.S.) Telegram (Ques.) 156.
Marine and Fishery Officers, Appmnts., &c. (Ques.) 158.
Marine and Fisheries sub-Agents at Pictou, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 1207.
Pictou Island Life-boat, Dismissal of Capt. (M. for Ret.*) 1207.
Prorogation (Ques.) 2057.
Provincial Subsidies, Mr. Fielding's Letter (1892) in Halifax *Chronicle* (Ques.) 157.
St. Louis *vs.* Queen, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2280.
Shortis Case, French Translation of Papers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2279.
Supplies for Repairs of Vessels (M. for Cor.) 411.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (General Statistics) 2210.
Charges of Management (Asst. Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 564.
Civil Government: Interior, 1875; Justice (Penitentiaries Branch) 570, 2173.
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2430, 1617.
Fisheries (Protection Service) 2304, 1678.
Ocean and River Service (Tidal Service, &c.) 1672.
Justice, Administration of (County Judge, Man.) 2173, conc., 2540, 2558; (Penitentiaries. Commissions of Investigation) 2197, 2408, conc., 2555.
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1070, 1076; (Stationery) 2447.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance) 1673.
Militia (Annual Drill) 558; (Oliver Equipment) 1491.
Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay Expedition) 2498; (Quebec Landslide) 2497.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Binder Twine) 1457.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ottawa) 2307. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2321, 2479; (Ont.) conc., 2555.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dismissals) 1500.
Scientific Institutions (Hydrographic Surveys) 1674.
Tariff Reform, Mr. Davies's Speech (1893) at Middleton (Ques.) 156.
——— Hon. Mr. Laurier's speech (1895) *re* Tariff (Ques.) 18.
Trust Funds, 1888, Investment (M. for Ret.*) 2115.

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 936.
Appropriations for Session 1897, Legislation *re*, in Com. of Sup., 2460.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service and Portland Harbour, on M. for 3° of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) 2639.

Wallace, Mr. N. C.—*Continued.*

Chicago Drainage Canal and Can. Interests (Ques.) 402.

Experimental Farm, Appnmt. of Agriculturist (Ques.) 1581.

Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Lount*) in Com., 1802.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1223: (Statistical Year-Book) 2213: (Three Rivers Ex.) 2209, 2224.

Civil Government: Customs, 861; Post Office, 865; (contingencies) 1029; Public Works, 966, (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2205.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 1610, 2436, 2503. Post Office (Mail Service) 2136.

Fisheries (Salaries, &c.) 1675.

Legislation: House of Commons (Stationery, &c.) 2448.

Militia (Charlottetown Drill Shed) 2137.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage la Prairie P.O.) 1290; (Dom. Reformatory) 1272; (Ottawa) 2313. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2484, 2487. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1433.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, increased accommodation) 2245.

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Superannuation of Civil Servants, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 886.

SUPPLY :

Indians (B.C.) 2039: (Ont. and Que.) 2028.

Wood, Hon. J. F., *Brockville.*

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 938.

Brockville and Ottawa Ry., Soldier's Island (M. for Ret.*) 1207.

French Can. Emigration to Brazil (remarks) 958.

Galops Canal, Enlargement, Contracts (Ques.) 886.

Wood, Hon. J. F.—*Continued.*

Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 9.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*) in Com., 2010.

Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Lount*) in Com., 1802.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2199.

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502. Electric Light, 2406. Excise, 2044. Weights and Measures, 2049.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gas Buoys, Lake Erie) 2372.

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 1262. Buildings (Dom. Buildings) 1264. Miscellaneous (Dismissals) 1435.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dismissals) 1534.

Weights and Measures, Metric System (Ques.) 9.

Wood, Mr. A. T., *Hamilton.*

Building Societies, &c. (B 27) introduced and 1°*, Sept. 17th.

Fishing in Lower Rideau Lakes (Ques.) 1141.

Personal Explanation *re* Binder Twine, 1473.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government: Public Works (Newspaper Subscriptions) 2204.

Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1981.

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Burlington Channel) 2338.

Quarantine (Cattle) 2215.

Railways—Capital: I. C. R., 1535.

Yeo, Mr. J., *East Prince, P.E.I.*

Dismissals, Public Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup., 386.

Public Works in P. E. I., on M. for Ret., 609.

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P. E. I.) 2326.

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

"ABERDEEN," CRUISER, MR. F. G. MARCHAND'S TRIP TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 406.

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *McInnis*) 20; seconded (Mr. *Lemieux*) 31.

Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 36; (Mr. *Laurier*) 70; (Mr. *Foster*) 86; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 117; (Mr. *Ives*) 137; (Mr. *Stenson*) 143; (Mr. *Davin*) 145; (Mr. *Oliver*) 151; (Mr. *Quinn*) 162; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 169; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 179; (Mr. *Monk*) 191; (Mr. *Frost*) 200; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 202; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 216; (Mr. *Hackett*) 219; (Mr. *Dupont*) 225, 240; (Mr. *Craig*) 253; (Mr. *Morrison*) 261; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 264; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 302.

—— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1036.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "Justice."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Mr. *Laurier*). 1*, 5; *pro formâ*.

ADVERTISEMENTS *re* PRIVATE BILLS: Ques. (Mr. *Clark*) 886.

AGRICULTURE:

AGRICULTURE AND COLINIZATION COM., 2ND REP. CONC.: M. (Mr. *Bain*) 2258.

—— List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 615.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup., 868, 2440; contingencies, 1032.

ANTWERP EXHIBITION, 1885: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION, MEMORIALS TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Maxwell*) 893, 1344.

CREAMERIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN N.W.T., GOVT. AID: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 583.

EXHIBITION, N.W.T., OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 17.

—— PARIS UNIVERSAL, AND CAN. REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 236.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, APPNMT. OF AGRICULTURIST: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1581.

—— OTTAWA, COST OF BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*), 1582.

FRENCH-CAN. EMIGRATION TO BRAZIL: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 957, 1133.

"HORN-FLY," ERADICATION OF SCOURGE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2107.

ST. JOHN (QUE.) PORT PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Dupont*) 238.

AGRICULTURE—*Continued.*

THREE RIVERS EX., EXPERIMENTAL FARM STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1583.

VETERINARY SURGEONS (N.W.T.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1067.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 573.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 1256.

ALIEN LABOUR B. ON ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 610.

Alien Labour Prohibition B. No. 5. (Mr. *Taylor*). 1*, 155; 2, 929.

Deb. (Mr. *Taylor*) 929, 951; (Mr. *Laurier*) 932, 949; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 933, 950; (Mr. *Wallace*) 936; (Mr. *Davin*) 937; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 937; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 938; (Mr. *McCleary*) 939; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 940; (Mr. *Dyment*) 941; (Mr. *Ganong*) 942; (Mr. *Prior*) 944; (Mr. *Clancy*) 945, (Mr. *McGregor*) 946; (Mr. *Bennett*) 946; (Mr. *Henderson*) 948; (Mr. *Hughes*) 950.

ALLAN SS. CO.'S MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Poulin*) 2104; (Mr. *Foster*) 2109.

ANDERSON, WM., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY INDIANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.

ANNANDALE WHARF (P.E.I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

ANNUAL DRILL: in Com. of Sup., 556, 2243; conc., 619.

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FISHING WITHIN THREE-MILE LIMIT: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1137.

ANTWERP EXHIBITION, 1885: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

Appropriations. *See* "SUPPLY."

APPROPRIATION FOR SESSION 1897, LEGISLATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 2451.

Deb. (Mr. *Fielding*) 2455; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2457; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2458; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2460; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2463; (Mr. *Davin*) 2465; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2466; (Mr. *Osler*) 2466; (Mr. *Montague*) 2466.

ARBITRATION, ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2043.

ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 1211.

ARMS, AMMUNITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243.

ARTILLERY AND RIFLE ASSOCIATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1493.

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS. : in Com. of Sup., 868, 1032, 1211, 2209, 2440, 2467.

ASST. RECEIVER GEN.'S OFFICES : in Com. of Sup., 563.

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, TENDER : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 17.

——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 484.

——— O. Cs., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier*) 582.

——— MINISTER'S STATEMENT AT QUEBEC : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1342.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1374.

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1384, 2117; (Mr. *Dubell*) 1387, 2118; (Mr. *Foster*) 1389, 2118; (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1399; (Mr. *Domville*) 1400; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1404; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1404; (Mr. *Davin*) 1410; (Mr. *Ellis*) 1417; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1418; (Mr. *Langelier*) 1419; (Mr. *Rogers*) 1420; (Mr. *Mc-Mullen*) 1421; (Mr. *McMillan*)1423; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1425; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2115.

——— ARTICLE IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" : Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1683.

——— CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Pouliot*) 2104.

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE AND PORTLAND HARBOUR : on M. for 3° of Sup. B. 39 (Mr. *Fielding*) :

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 2598, 2600, 2621; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2598, 2614, 2629; (Mr. *Blair*) 2605, 2619; (Mr. *Ellis*) 2610; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2612, 2634; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2618, 2633; (Mr. *Davies*) 2636; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2639.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 891.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 859; contingencies, 1027.

AUGUSTUS, CAPT., DISMISSAL : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 1476.

AUSTIN, JOHN, MAIL CLERK, LEAVE OF ABSENCE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1317.

AUSTRALIA, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, VALUE : Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 1144, 1585.

BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., PURCHASE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 236.

BALSAM AND CAMERON LAKES, IMPROVEMENT OF CHANNEL : Ques. (Mr. *McHugh*) 2104.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COM. : List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 615.

BARRON, MR. J. A., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1307.

BATTLEFORD INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, Close Confinement of Boy : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1323.

BEAR RIVER BRIDGE, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1310.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 2232.

BEDFORD TOWNSHIP, ADDINGTON, BRIDGES : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1138.

BEHRING SEA FISHERIES AWARD, REGULATIONS : in Com. of Sup. 2394.

——— CLAIMS CONVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 2392.

——— SEIZURES BY RUSSIANS : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1475, 1589.

BEHRING SEA, DATE OF COMMISSION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 951.

BELLE RIVER &c., (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 237.

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office :—(Mr. *Laurier.*)
1°*, 5 ; *pro formâ.*

BILL (No. 2) To amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893. —(Mr. *McLennan*, Glengarry.)
1°*, 155 ; 2°, 909 ; in Com., 1342.

BILL (No. 3) Respecting the sale of Railway Return-Fare Tickets.—(Mr. *McLennan*, Glengarry.)
1°*, 155.

BILL (No. 4) For the better protection of employees of railway companies and others.—(Mr. *Maclean.*)
1°*, 155 ; 2°, 918.

BILL (No. 5) To prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 155; 2°, 929.

BILL (No. 6) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 311.

BILL (No. 7) Further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 312.

BILL (No. 8) In further amendment of the "Railway Act."—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°, 313.

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Criminal Code of 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)
1°*, 617.

BILL (No. 10) To confirm an agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(*Mr. Gibson.*)
1°*, 713; 2°*, 908; in Com and 3°*, 1341. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 11) To amend and revive the Acts respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 784 ; 2°*, 908 ; in Com. and 3°*, 1342. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 12) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 784; 2°, 909; in Com. and 3°*, 1342. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Hamilton Powder Company.—(Mr. *Geffrion.*)
1°*, 784 ; 2°*, 908; in Com., and 3°*, 1512. (60 *Vic.*, *c* 15.)

BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 784; 2°*, 908 ; in Com., 1801 ; 3°*, 1803. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 15) Amalgamating the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company and the Parry Sound Colonization Railway Company under the name of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 784; 2°*, 908; in Com. and 3°*, 1803. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Mounted Police Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 784.

BILL (No. 17) Further to amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *McDougall.*)
1°, 785.

BILL (No. 18) For granting to Her Majesty the sum of $446,500, required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the annual drill of the Militia during the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 786; 2°* ——; in Com. and 3°*, 1037. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Georgian Bay Ship Canal and Power Aqueduct Company —(Mr. *Maclean.*)
1°*, 869; 2°*, 1342; wthdn, 1929.

BILL (No. 20) To change the name of the Hull Electric Company, to the Hull and Aylmer Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Devlin.*)
1°*, 869; 2°*, 1075; in Com., 2005, 2058; 3°, 2101.

BILL (No. 21) To incorporate the Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 869; 2°*, 1075; in Com. and 3°*, 2102. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Act incorporating the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. *Borden, Halifax.*)
1°*, 869; 2°*, 1076; wthdn., 1971.

BILL (No. 23) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 873.

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay Canal and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Boyd.*)
1°*, 951; 2°*, 1076.

BILL (No. 25) Further to amend the Act respecting Interest—(Mr. *Quinn.*)
1°*, 1132.

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1303; 2°*, 1512; wthdn., 1929.

BILL (No. 27) Further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton.*)
1°*, Sept. 17th.

BILL (No. 28) To revive and amend the Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1580; 2°*, 1803; in Com. and 3°*, 2166. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 29) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Rogers.*)
1°, 1682.

BILL (No. 30) For granting to Her Majesty certai sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1897, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1765. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 31) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1768; 2°*, 2102; in Com. and 3°*, 2166. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 1768; 2°*, 2102; in Com. and 3°*, 2166. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 33) For the appointment of temporary Judges of the Supreme Court in certain cases—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 1875.

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Railway Act—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Bain.*)
1°*, 1876.

BILL (No. 35) For the relief of Albert Nordheimer—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1875; 2°*, 2102; in Com. and 3°*, 2288. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the Manitoba and Nelson Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Roche.*)
1°*, 1929; 2°*, 2102; wthdn., 2165.

BILL (No. 37) To amend the Dairy Products Act, 1893.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°, m., 1768; 1°, 1971.

BILL (No. 38) To amend the North-west Territories Representation Act by dispensing with the preparation of new voters' lists in certain cases.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 2057; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2537. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 39) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1897, and other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 2595; 3°m., 2598; 3°, 2642. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 40) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2538. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1376, 1775, 2642.

BINDER TWINE, KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1452.
Deb. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1457, 1579; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1459, 1576; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1452; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1467; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1465; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1461; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1462; (Mr. *Lister*) 1463; (Mr. *Flint*) 1468; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1470, 1566, 1575; (Mr. *Guillet*) 1578; (Mr. *Montague*) 1578; (Mr. *Casey*) 578; (Mr. *Lister*) 1578.

—— SALES AND OVERDUE ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1584.

BINDER TWINE, CONTRACT, KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2596.

BLACKFEET RESERVE, TANNERY INSTRUCTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2402.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS CUSTOMS, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1341.

BONAVENTURE RIVER MONEY ORDER OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 406.

BOSTON (ONT.) P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.

BOULARDERIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2322.

BOUNDARY, DELIMITATION, N. S. AND CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2402.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, INCREASED: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 17.

——— DEEP SEA WEIR FISHING: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1589.

BOURINOT, Mr. J. G., Commissioner to administer Oaths., 1.

BOURASSA, P. E., IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1307.

BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Resignation (Mr. *McCarthy*) 86.

——— VACANCY: NOTIFICATION: (Mr. *Speaker*) 155.

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL, GRANOLITHIC SIDEWALK: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

——— GOVT. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

——— POSTAL SERVICE, FREE DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

BRAZIL, FRENCH-CAN. EMIGRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 957, 1133.

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC CONNECTING I. C. R. AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 17.

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 609.

——— CONSTRUCTION, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 883.

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

BRITISH PACIFIC RY. CO.'S MONEY SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1588

CHINESE IMMIGRATION, on M. for Ret., 1344.

——— MEMORIALS TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Maxwell*) 892, 1344.

CIVIL SERVANTS IN B. C., SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1310.

DAVIE, HON. THEO. AND RECENT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 407

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY., LANDS IN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1587.

FISH HATCHERIES ON FRASER AND SKEENA RIVERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.

KOOTENAY SMELTING, &C., CO.'S LAND GRANT AT REVELSTOKE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

LAND GRANTS IN RY. BELT, B.C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

MARA, J. A., EX-M.P., LAND GRANTS AT REVELSTOKE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

MINING INTERESTS OF DOM., INFORMATION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1323, 1329.

NANAIMO, COMOX, UNION, &C., MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 2102.

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1473.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued*.

PUBLIC WORKS IN B.C. ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.

RY. SUBSIDIES IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr *Prior*) 403.

——— Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 574.

SMUGGLING BETWEEN U.S. AND B.C., PREVENTION Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 405.

SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, PROCEEDINGS OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 403.

SUPREME COURT (B.C.) ADDITIONAL JUDGE: on M. for Com. of Sup. 1930.

VICTORIA AND CARMANAH POINT TELEGRAPH LINE. Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.

[*See* DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, MEETING: in Com. of Sup., 2560.

BRITISH PACIFIC RY. CO.'S MONEY SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1588.

BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RY., SOLDIER'S ISLAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1207.

BUILDINGS, PUBLIC, PROVINCES GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1264; MAN.: 1286; N.W.T.: 2302; N.S.: 1263, 2479; ONT.: 1267, 2302, 2479; QUE.: 1265, 2301.

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Amt. 3. No. 27 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*). 1st, Sept. 17th

BUREAU OF MINING INFORMATION, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572.

BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2338.

[*See* "SUPPLY," PROVINCES.]

CAMERON, MAJ. GEN., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 317.

CAMERON, MAJ. GEN., RESIGNATION, LETTER, *re*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1037, 1151.

——— GEN. GASCOIGNE'S LETTER: M. (Mr. *Borden*) 1475.

——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1475.

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Powell*) 2368.

——— *See* "MILITIA."

CAMPBELL, ANGUS P., P. O. DEPT., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1307.

CAMPBELL COVE (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 237.

CAMPBELL, J. J., AND NORTH ONT. BY-ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 884.

C. P. R. Co. *See* "G. T. R."

C. P. R. LAND GRANTS BY THE CROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1142.

C. P. R. LANDS IN N. W. T., EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 881.

CANALS:

BALSAM AND CAMERON LAKES, IMPROVEMENT OF CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *McHugh*) 2104.

CHAMBLY CANAL LOCK-KEEPER, APPNMT.: Ques: (Mr. *Morin*) 2109.

CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL AND CAN. INTERESTS: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 402.

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 886.

——— OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 1210.

CANALS—*Continued.*
HANNAN, JOHN, DISMISSAL FROM LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 577.
LACHINE CANAL, LOCK No. 2, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1136.
—— LOCK No. 1: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1306.
MONTREAL, OTTAWA, AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: M. for Cor * (Mr. *Poupore*) 2115.
O'NEILL, JOHN, COLLECTOR OF CANAL TOLLS, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2108.
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, SUPERINTENDENT'S VACATION: Ques. (Mr. *Dyment*) 883.
SOULANGES CANAL, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1586.
—— TENDERS, &c., FOR BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 880.
SUNDAY LABOUR ON CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 1249.
TAY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1312, 1314.
TRENT CANAL, BALSAM LAKE SECTION CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 19.
—— VALUATION OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1140.

CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 2248, 2478.

CAN. AND U. S., RELATIONS BETWEEN, CHICAGO *Record's* INTERVIEW WITH MR. LAURIER: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 12.

CAPE BRETON MAIL SERVICE, PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1320.

CAPE CROKER INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 2273.

CAPE TRAVERSE AND CAPE TORMENTINE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2491.

CARTWRIGHT, SIR RICHARD, INTERVIEW WITH HON. J. A. CHAMBERLAIN: Remarks (Mr. *Dupont*) 2122.

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1257, 2214, 2468.

CHAMBERLAIN, RT. HON. J. A., PRESS CRITICISMS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 952.

CHAMBLY CANAL LOCK-KEEPER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2109.

CHAPEL COVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 885.

CHAPLEAU, Mr. E. St. O., Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1.

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 563.

CHARLOTTETOWN DRILL SHED, ROADWAY: in Com. of Sup., 2236.

CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL AND CAN. INTERESTS: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 402.

CHICAGO *Record's* INTERVIEW WITH MR. LAURIER: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 12.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., HON. MR. DAVIES' SPEECH AT AMHERST: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1308.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., LAPSED SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1142.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION, MEMORIALS TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Maxwell*) 893, 1344.

CIVIL EMPLOYEES (MILITIA) WAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1478.

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 859, 978, 1024, 2444.

CIVIL SERVANTS IN B.C., SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1310.
—— SUPERANNUATION, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 886.

CIVIL SERVICE, APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, &c., O. Cs.: M. for copies (Mr. *Gibson*) 604.

COATICOOK PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2302.

COIN AND BULLION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 576.

COAL INTEREST (N.S.) MR. LAURIER'S TELEGRAM: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 2469.

COLEBROKE, MRS., PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1262.

COLONIAL SECURITIES, IMP. STAMP DUTY: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 1449, 1609, 2043, 2122, 2406, 2502.

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2297; conc., 2548.

Columbia Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Bostock*). 1*, 869; 2*, 1075: in Com. and 3*, 2102. (60 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 615.
—— 2ND REP., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Bain*) 2258.
BANKING AND COMMERCE: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 615.
DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* general heading.
EXPIRING LAWS: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 611.
PRINTING: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 614.
—— JOINT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 616.
—— 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Gibson*) 1368; conc., 2257.
—— 3RD REP.: conc. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2544.
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 613.
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 611.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 614.
RYS., CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 612.
SELECT STANDING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 7.
—— Lists presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 611.
—— SUBSTITUTION OF NAME: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 782.
STANDING ORDERS: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 613.

CONNOLLY, MESSRS., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT: M. for copies (Mr. *Cameron*) 1169.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (1896) RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 881.

CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.: in Com. of Sup., 978, 1024, 2444.
—— MILITIA, MISCELLANEOUS AND UNFORESEEN: in Com. of Sup., 1494.

CONTROLLERS OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE: STATUS IN CABINET: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 18, 161.

COPYRIGHT, CONCLUSION OF NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1307.

CORN AND CORNMEAL, ABOLITION CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach* 18.

CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2248.

COUNTY JUDGE (MAN.) ADDITIONAL: in Com. of Sup. 2173, 2538; conc., 2558.

COW BAY BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 576.

CLARKE, MR. E. F., DECEASED: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 84.

CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES, MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 1671, 1977, 2019, 2228; conc., 2545.

CREAMERIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN N. W. T., GOVT. AID: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 583.

—— in Com. of Sup., 2467.

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction, &c., Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1**, 617.

CROWSTAND BOARDING SCHOOL FOR INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2402.

CULLING TIMBER, CULLERS' FEES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Quinn*) 411.

—— MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 482.

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 573.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1341.

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 860, 1609, 2430, 2502.

CUSTOMS DEFALCATIONS AT PETERBOROUGH: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1140.

CUSTOMS SERVICE, KING'S CO., P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 877.

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS, STATUS IN CABINET: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 18, 161.

CORN AND CORNMEAL, ABOLITION CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 18.

LOUISBURG SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 408.

SMITH, GEORGE R., APPNMT. AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1589.

SMUGGLING BETWEEN U. S. AND B. C., PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 405.

[*See* "TRADE AND COMMERCE, &C."]

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*). 1**, 155; 2°, 909; in Com., 1342.

—— **No. 37** (Mr. *Fisher*). 1° m, 1768; 1°, 1971.

DAIRYING SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1237.

DALHOUSIE WHARF, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 2244.

DALTON, MAIL CLERK, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1322.

DAVIE, HON. THEO., AND RECENT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 407.

DAVIES, HON. MR., SPEECH AT MIDDLETON (1893) *re* TARIFF: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.

—— SPEECH AT SUSSEX, N. B., *re* TARIFF: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.

—— SPEECH AT AMHERST, CHIGNECTO SHIP RY.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1308.

DEATH DUTIES IMPOSED UPON COLONISTS BY ENGLAND: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP., 2ND REP. OF COM. (DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS) 1680: conc., M. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1766.

Deb. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1766, 1876; (Mr. *Foster*) 1766, 1927; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1766; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1767, 1924; (Mr. *Davin*) 1880; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1896; (Mr. *Craig*) 1900; (Mr. *Casey*) 1906; (Mr. *Dupont*) 1909; (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 1911; (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 1913; (Mr. *Britton*) 1919; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1922; (Mr. *Davies*) 1928.

—— 4TH REP. OF COM. (APPNMT. OF TRANSLATORS): Presented (Mr. *Choquette*) 2165; conc., 2346.

Deb. (Mr. *Davin*) 2346; (Mr. *Monet*) 2348, 2352; (Mr. *Fiset*) 2348; (Mr. *Dupont*) 2349; (Mr. *Stenson*) 2351; (Mr. *Foster*) 2354; (Mr. *Ellis*) 2356; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2359; (Mr. *Somerville*) 2361; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2361; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2362; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2363; (Mr. *Earle*) 2364; (Mr. *Blair*) 2364.

DEP. ASST. ADJUTANT GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 2228.

DISMISSALS:

AUGUSTUS, CAPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 1476.

I. C. R. BRIDGE-KEEPERS: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 482.

—— EMPLOYEES: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1064.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2105.

—— in Com. of Sup., 1494.

—— INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1591.

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*), 2057, 2167.

JOBIN, ACHILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2102.

LAMBERT, J. K.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2057, 2168.

—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 959.

LEPINE, A. P: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2106.

MCBRIDE, PATRICK: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 157.

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hackett*) 467.

MARINE AND FISHERIES EMPLOYEES: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1064.

—— SUB-AGENTS AT PICTOU: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1207.

P. E. I. RY. EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 159.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2105.

—— TRACKMEN; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hackett*) 483.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS, DISMISSALS, &C., SINCE JULY, 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Haggart*) 601.

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1119, 1430, 2308, 2318.

TRANSLATORS. *See* "Debates, Official Rep."

SESSIONAL CLERKS, MESSENGERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1069.

WAKEHAM, COMMANDER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1590.

DISMISSALS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 318.

Deb. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 318, 540; (Mr. *Davies*) 323; (Mr. *Lister*) 328; (Mr. *Clancy*) 332; Mr. *Sutherland*) 335; (Mr. *Casey*) 337; (Mr. *Sproule*) 340; (Mr. *Tindale*) 344; (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 346; (Mr. *Montague*) 346; (Mr. *McMullen*) 348; (Mr. *Taylor*) 349; (Mr. *McDougall*) 352; (Mr. *Fielding*) 353; (Mr. *Devlin*) 364; (Mr. *Britton*) 373, 501; (Mr. *Clarke*) 376; (Mr. *Ingram*) 379; (Mr. *Hackett*) 381; (Mr. *Yeo*) 386; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 387; (Mr. *Davin*) 391; (Mr. *Bennett*) 394; (Mr. *Foster*) 400, 494; (Mr. *Domville*) 400, 542; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 484; (Mr. *Laurier*) 504; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 506; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 514; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 524; (Mr. *Macdonell*) 535; (Mr. *McNeill*) 536; (Mr. *Oliver*) 540.

DIVISIONS:
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS: prop. Res., 637 (Mr. *Foster*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 69, N. 103) 851.
TARIFF LEGISLATION AND LIBERAL POLICY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 76, N. 113) 1847.
TARIFF LEGISLATION *re* N. W. TERS.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 26, N. 128) 2276.
DIVISIONS, MEMBERS NOT VOTING: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 852; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 853.
Divorce (Nordheimer, Albert) B. No. 35 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 1875; 2°*, 2102; in Com. and 3°*, 2288. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)
DOM. CROP REPORTS: in Com. of Sup., 1235.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*) 1°*, 311.
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 2165, 2407.
Dom. Lands Act Amt B. No. 23 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 873.
DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2197.
DOM. REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup. 1267.
——— Completion of Contract: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 1584.
DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 2243.
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1472.
DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1300, 1428.
DUNN, CAPT., OF CRUISER "PETREL" AND LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 16.
Eastern Trust Co.'s incorp. Act Amt B. No. 22 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*). 1°*, 869; 2°*, 1076; withn., 1971.
EDGAR, JOHN DAVID, Esq., ELECTION AS SPEAKER: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2.
Election Act. *See* "DOMINION."
ELECTION, GENERAL (EIGHTH) PRINTING, &c., Rets: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2115.
——— LITERATURE, GRATUITOUS DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Pouliot*) 572.
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 2406.
ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2398.
"EMPIRE" TUG, PURCHASE BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1139.
ENNIS, DR. AND LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 572, 874.
ESQUIMALT (B.C.) DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 1494.
ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY., LANDS IN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1587.
ESTIMATES, THE, 1896-97: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 307.
——— SUPPL: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2056.
——— FURTHER SUPPL: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2345.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 715, 1208.
——— LATE GOVT. AND PRESENT: in Com. of Sup., 545.
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 1450.
EXCISE DUTIES ON MALT LIQUORS, &c., AMOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1134.
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 2043.
EXHIBITION, ANTWERP, 1885: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.
——— N.W.T., OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 17.
——— PARIS UNIVERSAL AND CAN. REPRESENTATION: (Mr. *Lemieux*) 236.
——— THREE RIVERS, EXPERIMENTAL FARM STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1583.
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS; in Com. of Sup., 1213.
——— APPNMT. OF AGRICULTURIST: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1581.
——— OTTAWA, COST OF BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1582.
EXPIRING LAWS COM.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 611.
FAGES, CAPT. ("B" BATTERY) QUEBEC CENTRE VOTERS' LIST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 875.
FAGES, CAPT. ALF., LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1134, 1580.
FALL WHEAT, EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1236.
FARRAN'S POINT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2293.
FIELDING, HON. MR., LETTER IN HALIFAX "CHRONICLE" *re* PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 157.
FINANCE:
APPROPRIATION FOR SESSION 1897, LEGISLATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 2451.
BRITISH PACIFIC RY. CO.'S MONEY SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1588.
COIN AND BULLION, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 576.
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., LAPSED SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1142.
CONSOLIDATED FUND (1896) RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 881.
ESTIMATES, THE, 1896-97: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 307; Suppl., 2056; further Suppl., 2345.
——— LATE GOVT. AND PRESENT: in Com. of Sup., 545.
ESTIMATES, SUPPL.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 715, 1208.
FINANCIAL STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 316.
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 1028.
FREDERICTON BRIDGE CO., OVERDUE INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1141.
GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 19, 161, 240.
——— Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 317.
——— JULY AND AUG. (1896) AMOUNTS PAID UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 575.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 620; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 637; neg. (Y. 69, N. 103) 851.
HURVEY LINE RY. GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulback*) 2105.
IMPERIAL STAMP DUTY ON COLONIAL SECURITIES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.
LOANS, TEMPORARY AND CURRENT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 575.
PUBLIC SERVICE AND ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1372.
——— FINANCIAL PROVISIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1209.
RY. SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 574.

FINANCE—*Continued.*
Rys. Subsidies in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 403
Restigouche and Victoria Ry., Revote of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1591.
Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2115.
Subsidy to N.W.T., Increased: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Oliver*) 412.
——prop. Res. wthdn. (Mr. *Davin*) 601.
Superannuation of Civil Servants, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 886.
Trust Funds, 1888, Investment: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.
[*See* "Supply," &c."]

FISHERIES:
Anticosti Island, Fishing in Three-Mile Limit: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1137.
Behring Sea Seizures, Date of Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 951.
—— Seizures of Sealers by Russians: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1589.
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1475.
—— Award, Regulations: in Com. of Sup., 2394.
Bounty to Fishermen, Increased: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 17; (Mr. *Ganong*) 1589.
Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 961.
Fishery Commission, Joint: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1144, 1168.
Fishery Overseer (P.E.I.) Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 876.
Fish-breeding and Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 1674, 2392.
Fish Hatcheries on Fraser and Skeena Rivers (B.C.): Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.
Fishing Bounty Deep-Sea Weir Fishing: (Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1589.
Fishing Licenses Lake Winnipeg: Ques. Mr. (*Boyd*) 1317.
—— Lincoln and Niagara, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gibson*) 609.
Fishing in Lower Rideau Lakes: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1141.
Fishways in North River: Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 1137.
Lemieux, Jos., Fishery Inspector, Complaints against: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 237.
Linley, Harry, Fishery Overseer, Kent Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2113.
Lobster Fishery and Fishery Protection: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1582.
—— Par. in Montreal "Gazette": Remarks (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2168.
McBride Fishery Overseer, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 159.
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hackett*) 467.
Magdalen Islands Lobster Hatchery: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.
Maple Lake, Distribution of Fish Fry: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1590.
Oyster Fishery (P.E.I.) and Dredging: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 573.
—— Privileges in P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1586.
—— Removal of Restrictions: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1310.
"Willie McGowan" and "Ariel," Seizures, Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2107.
Floddy, Informer, Inland Rev. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2111.
Floods in South Monogan, Peterborough: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Kendry*) 2114.
Fog Alarm at Belle Isle: in Com. of Sup., 2391.
Fordwich P.O. and C.P.R. Station Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 405.
Forget, A. E., Indian Commissioner at Regina: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1683.
Fort Anne, Annapolis County, Repairs: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1581.
Fortifications at Kingston, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1581.
Foster, Jas. J., Refund of Bonus: in Com. of Sup., 2495.
Franchise Act Repeal: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 16; (Mr. *Ingram*) 19.
Fredericton Bridge Co., Overdue Interest: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1141.
French-Can. Emigration to Brazil: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 957, 1133.
Gabarus Breakwater or Pier: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 576.
Galops Canal, Enlargement, Contracts: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 886.
—— Obstructions to Navigation: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 1210.
—— in Com. of Sup., 2249.
Gananoque Drill Shed, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1136.
Gas Buoys on Lake Erie: in Com. of Sup., 2391.
Gaspe Coast Road, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.
General Election (Eighth) Printing, &c., Rets.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2115.
Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 968.
Georgian Bay Ship Canal and Power Aqueduct Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. *Maclean*). 1**, 869; 2**, 1342; wthdn., 1929.
Goderich Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2339.
—— Improvements, Expend., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 2114.
Gorrie P.O. and C.P.R. Station Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, Huron) 405.
Govt. Business Precedence: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 313, 1369, 2544.
Govt. (late) alleged mal-Administration, Appnmt. of Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1311.
Govt. (late) and Cor. with His Ex., Precedents: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 609.
—— Cor. re Resignation: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 617.
—— Reps. and O.Cs. Presented to His Ex.: M. for copies (Mr. *Choquette*) 1322.
—— Cor. with His Ex.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 10, 20, 609, 1037, 1207.
—— Cor. with His Ex.: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 311, 952, 1131.
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1523.

GOVT. OF N.W.T., WTHDRL. OF B.: Remarks Mr. *Davin*) 2166.

GOVERNOR GENERAL.
See "Govt."

GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE; in Com of Sup., 565; contingencies, 1024.

GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 19, 161, 240.

—— Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 317.

—— PRINTING: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) 482.

—— JULY AND AUGUST, 1896, AMOUNTS PAID UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 575.

—— On M. for Com. of Sup., 620; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 637; neg. (Y. 69, N. 103) 851.

Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 639; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 649; (Mr. *Lister*) 659; (Mr. *Craig*) 665; (Mr. *Lount*) 669; (Mr. *McInerney*) 676; (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 676; (Mr. *Flint*) 679; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 686; (Mr. *Russell*) 714; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 724; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 730; (Mr. *Clancy*) 737; (Mr. *Britton*) 745; (Mr. *Davin*) 755; (Mr. *Sproule*) 765; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 771; (Mr. *Bell, Picton*) 774; (Mr. *Haggart*) 786; (Mr. *McMullen*) 799; (Mr. *Henderson*) 805; (Mr. *Charlton*) 812; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 820; (Mr. *McNeill*) 832; (Mr. *Monk*) 841; (Mr. *Osler*) 846.

GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 9.

—— REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 878.

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1188, 1200.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 1929.

GREAT BRITAIN AND CAN. SS. SERVICE: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 575.

—— MAIL SUBSIDY: conc., 2583.

GREEN, T. D., EMPLYMT. BY INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1586.

GREY, NORTH, PAR. IN "L'ELECTEUR" *re* RECENT ELECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 1427.

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 1265.

G.T.R. and C.P.R. Co.'s confirmation of Agreement B. No. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1**, 713; 2**, 908; in Com. and 3**, 1341. (60 *Vic., c.* 6.)

HALF-BREEDS, DESTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 2497.

HALIFAX COTTON BRANCH, I.C.R. EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2246.

—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 1263, 2479.

—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2244.

Hamilton Powder Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. *Geoffrion*). 1**, 784; 2**, 908; in Com. and 3**, 1512. (60 *Vic., c.* 15.)

HANNAN, JOHN, DISMISSAL FROM LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 577.

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS IN N.S., ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 573.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., B.C., 2300; N.B., 2324, 2480; N.S., 1299, 2320, 2479; P.E.I., 1300, 2325, 2481; Ont., 1262, 2297, 2338, 2489, 2548; Que., 1262, 1429, 2300, 2483.

"HARD-PAN" CLAIMS, CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 1137.

HAYES, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 402.

HAY EXPORTS, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1136.

HER MAJESTY'S LONG REIGN: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1976.

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., contingencies, 978.

—— COR. WITH GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1369.

"HORNFLY" ERADICATION OF SCOURGE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2107.

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *McInnis*) 20; seconded (Mr. *Lemieux*) 31.

—— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1036.

ADVERTISEMENTS *re* PRIVATE BILLS: Ques. (Mr. *Clark*) 886.

BAR, ABOLITION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 611, 1208.

—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Craig*) 1202.

BOURINOT, MR. J. G., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.

BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, Resignation. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 86.

—— VACANCY: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 155.

CHAPLEAU, MR. E. ST. O., Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 1.

CLARKE, MR. E. F., DECEASED: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 83.

COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* general heading.

DIVISIONS, MEMBERS NOT VOTING: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 852; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 853.

EDGAR, JOHN DAVID, ESQ., ELECTION AS SPEAKER; M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2.

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 16; (Mr. *Ingram*) 19.

GOVT. BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 313, 1369, 2544.

GREY, NORTH, PAR. IN "L'ELECTEUR" *re* RECENT ELECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 1427.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1126.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex.; Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 15.

—— REPS. AFFECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1368.

JACQUES CARTIER ELECTION, JUDGMENT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.

LABOUR DAY, ADJNMT.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 712.

LAVAL ELECTION, JUDGMENT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7.

MEMBER, NEW, NOTIFICATION: (Mr. *Speaker*) 571.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EX.: presented 15, 85, 307, 1036, 2056, 2345.

MESSENGERS IN HOUSE OF COMMONS, 1878, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2106.

NORTH GREY ELECTION, ON THE ADDRESS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 128.

NORTH ONTARIO ELECTION, ARTICLE IN TORONTO "WORLD": Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 574.

NOTICES OF MOTION, POSTPONEMENT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 14.

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 410.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
ORDER PAPER, CHANGE IN FORM: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.
PARLIAMENT, NEWSPAPER CRITICISM *re* DIGNITY: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 1597.
—— RULES OF THE HOUSE, DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 10.
PRIVATE BILLS, STANDING AT NEXT SESSION OF PARLT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2444.
PROROGATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2057.
—— COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2595.
QUESTIONS, &c., ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 9.
ROULEAU, MR. F. F., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS: 1376, 1775, 2642.
—— COM. FROM DEP. GOV.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1373, 1766.
SASKATCHEWAN ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. *Sir Charles Tupper*) 161, 239.
—— ISSUE OF WARRANT FOR WRIT (Mr. *Speaker*) 310.
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, COMPLAINT AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 1315.
SESSIONAL CLERKS, MESSENGERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1069.
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2.
—— MR. DEPUTY, ELECTION: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 307.
SMITH, MR. H. R., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5: Prorogation, 2642.
[*See* "SPEAKER, MR."]

House of Commons. *See* "SENATE."

Hudson's Bay Canal and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. *Boyd*). 1°*, 951; 2°*, 1076.

HUDSON'S BAY EXPEDITION: in Com. of Sup., 2498.

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 784; 2°, 909; in Com. and 3°*, 1342. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

HUDSON'S BAY, PRACTICABILITY OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1316.

Hull Electric Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Devlin*). 1°*, 869; 2°*, 1075; in Com., 2005, 2058; 3°, 2101.
Deb. in Com. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2005, 2085; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2006, 2058, 2070; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2006; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2006; (Mr. *Lister*) 2007; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2008, 2077; (Mr. *Foster*) 2009, 2061, 2075; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 2010; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2013, 2095; (Mr. *Davin*) 2015; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 2015, 2063; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2017; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2018, 2063; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2065; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2069; (Mr. *Blair*) 2069; (Mr. *Lount*) 2072; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2073; (Mr. *Douglas*) 2075; (Mr. *Langelier*) 2078; (Mr. *Davies*) 2078; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2085; (Mr. *Morrison*) 2091; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2058; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2059; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2069.

HURVEY LINE RY. GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2105.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 1674.

IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1934, 2228.
—— CHINESE, MEMORIALS TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Maxwell*) 893, 1344.

IMPERIAL STAMP DUTY ON COLONIAL SECURITIES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.

IMPORT DUTIES ON MALT LIQUORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1580.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, AUSTRALIAN COLONIES, PERCENTAGES AND VALUES: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 1144, 1585.

IMPORTS AND HOME CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 575.

INDIAN DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1933.

INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2023, 2398, 2400.

INDIANS:
ANDERSON, WM., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY INDIANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.
BATTLEFORD INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, close confinement of Boy: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1323.
CAMPBELL, J. J., NORTH ONT. BY-ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 884.
CAPE CROKER INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 2273.
FORGET, A. E., INDIAN COMMISSIONER AT REGINA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1683.
GREEN, T. D., EMPLOYMENT BY INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1586.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, MAN. AND N.W.T., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 876.
INDIAN RESERVE, NORTH ONT., PAR. IN ORILLIA *Packet*: Remarks (Mr. *McGillivray*) 2168.
MCGIRR, WM., AND LATE ELECTION IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1142.
—— REP. *re* ST. PETER'S INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1589.
MONDOUX, A. A., INDIAN AGENT, ABENAKIS VILLAGE, COMPLAINTS; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mignault*) 2115.
PENHALLWICK, MESSRS., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY INDIANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.
SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, PROCEEDINGS OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 403.
WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, SERVICES DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1590.

INTERCOLONIAL RY:
BRANCH LINES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 423.
BRIDGE-KEEPERS, DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 482.
DISMISSALS COR. *re*: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1591, 2057, 2167.
EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2105.
EMPLOYEES AT LATE ELECTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Domville*) 577.
FREE CARRIAGE OF WOOD FOR EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 2111.
LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 406.
SALE OF NEWSPAPERS, &c., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 160.
SNOW FENCES: in Com. of Sup., 2247.
TENDERS AND CONTRACTS FOR SALE OF PAPERS &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1134, 1135.
TIME TABLE: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 1133.
[*See* DEPARTMENTS, PROVINCES, "SUPPLY," &C.]

INLAND REVENUE:
CULLING TIMBER, CULLERS' FEES &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Quinn*) 411.
——AT MONTREAL, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 482.

INLAND REVENUE—*Continued.*
EXCISE DUTIES ON MALT LIQUORS, &c., AMOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1134.
FLODDY, INFORMER, INLAND REV. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2111
GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 9.
—— REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 878.
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1188, 1200.
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 1828, 1929.
IMPORT DUTIES ON MALT LIQUORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1580.
INLAND REVENUE CONTROLLER, STATUS IN CABINET: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 18, 161.
—— COLLECTOR BRANTFORD, SUPERANUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2596.
—— DEPT.: in com. of sup., 862.
—— INSPECTOR, HALIFAX, APPNMT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2112..
PERSONAL EXPLANATION, INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. STAFF (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 2167.
TOBACCO, DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1310.
—— REGULATIONS, *re* MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2107.
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, LEGISLATION *re.* REPEAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2107.
—— METRIC SYSTEM ADOPTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 9.

[*See* "CUSTOMS," "FINANCE," &c.]

INSOLVENCY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 880.

INTERIOR:

BUREAU OF MINING INFORMATION, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572.
INTERIOR DEPT., VACANT PORTFOLIO: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 155.
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 785, 1208; (Mr. *Laurier*) 952.
Deb. in Com. of Sup., 1851; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1851; (Mr. *Foster*) 1851, 1857; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1852, 1868; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1853, 1867; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1855; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1861; (Mr. *Blair*) 1862; (Mr. *Davin*) 1864; (Mr. *Montague*) 1869; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1871.
KOOTENAY SMELTING, &c., CO.'S LAND GRANT AT REVELSTOKE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.
LANDS EARNED BY RYS. IN N.W.T., TRANSFERS: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 408, 410.
LAND GRANTS IN RY. BELT, B.C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.
MARA, J. A., EX-M.P., LAND GRANTS AT REVELSTOKE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.
MINING INTERESTS OF DOM., INFORMATION *re:* prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1323, 1329.
MOOSE JAW TOWN SITE, COM. FROM MUNICIPALITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1143.

[*See* "MANITOBA AND N. W. T."]

Interest Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *Quinn*). 1°*, 1132.

INTERNAL ECONOMY, H. OF C., REPS. AFFECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1368.
—— COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 15.
INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU, BRUSSELS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO., ST. PETERSBURG: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.
—— LONDON, 1895: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.
IROQUOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2294.
JACQUES CARTIER, ELECTION, JUDGMENT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.
JOBIN, ACHILLE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2102.
JONES, MRS. W. MCNAUGHTON, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 2468.

Judges, Temporary. *See* "SUPREME COURT."

JUSTICE:

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 2173, 2538; conc., 2558.
CONNOLLY, MESSRS., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cameron*) 1169.
DAVIE, HON. THEO., AND RECENT ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 407.
HAYES, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 402.
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2173.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, BINDER TWINE MANUFACTURED (1896): Ques. (Mr. *Rogers*) 1306.
—— CONTRACT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2596.
—— SALES AND OVERDUE ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1584.
—— MANUFACTURE AND SALE: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1452.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1316.
MAN. SCHOOLS QUESTION, PENDING NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8.
—— PRESS REP. *re* MR. GREENWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1134.
—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1765.
PENITENTIARIES BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 570.
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* BINDER TWINE (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 1473.
ST. LOUIS *vs.* QUEEN: on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2280.
SHORTIS, VALENTINE, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 407.
—— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF PAPERS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2278.
SUPREME COURT (B.C.) ADDITIONAL JUDGE: on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1930.
—— ADDITIONAL JUDGE: prop. Ress. wthdn (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2367.

[*See* "SUPPLY," &c.]

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1262.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY. *See* "JUSTICE," &c.
KOOTENAY SMELTING, &c., CO.'S LAND GRANT AT REVELSTOKE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.
LABOUR DAY, ADJNMT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 712.
LABOUR, PROHIBITION. *See* "ALIEN."
"LA CANADIENNE," CRUISER, DR. ENNIS'S TRIP TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 572, 874.
—— GASPÉ ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1585.
LACHINE CANAL, LOCK NO. 1: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1306.
—— LOCK NO. 2, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1136.
—— in Com. of Sup., 2255, 2282.

LAKEFIELD DAM, TRANSFER TO GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1139.
LAMBERT, J. K., DISMISSAL : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 959.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2057, 2168.
LANDS EARNED BY RYS. IN N.W.T., TRANSFERS : Ques (Mr. *Oliver*) 408, 410.
LAND GRANTS IN RY. BELT, B.C. : M. for Cor. *(Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.
LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION : M. for copies (Mr. *Cameron*) 427.
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER (C.B.) REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1581.
LAURIER, HON. MR., N.S. COAL INTERESTS, TELEGRAM : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.
——— SPEECH AT DALHOUSIE, N.B., TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2103.
——— SOHMER PARK, MONTREAL, *re* PROTECTION : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 158.
——— WINDSOR HALL, MONTREAL, *re* TARIFF : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 18.
——— AT MOOSE JAW, FREIGHT RATES : Ques : (Mr. *Davin*) 407.
LAVAL ELECTION JUDGMENT : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.
LEATHER TRUNKS FOR SENATORS : in Com. of Sup., 2206.
"LE COURIER DU CANADA," FREE TRANSMISSION THROUGH MAILS : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 879.
LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1126, 2206, 2445.
LEMIEUX, JOS., FISHERY INSPECTOR, COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 237.
LEPINE, A. P., DATE OF DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1582, 2106.
LETTER POSTAGE, 2-CENT RATE : Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1305.
LÉVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 2247.
LIBRARY OF PARLT., REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7.
——— SESSIONAL MESSENGERS : in Com. of Sup., 2467.
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1673, 2391.
LIGHTHOUSE AT OKA, CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 1305.
LI HUNG CHANG IN CAN. : Remarks (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 907.
——— TRANSPORTATION : in Com. of Sup., 2501.
LINLEY, HARRY, FISHERY OVERSEER, KENT CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2113.
LITTLE METIS HARBOUR OF REFUGE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 885.
LIVERPOOL AND ST. JOHN SS. SERVICE : conc., 2557.
LOANS, TEMPORARY AND CURRENT : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 575.
LOBSTER FISHERY AND FISHERY PROTECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1582.
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" : Remarks (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2168.
LONDON INTERNATIONAL RY. CO., 1895 : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.
LOUISBURG SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, (Guysborough)* 408.
LUNDY'S LANE, &c., HISTORICAL MONUMENTS, TENDERS, &c. : M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Gibson*) 2114.
MCBRIDE, FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 159.
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hackett*) 467.
MCGIRR, WM. (INDIAN DEPT.) AND LATE ELECTION IN N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1142.
——— REP. *re* ST. PETER'S INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1589.
MCGREGOR, CAPT. OF THE "BAYFIELD," AND LATE ELECTION : QUES. (Mr. *Cameron*) 15.
MACKENZIE, HON. ALEX., O.C's., PASSED AFTER RESIGNATION, 1878 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1341.
MACPHERSON, HON. SIR DAVID, DECEASED : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 83.
MAGDALEN ISLANDS LIGHTHOUSE, IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.
——— LOBSTER HATCHERY : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.
MAIL SERVICE : conc., 2546.
——— *See* "POST OFFICE".
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2021, 2491, 3557.
MANITOBA AND N.W.T.
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REDUCTION OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 573.
ANDERSON, WM., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY INDIANS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.
BATTLEFORD INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, CLOSE CONFINEMENT OF BOY : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1323.
BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT : Resignation (Mr. *McCarthy*) 86.
C.P.R., LAND GRANTS BY THE CROWN : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1142.
——— EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 881.
CREAMERIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN N. W. T., GOVT. AID : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 583.
EXHIBITION (N.W.T.) OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 17.
FISHING LICENSES ON LAKE WINNIPEG : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1317.
FORGET, A. E., INDIAN COMMISSIONER AT REGINA : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1683.
FREIGHT RATES, MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH AT MOOSE JAW : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 407.
GOVT. OF N.W.T., WTHDRL. OF B. : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2106.
GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1188, 1200.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 9.
——— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 1929.
——— REVISION : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 878.
GREEN, T. D., EMPLYMT. BY INDIAN DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1586.
HUDSON BAY, PRACTICABILITY OF NAVIGATION : Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1316.

MANITOBA AND N.W.T.—*Continued.*

INDIANS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2030, 2398.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, MAN. AND N.W.T., NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 876.

INTERIOR DEPT. *See* general heading.

LAMBERT, J. K., DISMISSAL: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 959.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2057, 2168.

LANDS EARNED BY RYS. IN N.W.T., TRANSFERS: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 408, 410.

MCGIRR, WM., AND LATE ELECTION IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1142.

—— REP. *re* ST. PETER'S INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 1589.

MAIL CONTRACT, MORRIS (MAN.) CANCELLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2112.

MAN. SCHOOLS QUESTION, PENDING NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8.

—— PRESS REP. *re* MR. GREENWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1134.

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1765.

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2391.

MAPLE LAKE, DISTRIBUTION OF FISH FRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1590.

MOOSE JAW TOWN SITE, COM. FROM MUNICIPALITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1143.

MOUNTED POLICE FINES, DISPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2595.

N.W.T. GOVT., INCREASED SUBSIDY: Res. wthdn. (Mr. *Davin*) 601.

PENHALLWICK, MESSRS., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY INDIANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1472.

REBELLION IN N.W.T., MONUMENT AT TORONTO, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 883.

RY. LANDS IN N. W. T., SELECTION, &C., BY COMPANIES: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 881.

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, CONSTRUCTION OF LOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 877.

SASKATCHEWAN ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 161, 239.

—— ISSUE OF WARRANT FOR WRIT (Mr. *Speaker*) 310.

SUBSIDIES TO N. W. T., INCREASED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Oliver*) 412.

TARIFF LEGISLATION: on M. for Com. of Sup., prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2274; neg. (Y. 26. N. 128) 2276.

—— VACANCY: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 155.

VETERINARY SURGEONS (N. W. T.): on M. for Com. of Sup., 1067.

WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, SERVICES DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1590.

See [DEPARTMENTS, &C.]

Man. and Nelson Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Roche*). 1**, 1929; 2**, 2102; wthdn., 2165.

MANUFACTURERS AND THE TARIFF, CIRCULAR LETTER: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 884.

MAPLE LAKE, DISTRIBUTION OF FISH FRY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1590.

MARA, J. A., EX-M. P., LAND GRANTS AT REVELSTOKE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

MARINE:

"ABERDEEN," CRUISER, MR. F. G. MARCHAND'S TRIP TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 406.

DUNN, CAPT., OF CRUISER "*Petrel*" AND LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 16.

"EMPIRE," TUG, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1139.

ENNIS, DR., AND LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 572, 874.

HUDSON BAY, PRACTICABILITY OF NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1316.

"LA CANADIENNE," CRUISER, DR. ENNIS'S TRIP TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 572, 874.

—— GASPE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1585.

LIGHTHOUSE AT OKA, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 1305.

MCGREGOR, CAPT., OF THE "*Bayfield*," AND LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 15.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS LIGHTHOUSE, IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.

MARINE AND FISHERY OFFICERS, APPNMTS., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 158.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1064.

MARINE, &C., SUB-AGENTS AT PICTOU, DISMISSAL: M.

MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 961.

MARINE AND FISHERY OFFICERS, APPNMTS., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 158.

PICTOU ISLAND LIFE-BOAT, DISMISSAL OF CAPT.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1207.

POINT CLARK LIGHT-KEEPER, COMPLAINTS, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 160.

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Semple*) 604.

POINT CLAIRE LIGHTHOUSE, REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1581.

SUPPLIES FOR REPAIRS OF VESSELS: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 411.

WAKEHAM, COMMANDER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1590.

[*See* PROVINCES, &C.]

MARSH HILL (ONT.) POSTMASTERSHIP, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 576.

MARYSVILLE, (N.B.) PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1264.

Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Lount*). 1**, 784; 2**, 908; in Com., 1801; 3**, 1803. (60 *Vic., c.* 13.)

MEMBERS, NEW: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 571.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EX.:

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1036.

ESTIMATES, THE, 1896-97: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 307.

—— SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2056.

—— FURTHER SUPPL: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2345.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 15.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION: Presented (Mr *Laurier*) 85.

LOYALTY RESOLUTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Laurier* 85.

MESSENGERS IN HOUSE OF COMMONS, 1878: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2108.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE:

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL, GRANOLITHIC SIDEWALK: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

CAMERON, MAJ. GEN., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 317.

—— LETTER, *re*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1037, 1131.

—— LETTER TO MIN.: Presented (Mr. *Borden*) 1684.

—— GEN. GASCOIGNE'S LETTER: M. (Mr. *Borden*) 1475.

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1475.

—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Powell*) 2368.

CLOTHING, TELEGRAM FROM SENATOR SANFORD: Read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2368.

FAGES, CAPT. ("B" BATTERY) QUEBEC CENTRE VOTERS' LIST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 875.

FAGES, CAPT. ALF., LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1134, 1580.

FORT ANNE, ANNAPOLIS COUNTY, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1581.

FORTIFICATIONS AT KINGSTON, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1581.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1136.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 858, 1026.

MILITIA CAMPS, CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 1036.

—— On M. for Com. of Sup., 1037.

—— EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 402.

MILITIA CAMP, LONDON, BRIGADE STAFF: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1140,

MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON, ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 159.

—— REP. OF COMMANDANT: M. for copy (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 869.

—— *See* "Cameron, Gen."

—— in Com. of Sup., 2477.

OLIVER'S INFANTRY EQUIPMENT, NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS: Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1209.

VOLUNTEERS (1837-38) SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Broder*) 1337.

—— in Com. of Sup., 1479.

[*See* "SUPPLY," PROVINCES, &C.]

Militia, Annual Drill. *See* "SUPPLY B. No. 18."

MILITIA CAMPS, CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 1036; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1037.

Deb. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1038; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1040; (Mr. *Ingram*) 1041; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1042; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1042, 1053; (Mr. *Calvert*) 1046; (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1046, 1059; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1047; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1047; (Mr. *Domville*) 1048; (Mr. *Gillies*) 1048; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 1051; (Mr. *Foster*) 1053; (Mr. *Speaker*) 1053; (Mr. *Lister*) 1055; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1056; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1058; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1060.

MILITARY COLLEGE. *See* "MILITIA."

MINING ENGINEERS' VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2103.

MINING INTERESTS OF DOM. INFORMATION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bostock*) 1323, 1329.

—— BUREAU, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572.

MISCELLANEOUS PUB. WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1429, 2317.

MONDOUX, A. A., INDIAN AGENT, ABENAKIS VILLAGE, COMPLAINTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mignault*) 2115.

MONTANA, REMOVAL CAN. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2400.

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. *Edwards*). 1°*, 1580: 2°*, 1803; in Com. and 3°*, 2166. (60 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Poupore*) 2115.

MONUMENTS, BATTLEFIELDS OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2242.

MOOSE JAW TOWN SITE, COM. FROM MUNICIPALITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1143.

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 784.

MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2040, 2497.

—— FINES, DISPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2595.

NANAIMO, COMOX, UNION, &C., MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 2102.

NANAIMO HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2300.

NEW BRUNSWICK:

FISHING BOUNTY, DEEP-SEA WEIR FISHING: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1589.

FREDERICTON BRIDGE CO., OVERDUE INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1141.

LAURIER, HON. MR., SPEECH AT DALHOUSIE, N.B., TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2103.

RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY., REVOTE OF SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1591.

TARIFF, THE, MR. DAVIES'S SPEECH AT SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.

See DEPARTMENT, &C.

NEWPORT WHARF (P.E.I.) EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

NFLD. LICENSE FEES, COSTS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 2394.

Nordheimer, Albert. *See* "DIVORCE."

NORTH CHANNEL, DEEPENING: in Com. of Sup., 2248.

NORTH GREY ELECTION, ON THE ADDRESS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 128.

—— Par in "L'ELECTEUR" *re* recent Election; Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 1427.

NORTH ONTARIO ELECTION, ARTICLE IN TORONTO "WORLD": Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 574.

NOTICES OF MOTION, POSTPONEMENT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 14.

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 410.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES. *See* "MANITOBA."

N. W. T. GOVT., INCREASED SUBSIDY: Res. wthdn. (Mr. *Davin*) 601.

N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 312.

N. W. T. Representation Act (Voters' Lists) Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 2057; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2537. (*60 Vic.*, c. 5.)

NOVA SCOTIA:

BEAR RIVER BRIDGE, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1310.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, INCREASED: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 17.

CAPE BRETON MAIL SERVICE. PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1320.

CHAPEL COVE BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 885.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., HON. MR. DAVIES'S SPEECH AT AMHERST: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1308.

—— LAPSED SUBSIDIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1142.

COAL INTERESTS, N.S., MR. LAURIER'S TELEGRAM: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.

CORN AND CORNMEAL, ABOLITION CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 18.

COW BAY BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 576.

FORT ANNE, ANNAPOLIS COUNTY, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1581.

GABARUS BREAKWATER OR PIER: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 576.

HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS IN N.S., ENGINEER'S REP., Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 573.

"HARD-PAN" CLAIMS, CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 1137.

HURVEY LINE RY., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2105.

I. C. R. *See* general heading.

INLAND REVENUE INSPECTOR, HALIFAX, APPNMT., &c., Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2112

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER (C. B.) REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1581.

LOUISBURG SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 408.

PETIT DE GRAT, CONSTRUCTION OF HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1591.

PICTOU ISLAND LIFE-BOAT. DISMISSAL OF CAPT., M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1207.

PORT HAWKESBURY, &c.: MAIL SERVICE, RET. *re.*: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1209, 1373.

—— MORRISON CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1596.

PORT RICHMOND, BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1587.

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN HALIFAX *Chronicle*: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 2545.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES: MR. FIELDING'S LETTER IN HALIFAX *Chronicle* Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 157.

SUPPLIES FOR REPAIRS OF VESSELS: M. for Cor. Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 411.

"WILLIE MCGOWAN" AND "ARIEL." SEIZURES, SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2107.

[*See* DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1672.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1672.

OCEAN S.S. SERVICE. *See* "Atlantic."

OLIVER'S INFANTRY EQUIPMENT, NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS: Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1209.

—— in Com. of Sup., 1479.

O'HARA, W., LATE ACTING COLL. OF CUSTOMS, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 2519.

O'NEIL, JOHN, COLLECTOR OF CANAL TOOLS, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2108.

ONTARIO:

AUSTIN, JOHN, MAIL CLERK. LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1317.

BALSAM AND CAMERON LAKES IMPROVEMENT OF CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *McHugh*) 2104.

BARRON, J. A., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1307.

"BAYFIELD," CAPT. MCGREGOR AND LATE ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 15.

BEDFORD TOWNSHIP, ADDINGTON, REBUILDING BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1138.

BOSTON P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. FOR COR.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL, SIDEWALK: QUES. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

—— GOVT. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

—— POSTAL SERVICE, FREE DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RY., SOLDIERS' ISLAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1207.

CAMPBELL, ANGUS P., P. O. DEPT., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1307.

CAMPBELL, J. J., AND NORTH ONT. BY-ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 884.

CAPE CROKER INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 2273.

CUSTOMS DEFALCATIONS AT PETERBOROUGH: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1140.

DALTON, MAIL CLERK, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1322.

"EMPIRE," TUG, PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1139.

FISHING LICENSES, LINCOLN AND NIAGARA, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gibson*) 609.

FISHING IN LOWER RIDEAU LAKES: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1141.

FLOODS IN SOUTH MONOGAN, PETERBOROUGH: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Kendry*) 2114.

FORDWICH P.O. AND C.P.R. STATION MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 405.

FORTIFICATIONS AT KINGSTON, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1581.

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 886.

—— OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 1210.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1136.

GODERICH HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS. EXPEND., &c.: M. for Stnmt.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 2114.

GORRIE P.O. AND C.P.R. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 405.

INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR, BRANTFORD, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 2596.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY. *See* "JUSTICE."

LAKEFIELD DAM, TRANSFER TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1139.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*
LINLEY, HARRY, FISHERY OVERSEER, KENT CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2113.
LUNDY'S LANE, &C., HISTORICAL MONUMENTS, TENDERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gibson*) 2114.
MARSH HILL POSTMASTERSHIP APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 576.
MILITIA CAMPS, CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 1036.
——on M. for Com. of Sup., 1037.
MILITIA CAMP, LONDON, BRIGADE STAFF: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1149.
MILITARY COLLEGE. *See* "MILITIA."
MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Poupore*) 2115.
NORTH GREY ELECTION, ON THE ADDRESS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 128.
——PAR. IN "L'ELECTEUR" RE RECENT ELECTION; Remarks (Mr. *Sproule* 1427.
NORTH ONT. ELECTION, ARTICLE IN TORONTO "WORLD": Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 574
PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY., Cor. *re* BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mackie*) 1143.
"PETREL", CRUISER, CAPT. DUNN, AND LATE ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 16.
POINT CLARK, LIGHTKEEPER, COMPLAINTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 160.
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Semple*) 604.
PORT ALBERT HARBOUR, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron*) 887.
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, TRANSFER TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 885.
—— DREDGING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 886.
—— PUBLIC EXPEND. AND TRANSFER.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 2114; Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1371.
REFORMATORY AT ALEXANDRIA, CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 1584.
—— in Com. of Sup., 1267.
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, SUPERINTENDENT'S VACATION; Ques. (Mr. *Dyment*) 883.
SCOTT, THOS., RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1372.
SMITH, CHAS. R., APPNMT. BY LATE GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2103.
SMITH, GEO. R., APPNMT. AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1589.
—— DUNNVILLE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2597.
STONEY AND CLEAR LAKES, ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1138.
TAY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1312, 1314.
THOUSAND ISLANDS, WTHDRL. FROM SALE: Ques (Mr. *Taylor*) 1137.
TRENT CANAL, BALSAM LAKE SECTION, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 19.
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, VALUATION OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1140.
WARDSVILLE POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 874.
WATERFORD POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, APPNMT.: &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.
[*See* DEPARTMENTS, "SUPPLY," &C.]
ORDER PAPER, CHANGE OF FORM: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.
ORDER, QUES. OF: TAY CANAL AND LAND DAMAGES (Mr. *Casey*) 1313.
—— UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1043.
ORDER, SINGING, &C., BY MEMBERS: in Com. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1004.
—— IRRELEVANCY OF REMARKS (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 595.
ORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1256.
Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s B. No. 15 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 784; 2°*, 908: in Com. and 3°*, 1803. (60 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)
OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2302, 2316, 2479.
OVERSEERS (FISHERY) AND GUARDIANS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1674.
OYSTER FISHING (P.E.I.) AND DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 573.
—— PRIVILEGES IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1586.
—— REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1310.
OYSTERS, STANDARD BARREL MEASURE: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 573.
PARLIAMENT, NEWSPAPER CRITICISM *re* DIGNITY: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 1597.
—— RULES OF THE HOUSE, DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 10.
—— 8TH, 1ST SESSION: Opening, 1; Prorogation, 2642.
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 1211.
PAYNE, MR. J. L., PAPERS *re*: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1303.
—— in Com. of Sup., 853.
P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 469.
PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY., COR. *re* BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mackie*) 1143.
PENHALLWICK, MESSRS., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY INDIANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.
PETIT, H. E., AND COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2110.
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1452, 2197, 2408; conc., 2555.
—— *See* "JUSTICE," "SUPPLY," &C.
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1262.
PERMANENT CORPS, PAY OF STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 1478.
PERSONAL EXPLANATION, BINDER TWINE (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 1473.
—— CHANGE OF POLITICS (Mr. *Dobell*) 307.
—— INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. STAFF (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 2167.
—— TELEGRAM PUBLISHED IN "L'ELECTEUR," ON M. TO ADJN. HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Dobell*) 1970.
—— VOTE ON TARIFF LEGISLATION (Mr. *Pettet*) 2367.
PETIT DE GRAT, CONSTRUCTION OF HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1591.
PICTOU ISLAND LIFE-BOAT, DISMISSAL OF CAPT.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1207.
Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. *McDougall*). 1°, 785.
POINT CLAIRE LIGHTHOUSE, REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1581.

POINT CLARK, LIGHTKEEPER, COMPLAINTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 160.

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Semple*) 604.

PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, TRANSFER TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 885.

PORTAGE LAPRAIRIE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1286.

PORT ALBERT HARBOUR, ENGINEER'S REPS., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron*) 887.

PORT HAWKESBURY, &c., MAIL CONTRACT, RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1209, 1373.

——— MORRISON CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1596.

PORT MULGRAVE, ARICHAT, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2493.

PORT RICHMOND BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1587.

PORT STANLEY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2490.

——— PUBLIC EXPEND. AND TRANSFER: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Casey*) 2114.

——— DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 886.

——— RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1371.

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 863, 961; contingencies, 1028.

POST OFFICE:

ALLAN SS. CO.'S MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2109.

AUSTIN, JOHN, MAIL CLERK, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1317.

BONAVENTURE RIVER MONEY ORDER OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 406.

BOSTON, (ONT.) P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 452.

BRANTFORD POSTAL SERVICE, FREE DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.

CAMPBELL, ANGUS P., P.O. DEPT., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 1307.

CAPE BRETON MAIL SERVICE, PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1320.

DALTON, MAIL CLERK, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1322.

ELECTION LITERATURE, GRATUITOUS DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Pouliot*) 572.

FORDWICH AND GORRIE P.O. AND C.P.R. STATION MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonal, Huron*) 405.

"*Le Courier du Canada*," FREE TRANSMISSION THROUGH MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 879.

LETTER POSTAGE, 2-CENT RATE; Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1305.

MORRIS (MAN.) MAIL CONTRACT, CANCELLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2112.

MARSH HILL, (ONT.) POSTMASTERSHIP APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 576.

NANAIMO, COMOX, UNION, &c., MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 2102.

PORT HAWKESBURY, &c., MORRISON MAIL CONTRACT RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1209. 1373, 1596.

POSTMASTERS AND LATE ELECTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 1321.

POST OFFICE ACT, VIOLATION *re* FREE POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1306.

POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2122; conc. 2546.

QUEENSTON (ONT.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SALARY; Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 406.

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

RIMOUSKI POST OFFICE, CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 884.

——— CONTRACT: M. for copy.* (Mr. *Fiset*) 2114.

ROSSEAU, WILFRID, APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2109.

ST. JOHN'S (QUEBEC) SUBURBAN POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 878.

SAILOR'S HOPE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2106.

WARDSVILLE POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 874.

WATERFORD POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, APPNMT., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.

[*See* PROVINCES, "SUPPLY, &c."]

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

ANNANDALE WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, &c., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 237.

CAMPBELL COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 237.

CUSTOMS SERVICE, KING'S CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 877.

FISHERY OVERSEER APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 876.

LOBSTER FISHERY AND FISHERY PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1582.

——— PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Remarks (Mr. *Macdonald*) 2168.

NEWPORT WHARF, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

OYSTER FISHERY AND DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 573.

OYSTER FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1586.

OYSTER FISHING, REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1310.

P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 460.

——— EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 159.

——— DISMISSAL OF TRACKMEN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hackett*) 483.

——— EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2105.

PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 606.

——— REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

RYS. IN P.E.I., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 155.

ST. PETER'S BAY LIGHTHOUSE, REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

SAILOR'S HOPE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2108.

STEPHEN'S PIER AT MONTAGUE, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

TIGNISH, MIMINEGASH, &c., BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 238.

TIGNISH VILLAGE, GOVT. AID TO SUFFERERS BY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 617, 2058.

VERNON RIVER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 237.

[*See* DEPARTMENTS, &c.]

PRINTING BUREAU, PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1373, 1596.

PRINTING COM.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 614.

——— JOINT, 1ST REP., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2257.

——— 3RD REP., CONC. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2544.

PRINTING NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 565.
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS COM.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 613.
PRIVATE BILLS, STANDING AT NEXT SESSION OF PARLT.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2444.
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 611.
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN HALIFAX *Chronicle*: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 2545.
PRIVY COUNCIL:
CIVIL SERVICE, APPNMTS., PROMOTIONS, &c., O.Cs.: M. for copies (Mr. *Gibson*) 604.
MACKENZIE, HON. ALEX., O. Cs., PASSED AFTER RESIGNATION, 1878: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1341.
PAYNE, MR. J. L., PAPERS *re*: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1303.
—— in Com. of Sup., 853.
RESIGNATIONS, GOVTL., 1873, 1878, 1896, O.Cs. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 482.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com of Sup., 555, 853; contingencies, 1025.
PROCEDURE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Foster*): Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1311.
PROHIBITION AND LIB. CONVENTION AT OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1317.
—— PLEBISCITE OF DOM.: Ques. (Mr. *Craig*) 406.
PROROGATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2057.
—— COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2595.
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, MR. FIELDING'S LETTER IN HALIFAX *Chronicle*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 157.
PROULX, L'ABBE, PAR. IN "LA PRESSE," *re* TELEGRAM: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1371.
PRUDHOMME, CONST., RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2197.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 614.
PUBLIC OFFICIALS. *See* "Dismissals."
PUBLIC SERVICE AND 8-HOUR LABOUR SYSTEM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1341.
PUBLIC SERVICE AND ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1372.
—— FINANCIAL PROVISIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1209.
PUBLIC WORKS:
ANNANDALE WHARF (P.E.I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.
BEAR RIVER BRIDGE, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1310.
BEDFORD TOWNSHIP, ADDINGTON, REBUILDING BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1138.
BELLE RIVER (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, &c., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 237.
BRANTFORD GOVT. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henry*) 879.
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, CONNECTING I.C.R. AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 17.
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 609.
—— GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 883.
CAMPBELL COVE (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 237.
PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
CHAPEL COVE (C.B.) BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques (Mr. *Gillies*) 885.
COW BAY (C.B.) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 576.
GABARUS (C.B.) BREAKWATER OR PIER: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 576.
GASPÉ COAST ROAD, MAINTENANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.
GODERICH HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPEND., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 2114.
HARBOURS AND BREAKWATER IN N.S., ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 513.
LAKEFIELD DAM, TRANSFER TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1139.
LANGEVIN BLOCK, OTTAWA, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies (Mr. *Cameron*) 427.
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER (C.B.) REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1581.
LITTLE METIS HARBOUR OF REFUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 885.
NEWPORT (P.E.I.) WHARF EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.
PETIT DE GRAT (C.B.) CONSTRUCTION OF HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1591.
PETIT, H. E., AND COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2110.
PORT ALBERT HARBOUR, ENGINEER'S REPS., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron*) 887.
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, TRANSFER TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 885.
PORT RICHMOND BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1587.
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beattie*) 886.
—— PUBLIC EXPEND. AND TRANSFER: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Casey*) 2114.
—— RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1371.
PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1256, 1428, 1449, 2222, 2297, 2302, 2479, 2548.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 963, 2199.
PUBLIC WORKS IN B.C., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.
—— GASPÉ, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 875.
—— P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 606.
—— REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, CONSTRUCTION OF LOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 877.
ST. PETER'S BAY (P.E.I.) LIGHTHOUSE, REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.
STEPHEN'S PIER AT MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.
TIGNISH, MIMINEGASH, &c. (P.E.I.) BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 238.
VERNON RIVER (P.E.I.) DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 237.
VICTORIA AND CARMANAH POINT TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.
[*See* "SUPPLY," PROVINCES, &c.]
QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1256, 2214, 2468.
QUEBEC IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2319.
QUEBEC:
ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 891.
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 236.

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

BONAVENTURE RIVER MONEY ORDER OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 406.

BOURASSA, P. E., IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1307.

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC CONNECTING I.C.R. AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 17.

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 609.

——— CONSTRUCTION, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 883.

CHAMBLY CANAL LOCK-KEEPER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2109.

CULLING TIMBER, CULLERS' FEES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Quinn*) 411.

——— MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 482.

FAGES, CAPT. ALF., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1134, 1580.

FAGES, CAPT. ("B" BATTERY) QUEBEC CENTRE. VOTERS' LIST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 875.

FISH-WAYS IN NORTH RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 1137.

FLODDY, INFORMER, INLAND REV. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2111.

FRENCH CAN. EMIGRATION TO BRAZIL: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 957, 1133.

GASPE COAST ROAD, MAINTENANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.

GENERAL ELECTION (EIGHTH) PRINTING, &C., OF RETS.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2115.

HANNAN, JOHN, DISMISSAL FROM LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 577.

HAYES, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 402.

"HORN-FLY" ERADICATION OF SCOURGE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 2107.

I.C.R. *See* general heading.

JACQUES CARTIER ELECTION, JUDGMENT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.

"LA CANADIENNE," CRUISER, DR. ENNIS'S TRIP TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 572, 874, 1585.

LACHINE CANAL, LOCK NO. 1: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1306,

——— LOCK NO. 2, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1136.

LAVAL ELECTION, JUDGMENT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1303.

"*Le Courier du Canada*," FREE TRANSMISSION THROUGH MAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 879.

LEMIEUX, JOS., FISHERY INSPECTOR, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 237.

LEPINE, ALF., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1582.

LIGHTHOUSE AT OKA, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 1305.

LITTLE METIS HARBOUR OF REFUGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 885.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS LIGHTHOUSE, IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.

——— LOBSTER HATCHERY: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 882.

MARCHAND, MR. F. G., TRIP TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS ON *Aberdeen*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 406.

MONDOUX, A. A., INDIAN AGENT, ABENAKIS VILLAGE, COMPLAINTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mignault*) 2115.

O'NEIL, JOHN, COLLECTOR OF CANAL TOLLS, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2108.

PETIT, H. E., AND COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2110.

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

POINT CLAIRE LIGHTHOUSE, REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1581.

PROULX, L'ABBÉ, PAR. IN *La Presse* re TELEGRAM: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1371.

QUEBEC P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 1265, 2301.

RIMOUSKI P. O., CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 884.

——— CONTRACT: M. for copy* (Mr. *Fiset*) 2114.

ROSSEAU, WILFRID, APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2109.

ST. JOHN, PORT PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Dupont*) 238.

ST. JOHN'S (QUEBEC) SUBURBAN POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 878.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 601.

SOULANGES CANAL, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1586.

——— TENDERS, &C., FOR BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 880.

THREE RIVERS EX., EXPERIMENTAL FARM STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1583.

VOLUNTEERS' (1837-38) SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Broder*) 1337.

[*See* DEPARTMENTS, &C.]

QUEENSTON (ONT.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 406.

QUESTIONS, &C., ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 9.

RAILWAYS:

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 236.

BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RY., SOLDIERS' ISLAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1207.

C. P. R. LANDS IN N. W. T., EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 881.

——— LAND GRANTS BY THE CROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1142.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY., LANDS IN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 1587.

"HARD-PAN" CLAIMS, CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 1137.

INTERCOLONIAL. *See* general heading.

INTERNATIONAL RY. CO., ST. PETERSBURG: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.

——— LONDON, 1895: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

P. E. I. RY. BRANCH LINES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 469.

[*See* "DISMISSALS."]

PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY., COR. re BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mackie*) 1143.

RY. LANDS IN N.W.T., SELECTION, &C., BY COMPANIES: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 881.

RYS. IN P.E.I., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 155.

RY. RATES COMMISSION, PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE: (Mr. *Oliver*) 674, 879.

[*See* PROVINCES, &C.]

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°, 313.

——— **B. No. 34** (Mr. *Bain*). 1°*, 1876.

RY. RATES COMMISSION, PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 874, 879.

Ry. Employees Protection B. No. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*). 1°*, 155; 2°, 918.

Ry. Return Fare Tickets, Sale B. No. 3 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*). 1**, 155.

Ry. Lands in N.W.T., Selection, &c., by Companies: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 881.

Rys. in P.E.I., Legislation respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 155.

Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines Com.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 612.

Rys. and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 967, 1494, 2244, 2478.

Rys. Subsidies in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 403.

——— Ques. (Mr. *McInnis*) 574.

Rapide Plat Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2293.

Rebellion in N. W. T., Monument at Toronto, Govt. Aid: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 883.

Reformatory at Alexandria, Contract, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan.*) 1584.

——— in Com. of Sup., 1267.

Regina, Govt. House Site: in Com. of Sup., 2302.

Resignations, Govtl., 1873, 1878, 1896, O.Cs. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 482.

Restigouche and Victoria Ry., Revote of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1591.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.

Anderson, Wm., Claims for Damages by Indians* (Mr. *Davin*) 2114

Antwerp Exhibition, 1885* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 891.

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Langelier*) 582.

Austin, John, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence (Mr. *Cameron*) 1317.

Battleford Industrial School, Close Confinement of Boy (Mr. *Richardson*) 1323.

Board of Commissioners (Customs), Appnmt.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1341.

Boston P.O., Change of Name* (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.

Bridge at Quebec, connecting I.C.R. with C.P.R.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 609.

Brockville and Ottawa Ry., Soldiers' Island* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1207.

Chinese Immigration, Memorials to Govt. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 893, 1344.

Civil Service Appnmts., Promotions, &c., O.Cs. (Mr. *Gibson*) 604.

Connolly, Messrs., Claim against Govt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1169.

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., Aid (Mr. *Davin*) 583.

Culling Timber at Montreal, &c.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 482.

——— Cullers' Fees, &c. (Mr. *Quinn*) 411.

Dalton, Mail Clerk, Leave of Absence (Mr. *Cameron*) 1322.

Death Duties imposed upon Colonists by England* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

Fishery Commission, Joint (Mr. *McDougall*) 1144, 1168.

Fishing Licenses, Lincoln and Niagara, Names, &c.* (Mr. *Gibson*) 603.

Floods in South Monogan, Peterborough* (Mr. *Kendry*) 2114.

General Elections (Eighth) Printing, &c.* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2115.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

Goderich Harbour Improvements, Expend., &c.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 2114.

Govt. Rys., I.C.R. Branch Lines (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 423.

Govt. (late) Reps. and O.C., &c., presented to His Ex. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1322

Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T. (Mr. *Davin*) 1188, 1200.

Imperial Stamp Duty on Colonial Securities* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.

I. C. R. *See* general heading.

International Customs Bureau, Brussels* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

International Ry. Co., St. Petersburg* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2114.

Kootenay Smelting Co.'s Land Grant at Revelstoke* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

Land Grants in Ry. Belt, B.C.* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

Langevin Block, Ottawa, Contracts for Construction, &c. (Mr. *Cameron*) 427.

London International Ry. Co., 1895* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

Lundy's Lane, &c., Historical Monuments, Tenders, &c. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2114.

Mackenzie, Hon. Alex., O.C.'s passed after Resignation, 1878* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1341.

McBride, Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Mr. *Hackett*) 467.

Mara, J. A., ex-M.P., Land Grants at Revelstoke* (Mr. *Bostock*) 1207.

Marine, &c., sub-Agents at Pictou, Dismissal* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1207.

Mondoux, A. A., Indian Agent, Abenakis Village, Complaints* (Mr. *Mignault*) 2115.

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal* (Mr. *Poupore*) 2115.

Point Clark Lighthouse-keeper, Complaints against (Mr. *Semple*) 604.

Port Albert Harbour, Engineer's Reps., &c. (Mr. *Cameron*) 887.

Port Stanley Harbour, Public Expenditure and Transfer* (Mr. *Casey*) 2114.

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (Mr. *Martin*) 469.

——— Dismissal of Trackmen* (Mr. *Hackett*) 85.

Penhallwick, Messrs., Claims for Damages by Indians (Mr. *Davin*) 2114.

Pictou Island Life-boat, Dismissal of Capt.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1207.

Public Officials, Dismissals, &c., since July, 1895 (Mr. *Haggart*) 601.

Public Service and 8-hour Labour System* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1341.

Public Works, P.E.I. (Mr. *Martin*) 606.

Resignations, Govtl., 1873, 1878, 1896, O. C.'s *re** (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 482.

Rimouski Post Office Contract* (Mr. *Fiset*) 2114.

St. Lawrence River Floods. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 601.

Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c.* (Mr. *Martin.*) 2115.

——— to N.W.T., Increased. (Mr. *Oliver*) 412.

Supplies for Repairs of Vessels. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 411.

Trust Funds, 1888, Investment* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

Waterford Postmaster, Resignation, Appnmt. &c.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.

[*See* Departments, Provinces, &c.]

Rideau Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2257.

RIMOUSKI POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: M. for copy. (Mr. *Fiset*) 2114.
——— CONTRACTOR'S FAILURE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 884.
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP STATION, I.C.R. GRADING: in Com. of Sup., 2248.
RIVIÈRE DU SUD: in Com. of Sup., 2483.
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1429, 2317.
ROSSEAU, WILFRID, APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2109.
ROULEAU, MR. F. F., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1373, 1766.
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1376, 1775, 2642.
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, CONSTRUCTION OF LOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 877.
St. Catharines and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. *Louna*). 1°*, 1768; 2°*, 2102; in Com. and 3°*, 2166. (60 *Vic. c.* 9.)
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 11 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 784, 2°*, 908; in Com. and 3°*, 1342. (60 *Vic., c.* 12.)
ST. FRANÇOIS STATION, I. C. R., SIDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2478.
ST. JOHN, DUBLIN AND BELFAST, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2495.
——— HALIFAX, LONDON OR LIVERPOOL, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2021.
——— AND W. INDIES, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2022.
ST. JOHN, P. Q., PORT PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Dupont*) 238.
ST. JOHN'S (QUEBEC) SUBURBAN POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 878.
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1262, 2300.
——— FLOODS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Beaulsoleil*) 601.
ST. LAWRENCE VALLEY EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 2209, 2223.
ST. PETER'S BAY (P.E.I.) LIGHTHOUSE REBUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com of Sup., 1265, 1471.
ST. LOUIS *vs.* QUEEN: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2280.
ST. VALENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2488.
SAILOR'S HOPE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2106.
SASKATCHEWAN, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 161, 239.
——— ISSUE OF WARRANT FOR WRIT (Mr. *Speaker*) 310.
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, SUPERINTENDENT'S VACATION: Ques. (Mr. *Dyment*) 883.
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2251.
SCHOOLS, MAN., PRESS REP. *re* MR. GREENWAY: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1134.
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1665.
SCHOOLS, MAN., PENDING NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2391.
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1674.
SECRETARY OF STATE:
DISMISSALS, INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1591, 2057, 2167.
GENERAL ELECTION (EIGHTH) PRINTING, &c., OF RETS.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 2115.
GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS, PRINTING: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) 482.
PRINTING BUREAU, PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1373, 1596.
PROHIBITION, PLEBISCITE OF DOM.: Ques. (Mr. *Craig*) 406.
SCOTT, THOS., RET. *re.*: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1372.
SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 859; contingencies, 1026.
Seduction, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."
SEIZURES OF SEALERS BY RUSSIANS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1589
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1475.
Senate and House of Commons Act. Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Rogers*). 1, 1682.
——— **B. No. 40**, (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2538. (60 *Vic., c.* 4.)
SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 1673, 2206, 2445.
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, COMPLAINT AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 1315.
SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1070, 1076.
——— MESSENGERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2445.
SHORTIS, VALENTINE, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 407.
——— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF PAPERS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2278.
SMITH, CHAS. R., APPNMT. BY LATE GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2103.
SMITH, GEORGE R., APPNMT. AS PREVENTIVE OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1589.
——— DUNNVILLE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2597.
SMITH, Mr. H. R., Commissioner to administer Oaths, 1.
SMUGGLING BETWEEN U.S. AND B.C., PREVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 405.
SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, PROCEEDINGS OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 403.
SOULANGES CANAL, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1586.
——— TENDERS, &c., FOR BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 880.
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 1768; 2°*, 2102; in Com. and 3°*, 2166. (60 *Vic., c.* 10.)
SPEAKER, ELECTION: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2.
SPEAKER, DEP., ELECTION: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 307.
——— SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 1068.
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5; Prorogation, 2642.
STANDING ORDERS COM.: List presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 613.

STATIONERY FOR HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 2447.

STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 2210.

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 1212, 2212.

STEPHEN'S PIER AT MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 238.

STICKEEN RIVER EXPLORATION SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 2405.

STONEY AND CLEAR LAKES, ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 1138.

SUBSIDIES TO N.W.T., INCREASED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Oliver*) 412.

——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) wthdn., 601.

——— (DOM.) TO RYS., &C.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2115.

——— *See* "FINANCE."

SUNDAY LABOUR ON CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 1210.

SUPERANNUATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 886.

SUPPLIES FOR REPAIRS OF VESSELS: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 411.

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.; Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Dismissal of Public Officials, 318: deb. adjd., 401; rsmd., 484. Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., *re* Estimates, 545. Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) Governor General's Warrants, 620; deb. adjd., 712; rsmd., 714, 786. Amt. neg. (Y. 69, N. 103) 851. Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) J. K. Lambert, 959: (Mr. *Beattie*) Contracts for Militia Supplies, 1037; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Dismissals from I.C.R., 1064; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 1374; (Mr. *Sproule*) North Grey Election, 1427: (Mr. *McDougall*) Seizure of Schooners by Russians, 1475: (Mr. *Taylor*) Dismissal of Webster Augustus, 1476; (Mr. *Davin*) Ques. of Priv., "The Salary Grab," 1597: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Governor General and Change of Government, 1623. Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) Tariff Legislation, 1684-1727; deb. rsmd., 1768; neg. (Y. 76. N. 113) 1848. Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Appointment of Judge, B.C. Supreme Court, 1930; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 2115; (Mr. *Davin*) Sir Richard Cartwright's conference with Hon. Jos. Chamberlain, 2122; (Mr. *McGillivray*) North Ont. Indian Reserve, 2169. Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) Tariff Legislation, 2274; neg. (Y. 26, N. 128) 2276. Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) Shortis case, 2278; (Mr. *Powell*) Major Gen. Cameron, 2368; (Mr. *Casgrain*) Man. Schools Question, 2390.

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1896-97, 307; Suppl., 2056; further Suppl., 2345.

RES. (Mr. *Fielding*) FOR COM., 306; Ms., 318, 619, 959, 1037, 1211, 1374, 1475, 1597, 1623, 1684, 1930, 2115, 2169, 2274, 2368, 2444.

IN COM.: 5 5, 853, 961, 1068, 1211, 1428, 1478, 1512, 1609, 1671, 1851, 1933. 1977, 2019. 2122, 2173, 2280, 2391, 2444.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Cold Storage, 2469.
Creameries in N.W.T., 2467.
Agricultural Societies, Aid, 1256.
Archives, 1211.
Census, Man., 2212.
Dairying Service, 1237.
Dominion Crop Reports, 1235.
Experimental Farms, 1213.
Fall Wheat, Experimental Stations, 1236.
"Patent Record," 1211.
St. Lawrence Valley Exhibition, 2209, 2223.
Statistical Year-Book, 1212, 2212.
Statistics, general, 2210.

Charges of Management:

Assistant Receiver Gen.'s Office, 562.
Printing Notes, 565.

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dep't., 868, 2440.
Auditor General's Dept., 859.
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 1032.
Auditor General, 1027.
Customs, 2444.
Finance and Treasury Board, 1028.
Governor General's Sec's Office, 1024.
High Commissioner's Office, 978.
Militia and Defence, 1026.
Post Office Dept., 1028.
Privy Council Office, 1025.
Secretary of State, 1026.
Trade and Commerce, 1034.
Customs Dept., 860.
Fisheries Dept., 961.
Geological Survey, 968.
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, 565.
Indian Dept., 1933.
Inland Revenue Dept., 862.
Interior Dept., 1851.
Justice Dept., 2173.
Penitentiaries Branch, 570.
Marine Dept., 961.
Militia and Defence Dept., 858.
Postmaster General's Dept., 863, 961.
Privy Council Office, 565, 853.
Public Works Dept., 963, 2199.
Railways and Canals Dept., 967.
Secretary of State's Dept., 859.
Trade and Commerce, 969.

Collection of Revenues:

Customs, 1609, 2430, 2502.
Dominion Lands, 2165, 2407.
Electric Light Inspection, 2406.
Excise, 2043.
Post Office, 2122; conc., 2546.
Public Works, 1449.
Weights and Measures, Gas, &c., 2047.

Dominion Police:

Prudhomme, Const., retiring allowance, 2197.

Dominion Lands—Capital:

Surveys, examination of surveys, &c., 2407.
[*See* "Collection of Revenues."]

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Fisheries:
Behring Sea, Award Regulations, 2394.
Behring Sea Claims Convention, 2392.
Costs *re* License Fees, Nfld., 2394.
Fish-breeding and Lobster Hatcheries, 1677.
Overseers and Guardians, salaries, &c., 1674.
Protection Service, 1678, 2394.

Geological Survey. See "Civil Government."

Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 1934.
Expenses, 1935.
Women's Protective Society, 2228.

Indians:
British Columbia, 2039.
Manitoba and N.W.T., 2039.
Blackfeet Reserve, Tannery, 2402.
Elkhorn Industrial School, 2398.
Removal Can. Indians from Montana, 2400.
Crowstand Boarding School, 2402.
Nova Scotia, 2023.

Justice, Administration of:
County Judge, Man., additional, 2173, 2538; conc., 2558. Exchequer Court, 1450.

Legislation:
House of Commons:
Deputy Speaker's salary, 1068.
Salaries, Clerk's Estimate, 1069.
Serjeant-at-Arms Estimate, 1126.
Sessional Clerks, &c., 1070, 1076.
Stationery, 2447.
Library:
Sessional Messengers, 2467.
Senate:
Leather trunks, 2206.
Speaker's Secretary, 2445.
Sessional Messengers, &c., 2445.

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Construction, &c., of Light, 1673.
Fog Alarm at Belle Isle, 2391.
Gas Buoys on Lake Erie, 2391.
Lightkeepers' Salaries and allowances, 1673.
Maintenance and Repairs, 1673.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, 2491.
Great Britain and Canada, conc., 2583.
Liverpool and St. John, conc., 2557.
Port Mulgrave, Arichat, &c., 2022, 2493.
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 2495.
St. John, Halifax, London or Liverpool, 2021, 2494.
St. John, &c., and West Indies, &c., 2022.

Militia:
Annual Drill, 556; conc., 619.
Annual Drill, 1895-96, Man., 2243.
Arms, Ammunition, &c., 2243.
Artillery and Rifle Associations, &c., 1493.
Charlottetown Drill Shed, Roadway, 2236.
Civil Employees Wages, &c., 1478.
Clothing and Necessaries, 1671, 1977, 2019, 2228; conc. 2545.
Contingencies, Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 1494.
Dep. Asst. Adjutant Gen., 2228.
Dom. Rifle Association, 2243.
Esquimalt, B.C., Defence, 1494.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Militia—Continued.
Military College, 2477.
Monuments, Battlefields of Can., 2242.
Permanent Corps, Pay of Staff, 1479.
Warlike and Other Stores, 1479.

Mounted Police, 2040.

Miscellaneous:
Arbitration, Ont. and Que., 2043.
Boundary, delimitation, U. S. and Can., 2402.
British Medical Association's Meeting, 2500.
Foster, Jas. J., Refund of Bonus, 2495.
Hudson's Bay Expedition, 2498.
Li Hung Chang and Suite, Transportation, 2501.
Mounted Police Destitute Half-breeds, 2497.
Stickine River Exploratory Survey, 2495.

Ocean and River Service:
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 1672.
Tidal Service, 1672.
Winter Mail Service, 1672.

Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 1473.
Dorchester, 1472.
General:
Commissions of Investigation, 2197, 2408; conc., 2555.
Kingston, Binder Twine, 1452.
Manitoba, 1472.
St. Vincent de Paul, 1471.

Pensions:
Colebrooke, Mrs., and child, 1262.

Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."

Public Works—Capital:
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Nanaimo Harbour, 2300.
Ontario:
Collingwood Harbour, 2297; conc., 2548.
Kaministiquia River, 1262.
Quebec:
St. Lawrence River Channel, 1262, 2300.

Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
Manitoba:
Portage la Prairie P. O., 1286.
Maritime Provinces Generally, 1264.
New Brunswick:
Marysville Public Building, 1264.
North-west Territories:
Regina Govt. House, site, 2302.
Nova Scotia:
Halifax Drill Hall, 1263, 2479.
Dominion Buildings:
Ontario:
Dominion Public Buildings, 2302.
Dominion Reformatory, 1267.
Ottawa, 2302, 2316, 2479.
Toronto Public Buildings, 2319.
Quebec:
Coaticook Public Building, 2302.
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 1265.
Quebec Immigration Buildings, 2319.
Quebec P. O., 1265, 2301.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 1265.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.
Dredging, 1300, 1428.
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 2343.
New Brunswick, 2324, 2480.
Nova Scotia, 1299, 2320, 2479.
Boularderie Wharf, 2322.
Ontario, 2338, 2489.
Burlington Channel, 2338.
Goderich Breakwater, 2339.
Port Stanley Breakwater, 2490.
Prince Edward Island, 1300, 2325, 2481.
Quebec, 2333, 2483.
Rivière du Sud, 2483.
St. Valentine, 2488.
Miscellaneous, 1429, 2317.
Roads and Bridges, 1429, 2317.
Telegraphs, 1429, 2317, 2344.

Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 1257, 2214, 2468.
Jones, Mrs. W. McNaughton, gratuity, 2468,
Organized Districts, 1256.
Tracadie Lazaretto, 2222.
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital, 1257.

Railways and Canals—Capital:
Canals:
Cornwall, 2248.
Galops, 2249.
Lachine, 2255.
North Channel, Deepening, 2248.
Rideau, 2257.
Sault Ste. Marie, 2251.
Welland, 2478.
Railways:
Intercolonial:
Dismissals, 1494.
Halifax Cotton Branch, Extension, 2246.
Halifax, increased Accommodation, 2244.
Lévis, increased Accommodation, 2247.
Rivière du Loup Station, grading, 2248.
Snow Fences, 2247.
St. François Station Siding, &c., 2478.
Wharf Accommodation at Dalhousie, 2244.

Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 2282.
Farran's Point, 2293.
Galops, 2294.
Iroquois, 2294.
Lachine, 2282.
Rapide Plat, 2293.
Trent, 2283, 2289.
Welland, 2295.

Scientific Institutions:
Hydrographic Surveys, 1674.

Trade and Commerce. See "Civil Government."

CONCURRENCE.
Annual Drill, 619.
Clothing and Necessaries (Militia) 2545.
Collingwood Harbour, 2548.
County Court Judge, Man., 2558.
Great Britain and Can. SS. Service, 2583.
Liverpool and St. John SS. Service, 2557.
Mail Service (P.O.) 2546.
Penitentiaries, Commissions of Investigation, 2555.

Supply B. (Militia Appropriation) No. 18 (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*. 786; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1037. (60 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

——**B. No. 30** (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1765. (60 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

——**B. No. 39** (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 2595; 3° m., 2598; 3°, 2642. (60 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

Supreme Court Judges, Temporary Appnmts., B. No. 33 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 1875.

—— ADDITIONAL JUDGE: prop. Res. wthdn. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2367.

SUPREME COURT (B.C.) ADDITIONAL JUDGE: on M. for Com. of Sup., 1930.

SURVEYS, EXAMINATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2407.

TARIFF LEGISLATION: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Foster*) 1684: Amt., 1727; neg. (Y. 76, N. 139) 1847.

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2274: neg. (Y. 26, N. 128) 2276.

—— DAVIES, HON. MR., SPEECH AT SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 156.

—— LAURIER, HON. MR., SPEECH AT SOHMER PARK, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 156.

—— SPEECH IN WINDSOR HALL, MONTREAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 18.

TAY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1312, 1314.

TELEGRAPHS, &C.: In Com. of Sup., 1429, 2317, 2344.

THOUSAND ISLANDS, WTHDRL. FROM SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1137.

THREE RIVERS EX., EXPERIMENTAL FARM STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1583.

TIDAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1672.

TIGNISH, MIMINEGASH, &c., (P.E.I.) BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 238.

TIGNISH VILLAGE SUFFERERS BY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 2058.

—— GOVT. AID TO SUFFERERS BY FIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 617.

TOBACCO, DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1310.

——REGULATIONS *re* MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2107.

TORONTO PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2319.

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 2222.

TRADE AND COMMERCE.

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE. *See* general heading.

AUSTRALIA IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 1144, 1585.

GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA SS. SERVICE: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 575.

HAY EXPORTS, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 1136.

IMPORTS AND HOME CONSUMPTION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 575.

INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU, BRUSSELS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

MANUFACTURERS AND THE TARIFF, CIRCULAR LETTER: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 884.

TRADE AND COMMERCE: in Com. of Sup., 969; contingencies, 1034.

[*See* "CUSTOMS" &c.]

TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S., SPEECHES OF MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1304.

—— LAURIER, HON. MR., SPEECH AT DALHOUSIE, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2103.

TRENT CANAL, BALSAM LAKE SECTION, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 19.

—— VALUATION OF LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Long*) 1140.

—— in Com. of Sup., 2283, 2289.

TRUST FUNDS, 1888, INVESTMENT: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2115.

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE. 1043.

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp., B. No. 36 (Mr. *Maxwell*). 1**, 1303; 2**, 1512; wthdn., 1929.

VERNON RIVER (P.E.I.) DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 237.

VETERINARY SURGEONS (N.W.T.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1067.

VICTORIA AND CARMANAH POINT TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 404.

VOLUNTEERS' (1837-38) SERVICES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Broder*) 1337.

Voters' Lists. *See* "N.W.T."

WAKEHAM, COMMANDER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1590.

WARDSVILLE POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 874.

WARLIKE AND OTHER STORES: in Com. of Sup., 1479.

WATERFORD POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, APPNMT.,&C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Charlton*) 482.

WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 307: in Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 713.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2047.

—— LEGISLATION *re* REPEAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 2107.

—— METRIC SYSTEM, ADOPTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 9.

WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2295, 2478.

"WILLIE MCGOWAN" AND "ARIEL," SEIZURES, SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 2107.

WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 1257.

WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1672.

WOMEN'S PROTECTIVE SOCIETY: in Com. of Sup., 2228.

WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, SERVICES DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1590.